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## The plan

In this talk I...
$\square$...come up with supertree problems
$\square$ Finding a supergenetree that minimizes duplications
$\square$...convince you that they're hard
$\square$...try to do something about it

- Exact, brute-force algorithm
$\square$ A greedy heuristic
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## Species tree


$\square$ Gene tree label = species

- Multiple copies (paralogs)
- e.g. $a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}$
$\square$ Gene trees may be partial + discordant with S (e.g. $\mathrm{G}_{3}$ )
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## SuperGeneTree

$\square$ Often, many supergenetrees exist
$\square$ Which one is the best?
$\square$ We explore ways to choose using information from the species tree S
$\square$ More specifically, we explore ways to use reconciliation with $S$ to pick the best supergenetree

## Reconciliation

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



## Reconciliation

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



## Reconciliation

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



## Reconciliation

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



## Reconciliation

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



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

## Reconciliation

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



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

## The Supergenetree problem



## The Supergenetree problem



## The Supergenetree problem



## The Supergenetree problem



## The Supergenetree problem



## The Supergenetree problem



## The Supergenetree problem



## The plan

## In this talk I...

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

■ ...convince you that they're hard
$\square$...try to do something about it

- Exact, brute-force algorithm
$\square$ A greedy heuristic


## SuperGeneTree Problem 1

$\square$ Given: a set of compatible gene trees $G=\left\{G_{1}, \ldots, G_{k}\right\}$ and a species tree $S$
$\square$ Find: a SuperGeneTree G* that
$\square$ displays every tree of $G$
$\square$ minimizes \#dups( $\mathrm{G}^{*}$, S )

## SuperGeneTree Problem 1

$\square$ Given: a set of compatible gene trees $G=\left\{G_{1}, \ldots, G_{k}\right\}$ and a species tree $S$
$\square$ Find: a SuperGeneTree G* that
$\square$ displays every tree of $G$
$\square$ minimizes \#dups( $\mathrm{G}^{*}$, S)
$\square$ NP-Complete

## SuperGeneTree Problem 1

$\square$ Given: a set of compatible gene trees $G=\left\{G_{1}, \ldots, G_{k}\right\}$ and a species tree $S$
$\square$ Find: a SuperGeneTree G* that
$\square$ displays every tree of $G$
$\square$ minimizes \#dups( $\mathrm{G}^{*}$, S )
$\square$ NP-Complete
$\square$ NP-Hard to approximate within a $\mathrm{n}^{1-\varepsilon}$ factor
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Speciation trees = all speciation (all agree with S)
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## Extending the BUILD algorithm

$\square$ Given a set of trees G, the BUILD algorithm outputs, if it exists, a supertree T displaying every tree of G
$\square$ T might be partially resolved (non-binary)
$\square$ Every binary resolution of T displays G
$\square$ BUILD can be extended to output every supertree displaying G + every minimally resolved (Constantinescu \& Sankoff, 1995, Ng \& Wormald, 1996, Semple, 2003)
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## Extending the BUILD algorithm

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

## Extending the BUILD algorithm

$\square$ Trying every partition of the components can take some time.
$\square$ Instead, let's find a way to choose a partition that "looks good".

## A greedy approach
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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

## A greedy approach



- Make the BUILD graph and identify the components.

$f_{1}$

$\mathrm{e}_{1}$
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- 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.
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## Extending the BUILD algorithm

To minimize the number of PreSpecDups:
$\square$ Make the BUILD graph
$\square$ Add the PreSpecDup edges
$\square$ Find a Max-Cut partition of the components
$\square$ Repeat recursively on the parts
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## Extending the BUILD algorithm

To minimize the number of PreSpecDups :
$\square$ Make the BUILD graph
$\square$ Add the PreSpecDup edges
$\square$ Find a Max-Cut partition of the components
$\square$ 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

$\square$ Fixed Parameter Tractability?
$\square$ Criteria other than duplications?
$\square$ e.g. gene losses
$\square$ What to do if the input gene trees are incompatible?
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