

Refinement-stable Consensus Methods

Mareike Fischer¹, Michael Hendriksen²

¹Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of
Greifswald, Germany

²Institut für Molekulare Evolution, Heinrich-Heine Universität,
Düsseldorf, Germany

Abstract

In a recent study, Bryant, Francis and Steel investigated the concept of “future-proofing” consensus methods in phylogenetics. That is, they investigated if such methods can be robust against the introduction of additional data like extra trees or new species. In the present manuscript, we analyze consensus methods under a different aspect of introducing new data, namely concerning the discovery of new clades. In evolutionary biology, often formerly unresolved clades get resolved by refined reconstruction methods or new genetic data analyses. In our manuscript we investigate which properties of consensus methods can guarantee that such new insights do not disagree with previously found consensus trees but merely refine them. We call consensus methods with this property *refinement-stable*. Along these lines, we also study two famous super tree methods, namely Matrix Representation with Parsimony (MRP) and Matrix Representation with Compatibility (MRC), which have also been suggested as consensus methods in the literature. While we (just like Bryant, Francis and Steel in their recent study) unfortunately have to conclude some negative answers concerning general consensus methods, we also state some relevant and positive results concerning the majority rule (MR) and strict consensus methods, which are amongst the most frequently used consensus methods. Moreover, we show that there exist infinitely many consensus methods which are refinement-stable and have some other desirable properties.

1 Introduction

In phylogenetics, consensus methods play a fundamental role concerning tree reconstruction: For instance when different genes of the same set of species lead to different gene trees or when different tree reconstruction methods come to different results, it may be hard to decide which of the given trees is the “true” tree in the sense of coinciding with the underlying (unknown) species tree. This is where consensus methods come into play — they use certain rules to summarize a set of trees

to form a *consensus tree*. There are various such methods used in biology, and their results can be quite different. However, even if you stick to one consensus method, its outcome might change when new input data is discovered. This is why it is important to determine how “future-proof” consensus methods are; i.e. how robust they are against the introduction of new data.

In a recent study [6], Bryant, Francis and Steel investigated the properties of consensus methods in an axiomatic manner, proposing three simple conditions that a consensus method should obey, referring to any such method as *regular*. The purpose of the article was precisely to investigate the concept of “future-proofing” with consensus methods. In particular, they investigated associative stability – robustness against the introduction of additional trees, and extension stability – robustness against the introduction of additional species. Unfortunately, it has recently been determined that such future-proofing is impossible, as there exist no regular, extension stable consensus methods [6], and while regularity and associative stability is possible, a consensus method cannot be regular, associatively stable and Pareto on rooted triples [8], i.e. the combination of certain desirable properties is not possible.

In the present paper we investigate a related question – can a consensus method be robust against refinement of the input trees? This question is of the utmost importance, as often formerly unresolved clades in known phylogenetic trees get resolved by new genetic analyses or refined tree reconstruction methods. This implies that a given set of input trees might be changed in the sense that new clades are added rather than new species or entirely new trees as in [6], and the main purpose of the present manuscript is to analyze the impact of this scenario on consensus methods. Additionally, we also study two so-called supertree methods, namely Matrix Representation with Parsimony (MRP) and Matrix Representation with Compatibility. These methods are sometimes considered as consensus methods in the literature, even though there is some ongoing debate about that [2, 3], because these methods do not necessarily lead to a unique tree and thus require another consensus method to summarize all trees they find. However, we will show in the present manuscript that even in the ideal case in which these methods do lead to a unique tree, these methods are not future-proof – neither in the sense of adding new species (thus complementing the study of [6]) nor in the sense of resolving new clades.

While the above mentioned findings might be considered “bad news”, we also show that majority rule consensus methods (including the so-called strict consensus) are indeed *refinement-stable*, i.e. they are robust against the new resolution of formerly unresolved input trees. Moreover, we are even able to show that there exist infinitely many consensus methods which are regular and refinement-stable, and even non-contradictory (which is yet another desirable property) – even if the class of such methods does not contain some of the established methods like loose consensus or Adams consensus. This paves the way for new directions in future research, namely the search for new consensus methods which have these desirable properties and are biologically plausible. Such methods could have huge potential in replacing some of the existing consensus methods.

2 Preliminaries

Before we can present our results, we need to formally introduce the most important concepts discussed in this manuscript.

2.1 Basic phylogenetic concepts

In the following, let X be a finite set, typically a set of *taxa* or *species*, but for simplicity, we may also assume without loss of generality that, whenever $|X| = n$, we have $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Recall that a phylogenetic X -tree T is a connected acyclic graph whose leaves are bijectively labelled by the elements of X . If there is one distinguished node ρ referred to as the *root* of the tree, then T is called *rooted*; otherwise T is called *unrooted*. Let $RP(X)$ and $UP(X)$ denote the set of rooted and unrooted phylogenetic trees on X , respectively. Then, a *profile* of trees is an ordered tuple (T_1, \dots, T_k) of trees such that $T_1, \dots, T_k \in RP(X)$ or $T_1, \dots, T_k \in UP(X)$ (that is, the trees in a profile must all be rooted or all be unrooted, and they must all refer to the same taxon set X).

We now first turn our attention to unrooted trees. Recall that a bipartition σ of X into two non-empty and disjoint subsets A and B is often called *X-split* (or *split* for short if there is no ambiguity), and is denoted by $\sigma = A|B$. Also recall that there is a natural relationship between X -splits and the edges of an unrooted phylogenetic X -tree T , because the removal of an edge e induces such a bipartition of X . In the following, the set of all such induced X -splits of T will be denoted by $\Sigma(T)$. Moreover, note that the *size of an X-split* $\sigma = A|B$ is defined as $|\sigma| = \min\{|A|, |B|\}$ [11]. An X -split of size 1 is called *trivial*. Note that two X -splits $\sigma_1 = A|B$ and $\sigma_2 = \tilde{A}|\tilde{B}$ are called *compatible* if at least one of the intersections $A \cap \tilde{A}$, $A \cap \tilde{B}$, $B \cap \tilde{A}$ or $B \cap \tilde{B}$ is empty (note that if more than one of them is empty, then $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$).

A fundamental and classic insight concerning unrooted trees is provided by the following classic theorem by Buneman [7], which is also known as Splits-Equivalence Theorem (see also [14, p. 44]).

Theorem 2.1 (Buneman). *Let Σ be a collection of X -splits. Then, there is an unrooted phylogenetic X -tree T such that $\Sigma = \Sigma(T)$ if and only if Σ contains the trivial splits and all splits in Σ are pairwise compatible. Moreover, if such a tree exists, it is unique (up to isomorphism).*

The Buneman theorem implies that an unrooted phylogenetic X -tree T is uniquely determined by its non-trivial X -splits $\Sigma^*(T)$ (note that given $\Sigma^*(T)$, the unique tree T can be found by the so-called Tree Popping algorithm [13, 14]). Recall that these splits can be coded as binary *characters* $B^*(T)$. A character is a function $f : X \rightarrow C$ from X to some alphabet C , and it is called binary whenever $|C| = 2$. For simplicity, in such cases we assume $C = \{0, 1\}$. Note that the elements of an alphabet are also often referred to as *states* or *character states*. Moreover, note that we often use the shorthand $f(1)f(2)\dots f(n)$ for a character on $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For instance, rather than explicitly writing $f(1) = 1$, $f(2) = 1$, $f(3) = 0$ and $f(4) = 0$,




Figure 1: All phylogenetic X -trees for $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

we will write $f = 1100$. Note that the characters 1100 and 0011 refer to the same X -split and are thus considered equivalent. Therefore, we will assume without loss of generality that when we translate a tree to its non-trivial X -splits and these X -splits in turn to binary characters, taxon 1 is always in state 1.

As an example, consider the four 4-taxon trees on $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ depicted in Figure 1. Tree T_1 , which has no non-trivial splits, has $\Sigma^*(T_1) = \emptyset$ and thus also $B^*(T_1) = \emptyset$. On the other hand, T_2 has the $\Sigma^*(T_2) = \{12|34\}$, and thus $B^*(T_2) = \{1100\}$.

