RECONSTRUCTING A SUPERGENETREE MINIMIZING RECONCILIATION

Manuel Lafond^{1,} Aïda Ouangraoua^{2,} Nadia El-Mabrouk¹

¹Université de Montréal ²Université de Sherbrooke

The plan

In this talk I...

- ...come up with supertree problems
 Finding a supergenetree that minimizes duplications
- …convince you that they're hard
- ...try to do something about it
 - Exact, brute-force algorithm
 - A greedy heuristic

TP53 gene tree(s)

82

Ensembl







TP53 gene tree(s)



TP53 gene tree(s)













Multiple gene trees









- Gene tree label = species
- Multiple copies (paralogs)
 - e.g. a₁, a₂, a₃
- Gene trees may be partial + discordant with S (e.g. G₃)

Multiple gene trees

Our goal : find a gene tree that displays them all











 $b_1 e_1 a_1 a_2$



 $b_1 e_1 a_1 a_2$



SuperGeneTree

Our trees are said compatible if there is a supertree displaying them all

Finding a supertree (or determining incompatibility) is an old problem
 The BUILD algorithm does that (Aho & al., 1981)

What's different about supergenetrees ?

SuperGeneTree

Our trees are said compatible if there is a supertree displaying them all

Finding a supertree (or determining incompatibility) is an old problem
 The BUILD algorithm does that (Aho & al., 1981)

What's different about supergenetrees ?

We have the species tree

SuperGeneTree

Often, many supergenetrees exist

□ Which one is the best ?

- We explore ways to choose using information from the species tree S
- More specifically, we explore ways to use reconciliation with S to pick the best supergenetree

Reconciliation identifies **duplication**, **speciation** and **loss** events in G.



Reconciliation identifies **duplication**, **speciation** and **loss** events in G.



Reconciliation identifies **duplication**, **speciation** and **loss** events in G.



Reconciliation identifies **duplication**, **speciation** and **loss** events in G.

d

С



Reconciliation identifies **duplication**, **speciation** and **loss** events in G.



Possible reconciliation costs : #dups, #dups + #losses

Reconciliation identifies **duplication**, **speciation** and **loss** events in G.



Possible reconciliation costs : **#dups**, #dups + #losses















The plan

In this talk I...

- ...come up with supertree problems
 Finding a supergenetree that minimizes duplications
- …convince you that they're hard
- ...try to do something about it
 Exact, brute-force algorithm
 - A greedy heuristic

SuperGeneTree Problem 1

Given: a set of compatible gene trees G = {G₁, ..., G_k} and a species tree S
 Find: a SuperGeneTree G* that
 displays every tree of G
 minimizes #dups(G*, S)

SuperGeneTree Problem 1

Given: a set of compatible gene trees G = {G₁, ..., G_k} and a species tree S
 Find: a SuperGeneTree G* that
 displays every tree of G
 minimizes #dups(G*, S)

NP-Complete

SuperGeneTree Problem 1

Given: a set of compatible gene trees G = {G₁, ..., G_k} and a species tree S
 Find: a SuperGeneTree G* that
 displays every tree of G
 minimizes #dups(G*, S)

- NP-Complete
- □ NP-Hard to approximate within a $n^{1-\epsilon}$ factor












Independent = each

gene appears only once









Speciation trees = all speciation (all agree with S)



SuperGeneTree Problem 2

Given: a set of independent speciation gene trees G = {G₁, ..., G_k} and a species tree S

Find: a SuperGeneTree G* that

displays every tree of G

minimizes #dups(G*, S)

SuperGeneTree Problem 2

Given: a set of independent speciation gene trees G = {G₁, ..., G_k} and a species tree S

Find: a SuperGeneTree G* that

displays every tree of G

minimizes #dups(G*, S)

NP-Complete

The plan

In this talk I...

...come up with supertree problems
 Finding a supergenetree that minimizes duplications

- …convince you that they're hard
- ...try to do something about it
 - Exact, brute-force algorithm
 - A greedy heuristic



(a partition into independent sets)



 G_i, G_j share a gene from the same species (i.e. a label) iff v_i, v_j share an edge \Leftrightarrow G_i, G_j can be merged into a supertree without duplications iff v_i, v_j share no edge





A best solution partitions the trees into k sets of trees that all share no "label"



A best solution partitions the trees into **k** sets of trees that **all share no "label"** Makes one zero-duplication tree for each part.



