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1 Abstract

The study of molecular evolution rests on the classical fields of population genetics and systematics, but the increasing availability of DNA sequence data has broadened the field in the last decades, leading to new theories and methodologies. This includes parsimony and maximum likelihood methods of phylogenetic tree estimation, the theory of genome rearrangements, and the coalescent model with recombination. These all interact in the study of genome evolution, yet to date they have only been pursued in isolation.

We present the first unified parsimony framework for the study of genome evolutionary histories that includes all of these aspects, proposing a graphical data structure called a history graph that is intended to form a practical basis for analysis. We define tractable upper and lower bound parsimony cost functions on history graphs that incorporate both substitutions and rearrangements. We demonstrate that these bounds become tight for a special unambiguous type of history graph called an ancestral variation graph (AVG), which captures in its combinatorial structure the operations required in an evolutionary history.

For an input history graph $G$, we demonstrate that there exists a finite set of interpretations of $G$ that contains all minimal (lacking extraneous elements) and most parsimonious AVG interpretations of $G$. We define a partial order over this set and an associated set of sampling moves that can be used to explore these DNA histories. These results generalise and conceptually simplify the problem...
so that we can sample evolutionary histories using parsimony cost functions that account for all substitutions and rearrangements in the presence of duplications.

2 Introduction

In genome evolution there are two interacting relationships between nucleotides of DNA, resulting from two key features: DNA nucleotides descend from common ancestral nucleotides, and they are covalently linked to other nucleotides. In this paper we explore the combination of these two relationships in a simple graph model, allowing for change by the process of replication, where a complete sequence of DNA is copied, by substitution, in which the chemical characteristics of a nucleotide are changed, and by the coordinated breaking and rematching of covalent bonds between nucleotides in rearrangement operations.

This paper will develop a parsimony model for these processes of change, however, they each have quite different dynamics that lead to us accounting for their parsimony costs differently. As DNA molecules replicate essentially continuously this process has zero cost. Much more rarely substitutions occur and more rarely still rearrangement operations take place. By making the common assumption that all substitutions and rearrangements occur independently of one another, we account for the cost of these latter two processes by independent rearrangement and substitution costs, which are themselves essentially sums over the numbers of inferred events. Importantly, replications that are combined with unbalanced rearrangements, which lead either to gain or loss of sequence, are costed in terms of the underlying rearrangement cost. By accounting for these costs independently and allowing for arbitrary replication, we build upon a wealth of models, data structures and algorithms that have studied these processes either in isolation or in a more limited combination.

Such evolutionary methods generally start with a set of observed sequences in an alignment, an alignment being a partitioning of elements in the sequences into equivalence classes, each of which represents a set of elements that share a recognizably recent common ancestor. Though alignments represent an uncertain inference, and though their optimisation for standard models is intractable for multiple sequences (Elias [2006]), we make the common assumption that the alignment is given, as efficient heuristics exist to compute reasonable genome alignments (Miller et al. [2007], Darling et al. [2010], Paten et al. [2011b]).

If the sequences in an alignment only differ from one another by substitutions and rearrangements that delete subsequences, or insert novel subsequences (collectively indels), then the alignment data structure is naturally a 2D matrix. In such a matrix, by convention, the rows represent the sequences and the columns represent the equivalence classes of elements. The sequences are interspersed with “gap” symbols to indicate where elements are missing from a column due to indels. From such a matrix alignment, phylogenetic methods infer a history of replication (Felsenstein [2004]). Such a history is representable as a phylogenetic tree, whose internal nodes represent the most recent common ancestors (MRCA) of subsets of the input sequences. To create a history including the
MRCA sequences, additional rows can be added to the matrix (Blanchette et al. [2004], Kim and Sinha [2007], Paten et al. [2008]). For parsimony models, both imputing phylogenetic trees from matrix alignments and calculating MRCA sequences given a phylogenetic tree and a matrix alignment are NP-complete (Day [1987], Chindelevitch et al. [2006]).