For rooted trees it is known that they are not fully determined by their corresponding sets of splits, because these do not contain any information on the position of the root. Thus, instead of considering splits, in the rooted setting we consider *clusters*. Recall that a clade of a rooted phylogenetic tree T is a pendant subtree T' of T , and a cluster is the set of leaves $Y \subseteq X$ of T' . Clusters of sizes 1, i.e. referring to single leaves, and n , i.e. referring to all leaves X , are called *trivial*. We denote the set of all clusters of a rooted phylogenetic tree T by $\mathcal{C}(T)$, and the set of its non-trivial clusters by $\mathcal{C}^*(T)$. Note that every cluster $Y \subset X$ (i.e. every strict subcluster of X) induces an X -split, namely $\sigma = Y|(X \setminus Y)$. In the following, we call two clusters $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{T})$ of a rooted phylogenetic X -tree *compatible* if the induced splits σ_1 and σ_2 of c_1 and c_2 , respectively, are compatible and if additionally we have $c_1 \subseteq c_2$ or $c_2 \subseteq c_1$ or $c_1 \cap c_2 = \emptyset$. Note that the latter condition is required because while, for instance, the splits $123|456$ and $12|3456$ are compatible (because $(\{4, 5, 6\} \cap \{4, 5, 6\}) = \emptyset$), the clusters $c_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $c_2 = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$, which induce these splits, do not fit together on a rooted tree.

Now, with these definitions, can be easily seen that, just as an unrooted phylogenetic tree T is fully determined by $\Sigma^*(T)$, a rooted phylogenetic tree T is fully determined by its set of clusters, which we denote by $\mathcal{C}^*(T)$. In fact, this is a direct

consequence of the Buneman theorem:

Corollary 2.1 (Buneman-type theorem for rooted trees). *Let \mathcal{C} be a collection of clusters on X . Then, there is a phylogenetic X -tree T such that $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(T)$ if and only if the clusters in \mathcal{C} are pairwise compatible. Moreover, if such a tree exists, it is unique (up to isomorphism).*

Proof. By the definition of compatible clusters, it is clear that – as their induced splits must be compatible, too – by Theorem 2.1, they correspond to a unique unrooted tree T . So we only need to show that the root position is uniquely determined by \mathcal{C} , too. As we defined compatible clusters to either be nested or disjoint, we can find all maximal clusters in \mathcal{C} , i.e. all clusters which are not contained in any other cluster. These clusters must belong to vertices adjacent to the root, because if the root was placed in any other vertex of T , at least one of these clusters would be broken up. This completes the proof. \square

Note that the unique rooted phylogenetic tree belonging to a set \mathcal{C} of pairwise compatible clusters can be easily found with the so-called BUILD algorithm [1].

Before we can turn our attention to consensus methods, we need to introduce two more pieces of notation. The first concept is the so-called Newick format. The Newick format (cf. [9]) uses nested brackets in such a way that two closely related species are grouped closely together. For instance, if $T = ((1, 2), (3, 4), 5)$, then species 1 and 2 are more closely related with each other than either of them is to 3 or 4. Typically, the uppermost level of the nesting is supposed to refer to the root if T is rooted, i.e. for $T = ((1, 2), (3, 4), 5)$ this would imply that the root leads to the three clusters $\{1, 2\}$, $\{3, 4\}$ and $\{5\}$. However, if T is unrooted, the root information inherent to the Newick format is simply disregarded.

The last concept we need to recall before we can turn our attention to consensus methods is the relation \preceq . For two rooted (or unrooted) phylogenetic trees T_1 and T_2 , we say T_2 *refines* T_1 and denote this by $T_1 \preceq T_2$, whenever $\mathcal{C}(T_1) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(T_2)$ (or $\Sigma(T_1) \subseteq \Sigma(T_2)$, respectively). It can be easily seen that \preceq is a partial order. As an example, in Figure 1, we have $T_1 \preceq T_2$, $T_1 \preceq T_3$ and $T_1 \preceq T_4$, but there is no such relation between T_2 , T_3 and T_4 .

2.2 Consensus methods

We are now finally in the position to introduce the most important concept underlying this manuscript.

Definition 2.2. A *rooted consensus method* (resp. *unrooted consensus method*) is a function ϕ that, for every set X of taxa and every number $k \geq 1$, associates with each profile of k trees from $RP(X)$ (resp. $UP(X)$) a unique corresponding tree in $RP(X)$ (resp. $UP(X)$).

Following [6], we call a consensus method ϕ *regular* if it obeys the following three properties:

1. **Unanimity:** If the trees in P are all the same tree T , then $\phi(P) = T$.
2. **Anonymity:** Changing the order of the trees in P does not change $\phi(P)$.
3. **Neutrality:** Changing the labels on the leaves of the trees in P simply relabels the leaves of $\phi(P)$ in the same way.

Unanimity reflects the completely reasonable assertion that if all of your data points towards a given tree, then the data is best represented by that particular tree. It additionally prevents useless consensus methods, such as $\phi(P) = T$ for all P , given some T . Anonymity means that the order does not affect the consensus method, preventing more useless consensus methods, such as returning the first tree in the profile every time. Neutrality reflects the condition that the labels should not affect the outcome – that is, if you swap two species, say *cat* and *dog*, in every tree in the profile, the only outcome should be that *cat* and *dog* are swapped in the consensus tree.

We now want the reader to recall three of the most frequently used consensus methods.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathcal{P} be a profile of trees (T_1, \dots, T_k) . Then, we define the following rules for forming a consensus tree:

- **Strict consensus (Γ):** The strict consensus tree $\Gamma(\mathcal{P})$ contains precisely all clusters (in the rooted setting), respectively all splits (in the unrooted setting) that are present in all trees $T_i \in \mathcal{P}$.
- **Loose (or semi-strict) consensus (γ):** The loose consensus tree $\gamma(\mathcal{P})$ contains precisely all clusters (or splits, respectively) that are present in at least one tree $T_i \in \mathcal{P}$ and that are not incompatible with any split induced by any tree in \mathcal{P} .
- **Majority rule consensus (MR):** Let $p > 50$. Then, the majority-rule consensus tree $MR_p(\mathcal{P})$ contains precisely all clusters (or splits, respectively) that are present in at least $p\%$ of the trees $T_i \in \mathcal{P}$. Note that whenever there is no ambiguity concerning p or whenever a statement holds for all possible choices of $p > 50$, we may simply write $MR(\mathcal{P})$ rather than $MR_p(\mathcal{P})$.

Before we can continue with a remark on how these methods are related, we need to state our first lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *In all above cases, the respective consensus tree $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ exists and is unique.*

Proof. We start by considering the unrooted case. We need to show that for all three definitions, there is precisely one tree $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ fulfilling the stated conditions. As the splits that shall be contained are in all cases uniquely determined, we know by Theorem 2.1 that if these splits are pairwise compatible, the resulting tree $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ will be unique. So the only thing that remains to be shown is the compatibility of the splits used for constructing $\phi(\mathcal{P})$.

- **Majority rule consensus:** By definition, all splits that shall be used for $MR(\mathcal{P})$ appear in at least one of the trees of \mathcal{P} , but these splits might be contradicted by some splits of other trees of \mathcal{P} . However, as we chose $k > 50$, we know that every split that shall be used to construct $MR(\mathcal{P})$ appears in *more* than half of the trees of \mathcal{P} . This implies that for any two splits σ_1, σ_2 that are used for $MR(\mathcal{P})$, there is at least one tree in \mathcal{P} that induces both of them. Thus, they must be compatible, which in turn implies pairwise compatibility of all splits used for $MR(\mathcal{P})$.
- **Loose (or semi-strict) consensus:** By definition, all splits that shall be used for $\gamma(\mathcal{P})$ appear in at least one of the trees of \mathcal{P} and are not contradicted by any of the trees – which means they are not incompatible with any split of any T_i . So again by Theorem 2.1, all these splits are pairwise compatible.
- **Strict consensus:** By definition, we have $\Gamma = MR_{100}$, i.e. strict consensus is just a special case of majority-rule consensus. So there remains nothing to show.