A best solution partitions the trees into **k** sets of trees that **all share no "label"** Makes one zero-duplication tree for each part. Connects these k subtrees with at most k - 1 duplications.



A best solution partitions the trees into k sets of trees that all share no "label" Makes one zero-duplication tree for each part. Connects these k subtrees with at most k - 1 duplications.



A best solution partitions the trees into k sets of trees that all share no "label" Makes one zero-duplication tree for each part. Connects these k subtrees with at most k - 1 duplications.

The plan

In this talk I...

...come up with supertree problems
 Finding a supergenetree that minimizes duplications

…convince you that they're hard

- ...try to do something about it
 - Exact, brute-force algorithm
 - A greedy heuristic

- Given a set of trees G, the BUILD algorithm outputs, if it exists, a supertree T displaying every tree of G
 - T might be partially resolved (non-binary)
 - Every binary resolution of T displays G

BUILD can be extended to output every supertree displaying G + every minimally resolved (Constantinescu & Sankoff, 1995, Ng & Wormald, 1996, Semple, 2003)

BUILD graph

vertices = genes edges = genes together in some triplet











BUILD graph

vertices = genes edges = genes together in some triplet



a₂ C₂

Partition of connected components = possible splits at the root







BUILD graph

vertices = genes edges = genes together in some triplet



BUILD graph

C₁

 a_2

C1



BUILD graph

. . .



- For every partially unresolved tree T obtained in this fashion :
 - Find a resolution that minimizes the number of duplications (linear time, Lafond & al. 2012)
- In the worst case, there are Ω(n^{n/2}) trees to resolve (Jansson, Lemence, Lingas, 2012).
 Total time : Ω(n * n^{n/2})

□ Worst case in practice : ?

Trying every partition of the components can take some time.

Instead, let's find a way to choose a partition that "looks good".







We already know that some duplications will be required.





We already know that some duplications will be required.

Focus on the "highest" ones, i.e. those that occur before the first speciation in S.



We already know that some duplications will be required.

Focus on the "highest" ones, i.e. those that occur before the first speciation in S.



We already know that some duplications will be required.

Focus on the "highest" ones, i.e. those that occur before the first speciation in S.

We call those duplication Pre Speciation Duplications (PreSpecDups).



We already know that some duplications will be required.

Focus on the "highest" ones, i.e. those that occur before the first speciation in S.

We call those duplication Pre Speciation Duplications (PreSpecDups).

New subproblem : minimize only these PreSpecDups





Make the BUILD graph and identify the components.
Add a special edge between components that requires a PreSpecDup when split.













- Make the BUILD graph and identify the components.

- Add a special edge between components that requires a PreSpecDup when split.

- Find the partition that merges a maximum of duplications.
A greedy approach



A greedy approach



A greedy approach



Extending the BUILD algorithm

To minimize the number of PreSpecDups :

- Make the BUILD graph
- Add the PreSpecDup edges
- Find a Max-Cut partition of the components
- Repeat recursively on the parts

Extending the BUILD algorithm

To minimize the number of PreSpecDups :

- Make the BUILD graph
- Add the PreSpecDup edges
- □ Find a Max-Cut partition of the components
- Repeat recursively on the parts

That's NP-Hard ! And we have to repeat it recursively !!

Extending the BUILD algorithm

To minimize the number of PreSpecDups :

- Make the BUILD graph
- Add the PreSpecDup edges
- □ Find a Max-Cut partition of the components
- Repeat recursively on the parts

That's NP-Hard ! And we have to repeat it recursively !!

The result : even this problem is hard to approximate !

Conclusion

Fixed Parameter Tractability ?

Criteria other than duplications ?
e.g. gene losses

What to do if the input gene trees are incompatible ?

Acknowledgements





Aïda Ouangraoua



Nadia El-Mabrouk





The 14th RECOMB-CG October 2016 in MONTRÉAL © Probably from Monday 10 to Wednesday 12



CENTRE DE RECHERCHES MATHÉMATIQUES

Université na de Montréal