The alignment of long DNA sequences related by substitutions and homologous recombination rearrangements is also representable as a matrix; homologous recombination operations being the primary modifier of individual genomes within a population. However, the history of replication of such an alignment is no longer generally representable as a single phylogenetic tree, as each column in the matrix may have its own distinct tree. To represent the MRCA of such an alignment requires a more complex data structure, termed an ancestral recombination graph (ARG) (Song and Hein [2005], Westesson and Holmes [2009]). It is NP-hard under the infinite sites model (no homoplasy) to determine the minimum number of homologous recombinations needed to explain the evolutionary history of a given set of sequences, and probably NP-hard under more general models (Wang et al. [2001]).

Larger DNA sequences, or complete genomes, are generally permuted by more complex rearrangements, such that the matrix alignment representation is insufficient. Instead, the alignment is naturally a form of graph, called a breakpoint graph (see Section 3 for a formal introduction). Using such graphs, for pairs of genomes and when rearrangements are assumed balanced, inferring rearrangement histories based upon inversions (Hannenhalli and Pevzner [1999]), translocations (Bergeron et al. [2006]) or double-cut-and-join (DCJ) operations (Yancopoulos et al. [2005]) has polynomial or better time complexity. However, for three or more genomes with balanced rearrangements or when rearrangements are unbalanced these exact parsimony methods are intractable, and heuristics become necessary (Bourque and Pevzner [2002], Ma et al. [2008]). Notably, there have been several recent methods to extend these models to handle limited forms of unbalanced rearrangements (Yancopoulos and Friedberg [2009], Bader [2010], Braga et al. [2011]).

The graph model introduced in this paper is capable of representing a general evolutionary history for any combination of replication, substitution and rearrangement operations, including homologous recombinations. It therefore generalises phylogenetic trees, graphs representing histories with indels, ancestral recombination graphs and breakpoint graphs. We start by introducing this graph and then develop a parsimony model that, somewhat imperfectly, generalises parsimony variants of all the problems mentioned, facilitating the study of all these subproblems in one unified domain. We provide a sampling approach to cope with the NP-hardness of the general parsimony problem.

3 Sequence Graphs and Threads

Sequence graphs are used extensively in comparative genomics, in rearrangement theory typically under the name (multi or master) breakpoint graph (Alek-
sevey and Pevzner [2008], Ma et al. [2008]) and in alignment under the name A-bruijn (Raphael et al. [2004]) or adjacency graph (Paten et al. [2011a]). We use the following bidirected form, which is similar to that used by Medvedev and Brudno [2009] for sequence assembly.

**Definition 1.** A (bidirected) sequence graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$ is a graph in which a set $V_G$ of vertices, termed segments, are connected by a set $E_G$ of bidirected edges (Edmonds and Johnson [1970]), termed bonds. A segment represents a subsequence of DNA. A segment is oriented, having a tail side and a head side. For segment $x$, a side is denoted $x_{\alpha}$, where $\alpha \in \{\text{head}, \text{tail}\}$. These categories are called orientations. A bond, which represents the covalent bond between adjacent nucleotides of DNA, is a pair set of sides. We refer to the two sides contained in a bond as its endpoints. Bonds are bidirected, in that each endpoint is not just a vertex, but a vertex with an independent orientation (either head or tail). For convenience, we say a side is attached if it is contained in a bond, else it is unattached. We say a segment is attached if either of its sides are attached, else it is unattached.

Associated with a sequence graph is a labeling function.

**Definition 2.** The function $l : V_G \to \Sigma^* \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is the labeling function where $\Sigma = \{A/T, C/G, G/C, T/A\}$ is the alphabet of bases, which are oriented, paired nucleotides of DNA, and $\Sigma^*$ is a set of sequences of bases. For $\rho/\tau \in \Sigma^*$, $\rho$ is the forward complement and $\tau$ is the reverse complement. Labels are directed. Traversed from the tail to the head side of a segment a label is read as its forward complement, and reversely, traversed from the head to the tail side of a segment a label is read as its reverse complement. A segment $x \in V_G$ for which $l(x) = \emptyset$ is unlabeled.

In this paper we limit ourselves to the following form of sequence graph.

**Definition 3.** A thread graph is a sequence graph in which each side is contained in at most one bond.

An example thread graph is shown in Figure 1.