So in all cases, a set of pairwise compatible splits is used to build the consensus. Thus, by Theorem 2.1, the resulting tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$ exists and is unique. This completes the unrooted case.

The rooted case follows analogously by using clusters instead of splits and Corollary 2.1 instead of Theorem 2.1. This completes the proof. \square

Next, we want to introduce two more classical consensus methods, namely the Adams and the Aho consensus. Our definitions are based on [6], but for further details, we refer the reader also to [5].

We start with **Adams consensus**. In order to build the Adams consensus tree for a profile \mathcal{P} of phylogenetic X -trees, we start by considering the partition $\Pi(X)$, which equals the non-empty intersections of the maximal clusters of the trees in \mathcal{P} . Note that $\Pi(X)$ will correspond to the maximal clusters in the consensus tree. Once this partition $\Pi(X)$ is determined, we take each element of $\Pi(X)$ and recursively repeat this procedure for the respective subset of taxa until it has size one and thus cannot be refined anymore. This eventually produces a set of compatible clusters on X , which by Corollary 2.1 can be assembled into a unique tree.

Similarly, for **Aho consensus**, we construct a partition $\Pi(X)$ that also gets recursively refined, but in this case, $\Pi(X)$ equals the connected components of the graph $(X, E_{\mathcal{P}})$, where there is an edge $\{x_1, x_2\} \in E_{\mathcal{P}}$ precisely if there exists $x_3 \in X \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}$ such that the subtree $((x_1, x_2), x_3)$ is contained in all trees of \mathcal{P} .

In both cases, the hierarchy induced by the recursive partitioning can be used to reconstruct a unique rooted tree (which we refer to as $\varphi_{Ad}(\mathcal{P})$ or $\varphi_{Aho}(\mathcal{P})$, respectively) using the famous BUILD algorithm [1]. Note, however, that both the Adams and the Aho consensus are only defined in the rooted setting and do not work for unrooted trees.

Remark 2.3. Recall that by [6, p. 613], “All standard phylogenetic consensus methods (e.g., strict consensus, majority rule, loose consensus, and Adams consensus)”, are regular. It is easy to see that this, too, applies to Aho consensus.

Remark 2.4. Let \mathcal{P} be a profile of (rooted or unrooted) phylogenetic X -trees. Then, it can be easily seen by Definition 2.2 that $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}) \preceq MR(\mathcal{P})$.

One of the primary aims of this paper is to consider a new concept of future-proofing, namely that of *refinement stability*.

Definition 2.5. Let ϕ be a consensus method. If, for any pair of profiles $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, \dots, T_k), \mathcal{P}' = (T'_1, \dots, T'_k)$ so that $T_i \preceq T'_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we have $\phi(\mathcal{P}) \preceq \phi(\mathcal{P}')$, then ϕ is referred to as *refinement-stable*.

Another natural property that might be desirable for a consensus method is that of being *non-contradictory*:

Definition 2.6. A consensus method is termed *non-contradictory* if each cluster (or split, respectively) of the output tree is compatible with at least one tree in the input profile.

We now turn our attention to two supertree methods, which also sometimes appear in the context of consensus trees.

2.3 MRP and MRC

In the literature you can find several well-known methods to construct so-called supertrees from (multi)sets of input trees. One difference to our setting is that the input trees used to build a supertree need not coincide in their taxon sets. It is quite typical, in fact, that their taxon sets do not coincide, but usually they overlap. In this case, the supertree will contain all taxa present in any of the input trees and combine the information of the input trees as best as possible. For instance, this approach is used for reconstructing the Tree of Life, i.e. the tree of all living species [3, 4]. It is obvious, though, that in the supertree setting, too, input trees might come with conflicting information, in which case the supertree corresponds to some sort of consensus. This is why supertree methods have also often been regarded as consensus methods by some authors [2, 5, 12], even if there is an ongoing debate whether this is justified [2, 3].

The reason why it is not straight forward to regard supertree methods as consensus methods is that (as opposed e.g. to strict consensus or majority-rule consensus with $k > 50$) a supertree need not be unique. This problem can be overcome e.g. by using an existing consensus method such as majority-rule or strict in order to summarize all supertrees into a single consensus tree [5]. However, another argument against regarding supertree methods as consensus methods is that a supertree may contain splits (or clusters) that are not present in any of the input trees. However, in the present manuscript, we will not join this debate, but we will consider two famous supertree methods as consensus methods in the case in which the respective

supertree is unique and test them for refinement stability: *Matrix Representation with Parsimony*, or *MRP* for short, and *Matrix Representation with Compatibility*, or *MRC* for short. Note that – as we only consider cases where the output of MRP and MRC is unique – applying a regular consensus method like majority-rule to the output of MRP or MRC as suggested for instance in [5] would not change anything due to unanimity.

In order to understand MRP and MRC, we first need to introduce the concept of *parsimony*. In this regard, recall that an *extension* of a character f on a phylogenetic X -tree T with vertex set $V(T)$ is a function $g : V(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, such that $g|_X = f$, i.e. g agrees with f on the leaves of T but also assigns states to inner vertices of T . Now the *changing number* $ch(g^f, T)$ of an extension g^f on a phylogenetic tree T is simply the number of edges $e = \{u, v\}$ for which $g^f(u) \neq g^f(v)$. An extension \tilde{g}^f such that $\tilde{g}^f = \min_{g^f} ch(g^f, T)$ is called *minimal*, and the changing number of such a minimal extension is called *parsimony score* of f on T , denoted $ps(f, T)$. Thus, we have $ps(f, T) = \min_{g^f} ch(g^f, T)$. The parsimony score of a character f on a phylogenetic tree T can for instance be calculated by the famous *Fitch-Hartigan algorithm*¹. Moreover, the parsimony score of a (multi)set of characters, which is also often referred to as *alignment* in evolutionary biology, is simply defined as the sum of the parsimony scores of all characters. In particular, we can calculate the parsimony score $ps(B^*(T))$ of $B^*(T)$ of a phylogenetic X -tree T . Next, the *maximum parsimony tree*, or *MP tree* for short, for a (multi)set S of characters on X is a phylogenetic X -tree T for which we have $ch(S, T) = ps(S, T)$, i.e. a tree which has minimal changing number for S amongst all phylogenetic X -trees. Note that this tree need not be unique.

Given a profile $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, \dots, T_m)$ of phylogenetic X -trees, we consider the union $\mathcal{B} := \cup_{i=1}^m B^*(T_i)$.² An MP tree of \mathcal{B} is called *Matrix Representation with Parsimony tree* of \mathcal{P} , or *MRP tree* of \mathcal{P} for short (note that the word matrix in this context stems from the fact that the 0-1-alignment \mathcal{B} can also be regarded as a matrix). Again, the MRP tree need not be unique.

The second supertree method which we want to consider is *Matrix Representation with Compatibility*, or *MRC* for short. This method is also based on alignment \mathcal{B} . It analyzes all characters of \mathcal{B} and finds a maximal compatible subset. Here, a set S of binary characters is called *compatible* if all characters in S are pairwise compatible, and two binary characters are called compatible if their corresponding splits are compatible. By Theorem 2.1, there is a unique tree corresponding to each such set of compatible characters, and it can be easily found, for instance with the so-called Tree Popping algorithm [13, 14]). In the following, we say that a compatible set of binary characters or splits *induces* T whenever T is the unique tree corresponding to this set according to Theorem 2.1. Now, concerning MRC: After a

¹Note that the original Fitch algorithm is only suited for binary trees, but we explicitly allow for non-binarity, which is why we refer to Hartigan’s generalization of this algorithm

²Note that biologists often regard \mathcal{B} as an alignment. Then, order of characters in \mathcal{B} is fixed, which is why it then makes sense to speak about a concatenation rather than a union. However, as the order of characters does not play a role for the methods considered in the present manuscript, it is sufficient here to consider the union.

maximal compatible subset of characters in B is found and the corresponding tree is constructed, this tree is called *Matrix Representation with Compatibility tree* or *MRC tree* for short. Note that there may be more than one MRC tree as there might be more than one maximal compatible subset of characters in B .