**Definition 4.** A connected component in a thread graph is called a thread.

A thread represents a single DNA sequence whose bases are encoded by the labels of the segments, where unlabeled segments represent missing information. A thread may be a simple cycle, representing a circular DNA molecule, or have two unattached sides, in which case it represents a linear DNA molecule or fragment of a larger DNA molecule. A thread graph is phased, in that each segment in it is part of one thread. In contrast, a sequence graph that is not a thread graph may be unphased, in that there exist many possible maximal thread subgraphs for each of its connected components.
Figure 1: A thread graph. For visual appeal, segments are the arrow shapes with the sides indicated by the ends of the arrows. Labels within the arrows represent the subsequence of DNA when traversed from the tail side to the head side of the arrow. Bonds are the lines connecting the ends of the arrow shapes. They are bidirected, i.e., there are 3 unordered types: head-tail (symmetrically tail-head), tail-tail and head-head bonds. In prior illustrations of bidirected graphs (Medvedev and Brudno [2009]) orientations were drawn on the lines, however the semantics of the graph are still the same, in that head and tail orientations are properties of the endpoints of the bonds, not the segments. The graph contains three linear threads. As an example, because the middle segment is attached in the opposite direction and therefore reverse-complemented when traversed left-to-right, the top thread represents the sequence “GAGGGTG-GCCCGAGAATACTTTAAGGTTCTGAATAAAACCCAGCACAAATTTT” (from left-to-right, colour used to distinguish segment labels) and its reverse complement, “AAAATTTTG-GCTGGGGTTTATTCAAGAACCTTAAAGTATTCTCGGCCCACCCCTC” (from the right-to-left). The colours of the arrows represent homologies between the segments, these are not part of the thread graph itself.
4 History Graphs

Nucleotides of DNA derive from one another by a process of replication. This replication process is represented in history graphs, which add ancestry relationships to thread graphs.

**Definition 5.** A *history graph* $G = (V_G, E_G, B_G)$ is a thread graph with an additional set $B_G$ of directed edges between segments, termed *branches*. Each segment is incident with at most one incoming branch. The *event graph* $D(G)$ is the directed graph formed by the contraction $\square$ of bonds in $E_G$. For $G$ to be a history graph $D(G)$ must be a directed acyclic graph (DAG), a property we term *acyclicity*.

Example history graphs are shown in Figure 2(A,B), along with an event graph in 2(C) for the history graph shown in 2(B). We now define useful terminology to discuss branch relationships.

**Definition 6.** Each connected component of branches forms a *branch-tree*. Two segments are *homologous* if they are in the same branch-tree. A segment $y$ is a *descendant* of a segment $x$, and conversely $y$ is an *ancestor* of $x$, if $y$ is reachable by a directed path of branches from $x$. If two homologous segments do not have an ancestor/descendant relationship then they are *indirectly related*.

For a branch $e = (x, y)$, $x$ is the *parent* of $e$ and $y$, and $y$ is the *child* of $e$ and a *child* of $x$. Similarly, $e$ is the *parent branch* of $y$ and a *child branch* of $x$.

A segment is a *leaf* if it has no incident outgoing branches, a *root* if it has no incident incoming branches, else it is *internal*.

We reuse the terminology of parent, child, homologous, ancestor, descendant and indirectly related with sides. Two sides have a given relationship if their segments have the relationship and they have the same orientation. Similarly, a side is a leaf (resp. root) if its segment is a leaf (resp. root).

5 Evolutionary Histories

Now we formally define a notion of a history graph without significant missing information.

**Definition 7.** An *epoch* is a history graph in which:

- Every branch-tree is identical, composed of a root segment with $n$ children.
- Every segment is labelled.
- A root segment has at most one child with a label different to its own.
- A side is attached if any homologous side is attached.

---

4 The contraction of an edge $e$ is the removal of $e$ from the graph and merger of the vertices $x$ and $y$ incident with $e$ to create new vertex $z$, such that edges incident with $z$ were incident either with $x$ or $y$ or both, in the latter case becoming a loop edge on $z$. 
Figure 2: (A) A history graph representing homology relationships between the segments in Figure [1]. Due to space, colours are used as labels (and match those in Figure [1]), with unlabeled segments shaded grey. Two segments have the same colour shade if and only if they have identical labels. The dotted arrows represent branches. Four ancestral segments are added relative to Figure [1] to represent the common ancestral segments of the subsets of homologous segments in Figure [1]. (B) An extension of (A). (C) The event graph for (B). (D) An evolutionary history with four epochs (1 - 4), and rearrangements given names corresponding to their type. It is a realization for the graphs in (A) and (B). (E) The module graph for the most recent epoch (nearest leaves) in (D).
If the number of leaves in each branch-tree is greater than 1, then for each pair of leaf sides connected by a bond there exists a bond connecting their parents.

**Definition 8.** An *evolutionary history* is a history graph that can be vertex-partitioned into a finite sequence of epochs, such that the leaf layer of an epoch is the root layer of the following epoch.

An example evolutionary history with epoch subgraphs is shown in Figure 2(D). An evolutionary history can be thought of as a history graph from which a parsimonious sequence of substitutions and rearrangements can be trivially derived. Note that there is no general requirement in this model for replications to produce only two copies of a thread, though parsimonious histories will often involve them.

**Definition 9.** The *substitution cost* of a branch in an evolutionary history is 0 if the labels of its endpoints are identical, else it is 1. The *substitution cost* of an evolutionary history $H$ is the sum of its branches’ substitution costs, denoted $s(H)$.

The example evolutionary history in Figure 2(D) has substitution cost 4.

The substitution cost defined is motivated by the case $\Sigma^* = \Sigma$, i.e. single base labels, where the substitution cost is the minimum number of single base changes. As any history graph in which all homologous labels have the same length can easily be converted to a semantically equivalent history graph for which $\Sigma^* = \Sigma$, we do not investigate more complex substitution costs. However, generalizations of the simple notion of substitution costs used here are relatively straightforward.

**Definition 10.** The *module graph* of an epoch $G$ is the graph resulting from the deletion of all labels in $G$, contraction of all branches in $G$, splitting of each segment into a separate vertex for each side, partitioning the bond incidences between the new vertices by the side to which they connect, and, finally, deletion of all isolated vertices.

Figure 2(E) shows an example module graph.

**Definition 11.** The Yancopoulos complexity of an epoch is $\Sigma_i \left\lceil \frac{k_i}{2} \right\rceil - 1$, where $k_i$ is the number of sides in the $i$th connected component of the module graph of the epoch. The *rearrangement cost* of an evolutionary history $H$ is the sum of its epochs’ Yancopoulos complexities, denoted $r(H)$.

The example evolutionary history in Figure 2(D) has rearrangement cost 3.

**Lemma 1.** The Yancopoulos complexity of an epoch is the minimum number of double-cut-and-join (DCJ) operations required to convert the root layer’s bonds into the leaf layer’s bonds.

*Proof.* Similar to that given in [Yancopoulos et al., 2005].
Note that by definition of an epoch, the module graph that results from an epoch has degree at most 2, i.e. every vertex is incident on at most two edges. For epochs that contain root segments with multiple children (i.e. replications), the module graph has degree at most 1, because of the requirement for this case that for each pair of leaf sides connected by a bond there exist a bond connecting their parents. Hence the rearrangement cost is always 0 for an epoch that contains a replication.

Because different studies lay different emphases on substitution or rearrangement (for example because of the available data) and because the events do not have the same probability in practice, we allow for a degree of freedom in the definition of the overall cost function.

Definition 12. An *(evolutionary history) cost function* for an evolutionary history is any monotone function on the substitution and rearrangement costs in which both substitutions and rearrangements have non-zero cost.

6 Reduction

Not all history graphs are as detailed as evolutionary histories. We define below a partial order relationship that describes how one graph can be a generalization of another graph, so for example, a less detailed history graph can be used to subsume multiple evolutionary histories.

Definition 13. A branch whose child is unlabeled and unattached is referred to as having a *free-child*. A branch whose parent is unlabeled, unattached and a root with a single child is referred to as having a *free-parent*. A segment is *isolated* if it has no incident bonds or branches.

Definition 14. A *reduction operation* is an operation upon a history graph that either:

- Deletes a bond, an isolated segment or the label of a segment.
- Contracts a branch with a free-child or free-parent.

See Figure 3(A-E) for examples. The inverse of a reduction operation is an *extension operation*.

Lemma 2. The result of a reduction operation is itself a history graph.

Proof. Easily verified. □

Definition 15. A history graph $G$ is a *reduction* of another history graph $G'$ if $G$ is isomorphic to a graph that can be obtained from $G'$ by a sequence of reduction operations, termed a *reduction sequence*.