Note that both MRP and MRC can only reconstruct unrooted trees. This is due to the fact that the root position neither has an impact on the parsimony score of a character on a given tree, nor on the compatibility of various splits (and thus their corresponding binary characters). So while we generally consider both the rooted and the unrooted setting in this manuscript, this does not hold true whenever we consider MRP or MRC, as these methods inherently work on unrooted trees only.

3 Results

3.1 Established consensus methods

3.1.1 Refinement-stability

In this section, we turn our attention to some established consensus methods and analyze which of them are actually refinement-stable and which ones are not. We start with a positive result. Note that whenever not stated otherwise, the results hold both in the rooted as well as in the unrooted setting.

Theorem 3.1. *Strict consensus and majority-rule consensus are refinement-stable.*

Proof. In the case of strict consensus, if only a few of the trees T_i of \mathcal{P} get refined, this does not immediately influence $\Gamma(\mathcal{P})$. Only if the refinement is such that a new split, say σ (or cluster, say c , respectively), is added to *all* input trees, then this split (or cluster) will also need to be added to $\Gamma(\mathcal{P})$. However, this is no problem, because as *all* splits (or clusters) of $\Gamma(\mathcal{P})$ are present in all input trees together with σ (or c), this implies that they are all pairwise compatible both with one another as well as with σ (or c , respectively). Thus, σ (or c) can be added to $\Gamma(\mathcal{P})$ by Theorem 2.1 (or by 2.1, respectively), which causes a refinement of this consensus tree, but no other modification.

In the case of majority-rule consensus with $k > 50$, the situation is similar but a bit more intricate. As long as fewer than 50% of the trees of \mathcal{P} get refined such that they now contain a new split σ (or new cluster c), this does not influence $MR(\mathcal{P})$. If, however, more than $k\% > 50\%$ of \mathcal{P} contain a new split σ (or cluster c) after refinement, this split (or cluster) has to be added to the consensus tree. However, this again must be possible. To see this, let τ (or c_τ) be a split (or cluster) already present in $MR(\mathcal{P})$ before σ (or c) is added. Then, by Definition 2.2, τ (or c_τ) is contained in more than $k\%$ and thus in more than half of all trees of \mathcal{P} , just as σ (or c). So there must be at least one tree \tilde{T} which contains both σ and τ (or c and c_τ). Thus, by Theorem 2.1 (or Corollary 2.1), σ and τ (or c and c_τ) are compatible. As τ (or c) was arbitrarily chosen amongst the splits (or clusters) of $MR(\mathcal{P})$, *all* splits of $\Sigma(MR(\mathcal{P}))$ (or all clusters of $\mathcal{C}(MR(\mathcal{P}))$) are pairwise compatible with σ (or c).

Thus, again by Theorem 2.1 (or Corollary 2.1), σ (or c) can get added to $MR(\mathcal{P})$ and will refine the consensus tree without any other modification. This completes the proof. \square

Next we consider the loose consensus method and state our first negative result.

Proposition 3.1. *Loose consensus is not refinement-stable.*

Proof. We prove this assertion by providing an explicit counterexample. Let $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $T_1 = ((1, 2), 3, 4, 5)$ be either rooted or unrooted, and let $S = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ be the so-called (rooted or unrooted) star-tree, i.e. the unique tree on X with only one inner vertex. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{T_1, S\}$. Then, for the loose consensus tree we have. $\gamma(\mathcal{P}) = T_1$. However, if we refine S to become $T_2 = ((2, 3), 1, 4, 5)$ and consider the profile $\mathcal{P}' = (T_1, T_2)$, we get $\gamma(\mathcal{P}') = S$ (because the splits $12|345$ and $23|145$ are incompatible). So if we refine input tree S , we get a coarser consensus tree, not a refined one. This completes the proof. \square

Now we turn our attention to the Adams and Aho consensus methods, which lead to another negative result.

Proposition 3.2. *Adams consensus and Aho consensus are not refinement-stable.*

Proof. We prove the statement by presenting an explicit counterexample. Let $T_1 = (((1, 2, 3), 4), 5)$, $T_2 = (((1, 2), (3, 4)), 5)$ and $T'_2 = ((1, 2), (3, 4), 5)$, and let $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, T_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}' = (T_1, T'_2)$. Note that T'_2 is a refinement of T_2 , and hence any consensus method ϕ that is refinement-stable must have $\phi(P) \preceq \phi(P')$. However, the Adams consensus tree of \mathcal{P} is tree $T = ((1, 2), 3, 4, 5)$, and the Adams consensus of \mathcal{P}' is tree $T' = ((1, 2, 3), 4, 5)$. It follows that the Adams consensus method is *not* refinement-stable as $\phi(P) \not\preceq \phi(P')$.

Note that in this example, Aho's consensus coincides with Adams, so Aho's consensus method is also *not* refinement-stable, which completes the proof. \square

So in summary, of the established consensus methods, strict and majority-rule are refinement-stable, whereas loose consensus as well as Adams and Aho consensus are not. In Section 3.3 we will show that this also applies to MRP and MRC, unfortunately. But before we do so, we turn our attention to another property that consensus methods might have, namely that of being non-contradictory.

3.1.2 Non-contradiction

Non-contradiction is another property that might be desirable for a biologically meaningful consensus method. It states that each cluster (or split) in the consensus tree must be compatible with at least one input tree. The main aim of this short subsection is to state and prove that this is a property that indeed various established consensus methods share, but not all of them.




Figure 2: The Adams and Aho consensus methods are not non-contradictory as $\varphi_{Ad}(T_1, T_2) = \varphi_{Aho}(T_1, T_2) = T_3$.

Proposition 3.3. γ , Γ and MR are all non-contradictory.

Proof. By Definition 2.2, all three methods lead to trees that only contain clusters (or splits) that are present in at least one tree. So each cluster (or split) in the respective consensus tree must be compatible with at least one tree in the input profile, namely with the one it is induced by. This completes the proof. \square

Next, we consider Adams and Aho consensus.

Proposition 3.4. Neither Adams nor Aho consensus are non-contradictory.

Proof. Consider trees T_1 and T_2 in Figure 2. For $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, T_2)$, Adams and Aho consensus coincide, and $\varphi_{Ad}(\mathcal{P}) = \varphi_{Aho}(\mathcal{P}) = T_3$, but T_3 contains the clusters $\{2, 3\}$ and $\{4, 5\}$, both of which are incompatible with both T_1 and T_2 . Hence neither Adams nor Aho consensus are non-contradictory. \square

We will now turn our attention to general consensus methods; i.e. we will no longer just consider the established ones.

3.2 General consensus methods

3.2.1 Refinement-stability

In this section, we want to gather some general properties of refinement-stable consensus methods, whether these are established methods or not. On the one hand,

this will allow us to gain further insight into majority rule and strict consensus, two of the most frequently used methods in phylogenetics, as both are refinement-stable by Theorem 3.1. On the other hand, however, general knowledge on refinement-stability also allows for conclusions on what to hope for concerning future consensus methods – what properties can you wish for if you are aiming at a refinement-stable method?

We have already seen that there are consensus methods that are not refinement-stable, such as the loose consensus. However, one can also construct other examples of consensus methods which are not refinement-stable. For example, consider the following: Define the rather trivial method in which the star tree is always returned unless all trees in the profile are the same tree, in which case that tree is returned. Then this method is not refinement-stable. To see this, suppose the first profile consists of two identical non-star trees that are not fully resolved, T . If we then form the second profile by resolving exactly one of the trees more, the consensus becomes the star tree.

However, we start this section by showing the fundamental property that necessarily all refinement-stable and unanimous consensus methods refine the strict consensus (note that by Theorem 3.1 this applies, for instance, to majority rule).