Lemma 3. The reduction relation is a partial order.

Proof. Easily verified. □
Figure 3: (A-E) Reduction operations. For each case the graph on the left is a reduction of the graph on the right. (A) A label deletion. (B) A bond deletion. (C) A segment deletion. (D) A contraction of a branch with a free-child. (E) A contraction of a branch with a free-parent.

Definition 16. We write $G \lessdot G'$ to indicate that $G$ is a reduction of $G'$ and $G \prec G'$ to indicate that $G$ is a reduction of $G'$ not equal to $G'$. Like reduction and extension operations, if $G$ is a reduction of $H$, $H$ is an extension of $G$.

An examination of the reduction relation is in the discussion section and Figure 11.

7 History Graph Cost

Using the parsimony principle, we now extend parsimony cost functions, previously defined on evolutionary histories, to all history graphs.

Definition 17. An evolutionary history $H$ that is an extension of a history graph $G$ is called a realisation of $G$. The set $\mathcal{H}(G)$ is the realisations of $G$.

Definition 18. For a given cost function $c$ the cost of a history graph $G$ is
\[
C(G, c) = \min_{H \in \mathcal{H}(G)} c(s(H), r(H)).
\]

Lemma 4. The problem of finding the cost of a history graph is NP-hard.

Proof. Parsimony problems on either substitutions or rearrangements alone are NP-hard and can be formulated as special cases of the problem of finding the minimum cost realization of a history graph [Day 1987, Tannier et al. 2009].

8 The Lifted Graph

Although determining the cost of a history graph is NP-hard, we will show that the cost can be bounded such that the bounds become tight for a broad,
characteristic subset of history graphs. To do this we introduce the concept of lifted labels and bonds.

**Definition 19.** The free-roots of a history graph \( G \) are a set of additional segments such that a single, unique free-root is assigned to each root segment in \( G \) (see the top of Figure 4(A)).

**Definition 20.** For a segment \( x \), \( A(x) \) is the most recent labeled ancestor of \( x \), else if no such segment exists, the free-root of the branch-tree containing \( x \). For a side \( x_\alpha \), overloading notation, \( A(x_\alpha) \) is the most recent attached ancestor of \( x_\alpha \), else if no attached ancestor exists, the side \( x_\alpha^\prime \), where \( x_\alpha^\prime \) is the free-root of the branch-tree containing \( x \). For a side or segment \( x \), \( A(x) \) is the lifting ancestor of \( x \).

**Definition 21.** For a labeled segment \( y \), a lifted label is a label for \( A(y) \) identical to \( l(y) \). For a segment \( x \) its lifted labels is therefore the multiset \( L_x = (L_u, N_x) \), where \( L(u) \) is the set of distinct lifted labels for \( x \), and for each lifted label \( \rho \), \( N_x(\rho) \) is the number of times \( \rho \) appears as a lifted label for \( x \), i.e. \( L_x = \{ l(y) : A(y) = x \} \subseteq \Sigma^\ast \) and \( N_x : L_x \to \mathbb{Z}_+ \) such that \( N_x(\rho) = |\{ y : A(y) = x, l(y) = \rho \}| \).

**Definition 22.** For a bond \( \{ y_\alpha, z_\beta \} \), a lifted bond is a bidirected edge \( \{ A(y_\alpha), A(z_\beta) \} \). For a side \( x_\alpha \) its lifted bonds is the multiset (again overloading notation) \( L_{x_\alpha} = (L_{x_\alpha}, N_{x_\alpha}) \), where \( L(x_\alpha) \) is the set of distinct lifted bonds incident with \( x_\alpha \), and for each lifted bond \( \{ x_\alpha, w_\gamma \} \), \( N_{x_\alpha}(\{ x_\alpha, w_\gamma \}) \) is the number of sides whose lifting ancestor is \( x_\alpha \), and which are connected by a bond to a side whose lifting ancestor is \( w_\gamma \), i.e. \( L_{x_\alpha} = \{ \{ x_\alpha = A(y_\alpha), A(z_\beta) \} : \{ y_\alpha, z_\beta \} \in E_G \} \) and \( N_{x_\alpha} : L_{x_\alpha} \to \mathbb{Z}_+ \) such that \( N_{x_\alpha}(\{ x_\alpha, w_\gamma \}) = |\{ y_\alpha : x_\alpha = A(y_\alpha), w_\gamma \} \in L_{x_\alpha} \}| \).