Theorem 3.5. *Let ϕ be any refinement-stable, unanimous consensus method and Γ the strict consensus method. Let \mathcal{P} be a profile of k trees. Then we have: $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}) \preceq \phi(\mathcal{P})$. In particular, if a cluster c (or split σ in the unrooted case) is induced by all trees in \mathcal{P} , then c (or σ) is also induced by $\phi(\mathcal{P})$.*

Proof. Let the strict consensus of $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, \dots, T_k)$ be some tree T , i.e. $T = \Gamma(\mathcal{P})$. Then every tree in \mathcal{P} contains each cluster (or each split, respectively) of T . It follows that every tree in \mathcal{P} is a refinement of T , and so given the profile $Q := (T, \dots, T)$ consisting of k copies of T (where $k \geq 1$), we have that $T \preceq T_i$ for each i in $\{1, \dots, k\}$, and as $\phi(Q) = T$ by unanimity and $\phi(Q) \preceq \phi(P)$, therefore $T \preceq \phi(P)$ and we have the result. \square

While the strict consensus thus is a coarse version of *all* possible consensus trees induced by unanimous and refinement-stable methods, we now consider the opposite scenario, namely the loose consensus.

Theorem 3.6. *Let ϕ be any refinement-stable, unanimous consensus method, and let γ be the loose consensus method. Let \mathcal{P} be a profile of k trees such that each cluster (or each split, respectively) of every tree in \mathcal{P} is compatible with all trees in \mathcal{P} . Then $\phi(\mathcal{P}) \preceq \gamma(\mathcal{P})$.*

Proof. Let the loose consensus of $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, \dots, T_k)$ be the tree $T := \gamma(\mathcal{P})$, noting that by definition of loose consensus, every cluster (or split, respectively) of each tree T_i in \mathcal{P} is contained in the clusters (or splits) of T as all these clusters (or splits) are by assumption compatible with all trees in \mathcal{P} . It follows that, given the profile Q consisting of k copies of T , we have that $T_i \preceq T$ for each i in $\{1, \dots, k\}$, and as $\phi(Q) = T$ by unanimity and $\phi(P) \preceq \phi(Q) = T = \gamma(\mathcal{P})$ by refinement-stability, we have $\phi(P) \preceq \gamma(\mathcal{P})$, which completes the proof. \square

Note that Theorem 3.5 implies that the strict consensus tree is the coarsest refinement of any refinement-stable and unanimous consensus method's output tree. This, together with Theorem 3.6, might lead to the idea that maybe the opposite is true for loose consensus: it might be the finest refinement of any refinement-stable and unanimous consensus method's output tree. This would in particular imply that we could drop the condition that each cluster of every tree in \mathcal{P} is compatible with all trees in \mathcal{P} from Theorem 3.6. However, this stronger version of the theorem does *not* hold, as is demonstrated by Example 3.7.

Example 3.7. For the unrooted case, consider again Figure 1. Let $\mathcal{P} = (T_2, T_2, T_3)$, i.e. \mathcal{P} employs two copies of T_2 and one copy of T_3 . For the rooted case, we introduce a root on the inner edges of T_2 and T_3 , respectively. It can easily be seen that in both cases, we have $MR(\mathcal{P}) = T_2$, whereas $\varphi(\mathcal{P})$ is the star tree (i.e. T_1 in Figure 1; in the rooted case the only inner vertex of T_1 is then the root). So in particular, we have $MR(\mathcal{P}) \not\preceq \varphi(\mathcal{P})$. Since MR is unanimous (it is even regular, cf. [6]) and refinement-stable by Theorem 3.1, this shows that the conditions of Theorem 3.6 cannot be relaxed.

However, as we will now show, if there is a cluster (or split, respectively) that is incompatible with a cluster (or split) that is compatible with *all* trees in a profile \mathcal{P} , then this cluster cannot be contained in the output tree of any regular and refinement-stable consensus method.

Proposition 3.8. *Suppose ϕ is a regular, refinement-stable consensus method. Let $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, \dots, T_k)$ be a profile of k rooted (or unrooted) phylogenetic X -trees, and let c_1 and c_2 be two clusters (or σ_1 and σ_2 be two splits) such that c_1 (or σ_1) is compatible with all trees in \mathcal{P} , while c_2 (or σ_2) is not compatible with c_1 (or σ_1 , respectively). Then, $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ does not contain c_2 (or σ_2).*

Proof. To see this, suppose $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ contained c_2 (or σ_2). Then we can refine all trees in \mathcal{P} to contain c_1 (or σ_1), forming a new profile \mathcal{P}' (this must be possible as c_1 (or σ_1 , respectively) is compatible with all trees in \mathcal{P} by assumption). Then by definition of the strict consensus, $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}')$ contains c_1 (or σ_1). By Theorem 3.5, this implies $\phi(\mathcal{P}')$ contains c_1 (or σ_1). Thus, by refinement stability, $\phi(\mathcal{P}) \preceq \phi(\mathcal{P}')$. But this is impossible, since this would imply that $\phi(\mathcal{P}')$ contains both c_1 and c_2 (or σ_1 and σ_2), but these are incompatible by assumption. So this is a contradiction, which shows that c_2 (or σ_2) cannot be contained in $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ to begin with. This completes the proof. \square

As we will now show, the previous proposition implies that if there are two clusters (or splits) that are incompatible with one another, *neither* one of them can be contained in the tree generated by a regular and refinement-stable consensus method, even if both of them are compatible with *all* input trees.

Corollary 3.9. *Suppose ϕ is a regular, refinement-stable consensus method. Let $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, \dots, T_k)$ be a profile of k rooted (or unrooted) phylogenetic X -trees, and let c_1 and c_2 be two clusters (or σ_1 and σ_2 be two splits) compatible with all clusters*

(splits) of all trees in \mathcal{P} , but not with each other. Then $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ contains neither c_1 nor c_2 (neither σ_1 nor σ_2).

Proof. As c_1 (or σ_1) is compatible with all trees in \mathcal{P} , by Proposition 3.8, $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ cannot contain c_2 (or σ_2). Swapping the roles of c_1 and c_2 , however, as now they are *both* compatible with all trees in \mathcal{P} , yields that by the same argument, $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ cannot contain c_1 (or σ_1). This completes the proof. \square

So just because two clusters (or splits) are incompatible with one another, they cannot be contained in the output of any regular and refinement-stable consensus method – even if both are compatible with all input trees. Again, note that by Theorem 3.1, this for instance applies to majority rule and strict consensus, i.e. to two of most frequently used consensus methods. Another direct consequence of Proposition 3.8 is the following corollary.

Corollary 3.10. *Suppose ϕ is a regular, refinement-stable consensus method. Let $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, \dots, T_k)$ be a profile of k rooted (or unrooted) phylogenetic X -trees, and let T be some tree that is a refinement of all trees in \mathcal{P} . Then $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ can consist only of clusters (or splits, respectively) compatible with T .*

Proof. Let c be a cluster (or σ be a split) not compatible with T . Then c (or σ) must be incompatible with at least one cluster $\tilde{c} \in \mathcal{C}^*(T)$ (or split $\tilde{\sigma} \in \Sigma^*(T)$). Then, as $T_i \preceq T$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ by assumption, \tilde{c} (or $\tilde{\sigma}$) is compatible with T_i for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Thus, by Proposition 3.8, c (or σ) cannot be contained in $\phi(\mathcal{P})$. This completes the proof. \square

As we have seen in Theorem 3.1, majority rule and strict consensus are refinement-stable. Moreover, they are known to be regular [6]. We have also seen that not all methods are refinement-stable, and also not all methods are regular – so is it possible that majority rule consensus and strict consensus are the *only* consensus methods that have both properties? This would be mathematically ‘nice’ because it would imply that these two properties already give a full characterization for such methods. However, as we will later on see in Theorem 3.12, this is unfortunately not the case – in fact, there are even infinitely many such methods. As we will see later on, the same is still true even if we enforce another biologically sensible property, namely non-contradiction, which we will consider in the following section.

3.2.2 Non-contradiction

Before we turn our attention to the main result of this section, we will present a fundamental insight into consensus methods that are both non-contradictory and refinement-stable. In particular, we will show that under these circumstances, the output tree contains only clusters (or splits, respectively) that are already present in the input profile. Note that this is not automatically the case: non-contradiction requires only compatibility with at least one input tree, not containment.

Proposition 3.11. *Let ϕ be a refinement-stable and non-contradictory consensus method. Let $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, \dots, T_k)$ be a profile of phylogenetic X -trees. Then for every cluster c (or split σ , respectively) in $\phi(\mathcal{P})$, there is at least one tree T_i that displays c (or σ).*

Proof. Let $T = \phi(\mathcal{P})$ and assume T induces c (or σ). Suppose, seeking a contradiction, that c (or σ) is not induced by any tree in the profile \mathcal{P} . First of all, $|c| \geq 2$ (otherwise, c would only contain one leaf and would thus be induced by all phylogenetic X -trees; the same applies to σ in the unrooted case).

We now first consider the rooted case. Note that each T_i must contain a subtree t_i which contains all leaves of cluster c and such that t_i is minimal with this property (for $i = 1, \dots, k$). Also note that as c is not induced by any $T_i \in \mathcal{P}$, the cluster induced by t_i , say c_i , is not identical to c (for $i = 1, \dots, k$).

For each T_i , we now construct a refinement T'_i which is incompatible with c . Therefore, we distinguish two cases for each T_i : If c is already incompatible with T_i , we set $T'_i := T_i$. Else, if c is compatible with T_i , we proceed as follows: In this case, t_i contains at least one maximal pendant subtree t_i^* (possibly with only one leaf) whose taxon set is disjoint from c . This is due to the fact that it must be possible to introduce a single edge to separate c from all other leaves of t_i (else, T_i and c would not be compatible). Furthermore, it is important to note that the removal of root ρ_i of subtree t_i would then subdivide cluster c into at least two parts. This is due to the fact that if c was a pendant cluster in t_i , c would be induced by T_i . In turn, this means that in t_i , there are at least two different maximal subtrees t_i^1 and t_i^2 which only lead to taxa in c (as T_i is compatible with c).

Now, we refine each t_i and thus also each T_i to get T'_i as follows:

- In t_i , we introduce an edge e_i leading to the new cluster formed by t_i^* and t_i^1 .
- The new cluster consisting of the leaves of t_i^* and t_i^1 will be called \tilde{c}_i .
- The new tree, resulting from T_i by introducing edge e_i , will be called T'_i .

Now, note that c must be incompatible with \tilde{c}_i : Edge e_i separates the taxa of t_i^1 from those of t_i^2 , which all belong to cluster c , and \tilde{c}_i contains taxa of t_i^* which are *not* contained in c .

Therefore, in summary, *none* of the T'_i (neither the ones that were incompatible with c right away nor the ones which we generated by refining trees compatible with c appropriately) are compatible with c , but T'_i is a refinement of T_i for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Now let $\mathcal{P}' = (T'_1, \dots, T'_k)$. As ϕ is refinement-stable, $T' := \phi(\mathcal{P}')$ is a refinement of T and thus also necessarily induces c . However, as explained before, as c is not compatible with any T'_i (for $i = 1, \dots, k$), ϕ cannot be non-contradictory – otherwise, as c is incompatible with all trees in \mathcal{P}' , c could not be contained in T' . So this is a contradiction. Therefore, the assumption was wrong and c must be displayed by some tree in \mathcal{P} .

We now consider the unrooted case, in which T induces a split $\sigma = A|B$ that is not induced by any tree in \mathcal{P} . We have already stated that $|\sigma| \geq 2$, where

$|\sigma| = \min\{|A|, |B|\}$ as defined in [11]. Then, there some $T_i \in \mathcal{P}$ that are compatible with σ (this has to be the case as ϕ is non-contradictory), and possibly some that are not. For now we disregard the ones that are incompatible with σ (if there are any).

For all others, i.e. for all $T_i \in \mathcal{P}$ that are compatible with σ , note that each such $T_i \in \mathcal{P}$ contains only splits that are compatible with σ , but as σ is by assumption not induced by any of the T_i , this implies that we could add σ to T_i to get a tree T'_i (which would be unique by Theorem 2.1). Note that this must mean that none of these T_i are binary (otherwise we could not add an additional split), and thus each such T_i contains at least one vertex of degree at least 4. For $\sigma = A|B$, let us assume that all leaves in T_i that belong to A are colored red and all leaves of B are colored green. In the following, we call a tree monochromatic if it only contains leaves of one color.

We now argue that T_i must contain a vertex u of degree at least 4 such that the removal of u would lead to only monochromatic subtrees, and in particular at least two red ones and at least two green ones. Assume this is not the case:

- First, assume that all vertices of degree at least 4 lead to at least one non-monochromatic subtree. Then for all such vertices v , it is impossible to replace them by two new vertices v_1 and v_2 connected by an edge e_σ separating the red from the green subtrees, i.e. A from B . In other words, it is impossible to add an edge that induces σ , which contradicts the compatibility of T_i with σ .
- So now that we know that there is a vertex u of degree at least 4 whose removal leads to only monochromatic subtrees, assume that there are not at least two subtrees of each color. In this case, if there is no, say, red subtree, all leaves are green. This contradicts the fact that $|\sigma| \geq 2$. So there has to be at least one subtree of each color. However, assume that there is only one red subtree. Then the edge e leading from u to this subtree clearly separates all red leaves from all green leaves, in other words, e separates A from B . This is a contradiction, as we assume that no T_i induces σ .

So there must be a vertex u of degree at least 4 whose removal leads to only monochromatic subtrees, at least two of which, say T_A^1 and T_A^2 , contain only leaves from A and at least two of which, say T_B^1 and T_B^2 , contain only leaves from B .

We now refine T_i to give T'_i as follows:

- Introduce two new vertices u_A and u_B .
- Delete u .
- Connect all *except for one* of the red subtrees formerly incident to u now to u_A by new edges.
- Connect all *except for one* of the green subtrees formerly incident to u now to u_B by new edges.

- Connect the remaining red subtree to u_B .
- Connect the remaining green subtree to u_A .

Clearly, T'_i refines T_i : It contains all splits of T_i , but it additionally contains a split $\sigma' = A'|B'$, which is incompatible with σ , because we have that $A \cap A'$, $A \cap B'$, $B \cap A'$ and $B \cap B'$ are all non-empty by construction.

So all T_i in \mathcal{P} that are compatible with σ have been refined to trees T'_i which are not compatible with σ . For the other trees T_i in \mathcal{P} which are already incompatible with σ , we set $T'_i := T_i$.

This way, we can now consider profile $\mathcal{P}' := (T'_1, \dots, T'_k)$, which only contains trees that are incompatible with σ . As ϕ is refinement-stable, $T' := \phi(\mathcal{P}')$ is a refinement of T and thus also necessarily induces σ . However, as explained before, as σ is not compatible with any T'_i (for $i = 1, \dots, k$), ϕ cannot be non-contradictory – otherwise, as σ is incompatible with all trees in \mathcal{P}' , σ could not be contained in T' . So this is a contradiction. Therefore, the assumption was wrong and σ must be displayed by some tree in \mathcal{P} . This completes the proof. \square

While we have already seen that MR and Γ are regular, refinement-stable and non-contradictory (and all these are desirable properties of any consensus method, after all), whereas γ is not (as it lacks refinement-stability), the question remains if this combination makes Γ and MR unique or if there are other consensus methods – biologically justified or not – that also share all these properties. The following theorem, which is the main result of this section, states that there are in fact infinitely many such consensus methods, so these properties are not unique to the mentioned ones.

Theorem 3.12. *There are infinitely many consensus methods that are regular, refinement-stable and non-contradictory.*

Proof. For the rooted case, consider the profile $\mathcal{P} = (T'_1, T_2)$, where T_1 and T_2 are the two phylogenetic X -trees depicted in Figure 3 and T'_1 is a refinement of T_1 (not necessarily a strict one, so we may have $T'_1 = T_1$), and where $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For the unrooted case, consider the exact same profile, but suppress the root, i.e. replace the two edges incident to the degree-2 root vertex by a single edge.

Note that the exact structure of the trees depends on whether $n = 2m + 2$ or $n = 2m + 3$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e. whether n is even or odd. Note that $T_{1\dots m}^*$ and $T_{m+1\dots 2m}^*$ are identical if leaf labels are disregarded, i.e. they correspond to the same treeshape, say T^* , but T^* can be chosen to be *any* rooted binary tree (note that this implies that there are $WE(m)$ many choices for T^* , where $WE(m)$ denotes the m^{th} Wedderburn Etherington number [15, Sequence A001190]).

We now define a consensus method ϕ as follows: If $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{P}$, i.e. if $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ contains T'_1 and T_2 , then we define $\phi(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}) := T_2$. Let π be a permutation on X . Let $\pi(T)$ denote a version of T in which the leaves are permuted according to π , where T is a phylogenetic X -tree. Then, we also define $\phi(\{\pi(T'_1), \pi(T_2)\}) := \pi(T_2)$.

In all other cases, i.e. for all other input profiles $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, we define $\phi(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}) := \Gamma(\tilde{\mathcal{P}})$.

We now argue that ϕ is regular, refinement-stable and non-contradictory. Unanimity follows by the unanimity of Γ , and neutrality follows by Γ for all profiles that are not $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, and for $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ it follows by our consideration of permutation π . To check anonymity, note that T'_1 is either such that $T'_1 \preceq T_2$ or such that T_1 and T_2 have completely different tree shapes (if T_1 gets refined in a way that does not form T_2 , namely by combining leaf $2m+1$ with one of the copies of T^* to form a new subtree). This shows that the only time when a permutation can modify T'_1 to give T_2 and T_2 to give T'_1 is when T'_1 and T_2 are isomorphic. However, in this case we actually have by unanimity that ϕ returns precisely this tree, so for anonymity, there remains nothing to show. Thus, ϕ is regular.

To see that ϕ is actually refinement-stable, recall that Γ is refinement-stable by Theorem 3.1, and if a profile $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ consists of $\pi(T'_1)$ and $\pi(T_2)$ for some permutation π , then ϕ returns $\pi(T_2)$, whether T'_1 equals T_1 or is a strictly refined version of it. Thus, in summary, ϕ is refinement-stable.

Last, we need to show that ϕ is non-contradictory. To see this, recall that by Proposition 3.3, Γ is non-contradictory, and if a profile $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ consists of $\pi(T'_1)$ and $\pi(T_2)$ for some permutation π , then ϕ returns $\pi(T_2)$. So in particular, all splits of $\phi((\pi(T'_1), \pi(T_2))) = \pi(T_2)$ are not only compatible with at least one of the input trees, but even contained in it, as $\pi(T_2)$ is contained in the input profile.

So any consensus method ϕ of the type described here is regular, refinement-stable and non-contradictory. But we can construct infinitely many such methods by varying the trees depicted in Figure 3: We can, for instance, consider different values for n , so the cardinality of the set of such examples (and thus of such consensus methods) equals the cardinality of \mathbb{N} . This completes the proof. \square

3.3 Results on MRP and MRC

In this section, we take a closer look on MRP and MRC as consensus methods. In particular, we analyze them concerning refinement-stability and non-contradiction.

We start with the first main theorem of this section.

Theorem 3.13. *MRP and MRC are not refinement-stable.*

Proof. Consider again Figure 1. We consider profiles $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, T_1, T_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}_2 = (T_3, T_3, T_2)$. We consider the non-trivial splits induced by these profiles and code them as binary characters as explained in Section 2.1. Then we can define \mathcal{B} for \mathcal{P} (and, analogously, \mathcal{B}_2 for \mathcal{P}_2) as in Section 2.3. Then, for \mathcal{P} we have $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset \cup \emptyset \cup \{1100\} = \{1100\}$, as the star tree T_1 has no non-trivial splits. However, if we refine both star trees such that we derive \mathcal{P}_2 (note that T_3 is a refinement of T_1), we derive $\mathcal{B}_2 = \{1010, 1010, 1100\}$.

We now start with considering MRP: It can be easily verified that the unique MRP tree for \mathcal{P} is T_2 : We have $ps(1100, T_1) = ps(1100, T_3) = ps(1100, T_4) = 2$,





Figure 3: Profile In the proof of Theorem 3.12, we have $\mathcal{P} = (T'_1, T_2)$ on $n = 2m + 2$ or $n = 2m + 3$ leaves, respectively, where T'_1 is a refinement of T_1 as depicted here. $T_{1\dots m}^*$ and $T_{m+1\dots 2m}^*$ are both trees with the same binary treeshape T^* , e.g. a so-called caterpillar (i.e. a rooted binary tree with precisely one cherry, i.e. one pair of leaves sharing the same parent), but the leaves of $T_{1\dots m}^*$ are bijectively labelled by $\{1, \dots, m\}$ and the leaves of $T_{m+1\dots 2m}^*$ are bijectively labelled by $\{m + 1, \dots, 2m\}$. Note that the dashed parts of the trees only exist if n is odd.

but $ps(1100, T_2) = 1$, so in total $ps(\mathcal{B}, T_2) < ps(\mathcal{B}, T_i)$ for $i = 1, 3, 4$. However, as $ps(1010, T_3) = 1$ and $ps(1010, T_1) = ps(1010, T_2) = ps(1010, T_4) = 2$, we also have that $ps(\mathcal{B}_2, T_1) = ps(\mathcal{B}_2, T_4) = 2 + 2 + 2 = 6$, $ps(\mathcal{B}_2, T_2) = 1 + 2 + 2 = 5$ and $ps(\mathcal{B}_2, T_3) = 2 + 1 + 1 = 4$. So in total, T_3 is the unique MRP tree for \mathcal{P}_2 . This shows that the sets of MRP trees for \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}_2 are disjoint, even though \mathcal{P}_2 is a refinement of \mathcal{P} . Thus, MRP is *not* refinement-stable.

Now let us consider MRC: In \mathcal{B} , there is only one character, namely 1100, and this character induces tree T_2 . Thus, T_2 is the unique MRC tree for \mathcal{P} . On the other hand, in $\mathcal{B}_2 = \{1100, 1010, 1010\}$ we have both 1100 and 1010, which are incompatible (as the splits $12|34$ and $13|24$ are incompatible). Thus, not all three characters of \mathcal{B}_2 can be compatible. The maximum number of compatible characters in \mathcal{B}_2 is therefore 2. As no subset containing both 1100 and 1010 can be compatible, it turns out that the unique maximal subset of compatible characters is $\{1010, 1010\}$, and this subset induces tree T_3 . Therefore, T_3 is the unique MRC tree for \mathcal{P}_2 . This shows that the sets of MRC trees for \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}_2 are disjoint, even though \mathcal{P}_2 is a refinement of \mathcal{P} . Thus, MRC is *not* refinement-stable.

This completes the proof. \square

We will now turn our attention to non-contradiction, which shows a severe difference between MRP and MRC, as one of these methods turns out to be non-contradictory, while the other one is not. We start with the following negative result concerning MRP.

Theorem 3.14. *MRP is not non-contradictory.*

Proof. Consider profile $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, T_2)$ consisting of the two trees T_1 and T_2 from Figure 4. Moreover, consider the corresponding alignment of these two trees as given in Table 1. It can be easily seen that neither T_1 nor T_2 are MP trees for this alignment; in fact, the alignment has parsimony score 13 on tree T_3 from Figure 4, but 14 on both T_1 and T_2 , respectively (cf. Table 1). Moreover, we performed an exhaustive search using the computer algebra system Mathematica [16] in order to verify that T_3 is even the unique MP tree for this alignment. However, T_3 contains the split $\sigma = 1, 2, 3, 4|5, 6, 7$ which is not contained in any of the input trees T_1 and T_2 . As T_1 and T_2 are binary, this (by Theorem 2.1) necessarily means that σ is incompatible with both trees, because no more split can be added to said trees. This completes the proof. \square

Next, we present a positive result on MRC, before we turn our attention to “future-proofing” MRP and MRC in the sense presented in [6], i.e. concerning the addition of new taxa.

Theorem 3.15. *MRC is non-contradictory.*

Proof. By definition, the MRC tree is built by taking a maximum set of compatible splits of the input tree and combining them into a unique tree, e.g. using the so-called tree popping algorithm. This means that the MRC tree by definition only




Figure 4: Trees T_1 , T_2 and T_3 as needed for the proof of Theorem 3.14. The alignment for $\mathcal{P} = (T_1, T_2)$ is depicted in Table 1.

		alignment									
		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1		
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		
		0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1		
		0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
		0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1		
		1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0		
sd	T_1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	2	14	total
	T_2	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	14	
	T_3	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	13	

Table 1: The alignment resulting from “translating” trees T_1 and T_2 into binary characters and its corresponding parsimony scores on T_1 , T_2 and T_3 from Figure 4.

employs splits that occur in at least one input tree. Note that this in particular implies that MRC is non-contradictory. This completes the proof. \square

3.3.1 “Future-proofing” MRP and MRC concerning the addition of new taxa

In order to complement the results of [6], we briefly consider MRP and MRC in the light of adding more taxa (rather than more splits or clusters). This scenario is for instance relevant concerning the discovery of new species. The results stated in the following and the construction of the particular examples were strongly inspired by [10]. As stated above, both MRP and MRC are strictly speaking not consensus methods as their output may be a set of trees rather than a single tree. However, we will here focus on a profile P for which both MRP and MRC produce a unique tree, namely $\tilde{P} = (\tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2, \tilde{T}_2, \tilde{T}_3, \tilde{T}_3)$, where $\tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2, \tilde{T}_3$ are as depicted in Figure 5. Now, we add taxon 5 to all trees in \tilde{P} such that we get profile $P = (T_1, T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4, T_5)$, where again T_1, \dots, T_5 are as depicted in Figure 5. Note that $T_1 \setminus \{5\} = \tilde{T}_1$, $T_2 \setminus \{5\} = T_3 \setminus \{5\} = T_4 \setminus \{5\} = \tilde{T}_2$, and $T_5 \setminus \{5\} = \tilde{T}_3$. Translating all non-trivial splits of P and \tilde{P} to characters leads to alignments \mathcal{A}_P and $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{P}}$ as depicted in Figures 6 and 6.

We used the computer algebra system Mathematica [16] to prove by exhaustive search that T_1 is both the unique MRP and MRC tree for \mathcal{A}_P , and that \tilde{T}_2 is both the unique MRP and MRC tree for $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{P}}$. However, as \tilde{T}_2 is not a subtree of T_1 , this shows that even in the case where MRP and MRC agree and additionally lead to a unique tree, additional taxa can change the predetermined relationships of the species in question. Thus, MRP and MRC are not ‘future-proof’ in the sense of [6].

4 Discussion and outlook

We introduced two new properties which are desirable for sensible phylogenetic consensus methods, namely refinement-stability and non-contradiction. We analyzed seven established consensus methods and found that only two of them, namely strict consensus and majority-rule consensus, are refinement-stable, whereas the other five (loose consensus, Adams consensus, Aho consensus, MRP and MRC) are not. We also proved that strict, majority-rule and loose consensus as well as MRC are all non-contradictory, whereas Adams and Aho consensus as well as MRP are not.

We also analyzed the implications that the properties of refinement-stability and non-contradiction have on any refinement method, established or not, and surprisingly found that there are infinitely many consensus methods which are regular, refinement-stable and non-contradictory. As of the established consensus methods we analyzed only two (namely strict and majority-rule) fit that description, it would be interesting to see if there are other biologically plausible consensus methods which have these properties. This is a possible area for future investigations.




Figure 5: Profile \tilde{P} , which can be turned into profile P by adding information on taxon 5, leading to alignments $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{P}}$ and \mathcal{A}_P as depicted in Figures 6 and 7, respectively. T_1 is the unique MRP and MRC tree for P , while \tilde{T}_2 is the unique MRP and MRC tree for \tilde{T} .

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{P}} :$$

1:	A	A	A	A	A
2:	A	A	C	C	C
3:	C	C	C	C	C
4:	C	C	A	A	A

Figure 6: Alignment $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{P}}$, which has both a unique parsimony tree as well as a unique compatibility tree: both of them equal \widetilde{T}_2 as depicted in Figure 5. The unique maximum set of compatible characters in $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{P}}$ is highlighted in bold.

$$\mathcal{A}_P :$$

1:	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
2:	A	A	A	A	C	A	C	C	C	A
3:	C	A	C	A	C	C	C	C	C	A
4:	C	C	C	C	A	A	C	A	A	C
5:	C	C	C	C	C	C	A	A	C	C

Figure 7: Alignment \mathcal{A}_P , which has both a unique parsimony tree as well as a unique compatibility tree: both of them equal T_1 as depicted in Figure 5. The unique maximum set of compatible characters in \mathcal{A}_P is highlighted in bold.

Acknowledgement

MF wishes to thank the joint research project DIG-IT! supported by the European Social Fund (ESF), reference: ESF/14-BM-A55- 0017/19, and the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of MecklenburgVorpommern, Germany. MH thanks Prof. Dr. W. F. Martin, the Volkswagen Foundation 93_046 grant and the ERC Advanced Grant No. 666053 for their support during this research.

References

- [1] A. V. Aho, Y. Sagiv, T. G. Szymanski, and J. D. Ullman. Inferring a tree from lowest common ancestors with an application to the optimization of relational expressions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(3):405–421, 1981. doi: 10.1137/0210030. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0210030>.
- [2] O. Bininda-Emonds. MRP supertree construction in the consensus setting. *Bioconsensus*, 61, 04 2003. doi: 10.1090/dimacs/061/16.
- [3] O. Bininda-Emonds, editor. *Phylogenetic Supertrees: Combining Information to Reveal the Tree of Life*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004. ISBN 1-4020-2328-6.
- [4] O. Bininda-Emonds, J. Gittleman, and M. Steel. The (super)tree of life: Procedures, problems, and prospects. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 33:265–89, 11 2002. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.33.010802.150511.
- [5] D. Bryant. A classification of consensus methods for phylogenetics. In *Bioconsensus*, 2001.

- [6] D. Bryant, A. Francis, and M. Steel. Can we “future-proof” consensus trees? *Systematic biology*, 66(4):611–619, 2017.
- [7] P. Buneman. *The Recovery of Trees from Measures of Dissimilarity*, pages 387–395. Edinburgh University Press, 1971. ISBN 9780852242131.
- [8] E. Delucchi, L. Hoessly, and G. Paolini. Impossibility Results on Stability of Phylogenetic Consensus Methods. *Systematic Biology*, 11 2019. ISSN 1063-5157. doi: 10.1093/sysbio/syz071. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syz071>.
- [9] J. Felsenstein, J. Archie, W. Day, W. Maddison, C. Meacham, F. Rohlf, and D. Swofford. The Newick tree format, 2000. URL <http://evolution.genetics.washington.edu/phylip/newicktree.html>.
- [10] M. Fischer. Non-hereditary maximum parsimony trees. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 65(2):293–308, Aug 2012. ISSN 1432-1416. doi: 10.1007/s00285-011-0458-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00285-011-0458-9>.
- [11] M. Fischer and V. Liebscher. On the balance of unrooted trees. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 25:133–150, 2021. doi: 10.7155/jgaa.00553.
- [12] C. Levasseur and F. Lapointe. Total evidence, average consensus and matrix representation with parsimony: What a difference distances make. *Evolutionary bioinformatics online*, 2:1–5, 02 2006. doi: 10.1177/117693430600200018.
- [13] C.A. Meacham. Theoretical and computational considerations of the compatibility of qualitative taxonomic characters. In J Felsenstein, editor, *Numerical Taxonomy. NATO ASI Series (Series G: Ecological Sciences)*, volume 1. Springer, 1983. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69024-2_34.
- [14] C. Semple and M. Steel. *Phylogenetics (Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications)*. Oxford University Press, 2003. ISBN 0198509421.
- [15] N.J.A. Sloane. The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences OEIS, 2018. URL <https://oeis.org>.
- [16] Wolfram Research Inc. *Mathematica 11.1*, 2017. URL <http://www.wolfram.com>.