**Definition 23.** A history graph \( G \) with free-roots, lifted labels and lifted bonds is a lifted graph \( L(G) \).

Figure 4(A) shows an example lifted graph that outlines these concepts. Note that for a side \( x_\alpha \), \( N_{x_\alpha}(\{ x_\alpha, w_\gamma \}) \) gives the multiplicity of lifted bond incidences with \( x_\alpha \), not the multiplicity of \( \{ x_\alpha, w_\gamma \} \), i.e. each lifted loop bond contributes two to the multiplicity of incidences with a side while each lifted non-loop bond contributes one to the multiplicity of incidences with a side.

**Definition 24.** A junction side is a most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of two attached, indirectly related sides.

**Definition 25.** A lifted label \( \rho \) of a labeled segment \( x \) is trivial if \( l(x) = \rho \), else it is non-trivial. For a history graph \( G \), a lifted bond \( e = \{ A(y_\alpha), A(z_\beta) \} \) is trivial if \( e \in E_G \) and there exists no unattached junction side that is the ancestor of \( y_\alpha \) and descendant of \( A(y_\alpha) \), or the ancestor of \( z_\beta \) and descendant of \( A(z_\beta) \), else \( e \) is non-trivial. For a segment or side \( x \) the non-trivial lifted labels or bonds, respectively, are \( L'_x = (L_x, N_x) \subseteq L'_x \), where \( L_x \) is the set of non-trivial lifted labels or bonds and \( L'_x \) is the multi-set of lifted labels and bonds that includes multiplicities.

See Figure 4(A) for examples of trivial and non-trivial labels and bonds.
Figure 4: (A) The lifted graph for the history graph in Figure 2(B). The blue and red lines represent, respectively, trivial and non-trivial lifted bonds. Similarly, the blue and red stars represent, respectively, trivial and non-trivial lifted labels. The free-roots are shown as a set of segments above the other segments, with a grey line identifying their matching branch-tree. (B) The module graph for (A). Lower case letters are used to identify the sides.
9 Ancestral Variation Graphs

We can now define a broad class of history graphs for which, we will demonstrate, cost can be computed in polynomial time. To do this we will define ambiguity, information that is missing but when added allows the tractable assessment of cost. There are two types of ambiguity.

Definition 26. The substitution ambiguity of a history graph \( G \) is \( u_s(G) = \sum_{x \in V_L(G)} \max(0, |\tilde{L}_x'| - 1) \), i.e. the total number of non-trivial lifted labels in excess of one per segment.

Substitution ambiguity reflects uncertainty about MRCA bases. The substitution ambiguity of the history graph in Figure 2(B) is 1, as there exists one segment with two non-trivial lifted labels.

Definition 27. The rearrangement ambiguity of a history graph \( G \) is \( u_r(G) = \sum_{x \in V_L(G)} \max(0, |\tilde{L}_x'| - 1) + \max(0, |\tilde{L}_x'| - 1) \), i.e. the total number of non-trivial lifted bonds in excess of one per side.

Rearrangement ambiguity reflects uncertainty about MRCA bonds. The rearrangement ambiguity of the history graph in Figure 2(B) is 5.

Definition 28. The ambiguity of a history graph \( G \) is \( u(G) = u_s(G) + u_r(G) \).

An ancestral variation graph (AVG) \( H \) is a history graph such that \( u(H) = 0 \), i.e. an unambiguous history graph.

Lemma 5. Evolutionary histories are AVGs.

Proof. Easily verified. \( \square \)

While evolutionary histories are AVGs, so are many other history graphs that contain far less information, for example, Figure 3 shows an AVG extension of the history graph in Figure 2(B) that is not an evolutionary history.

10 Bounds on Cost

We provide trivially computable lower and upper bound cost functions for history graphs that are tight for AVGs.

Definition 29. For any pair of objects \( a \) and \( b \), \( \delta_{a,b} = 1 \) if \( a = b \), else 0. The lower bound substitution cost (LBSC) of a history graph \( G \) is \( s_l(G) = \sum_{x \in V_L(G)} \max(0, |\tilde{L}_x| - \delta_{l(x), \emptyset}) \), i.e. the total number of distinct nontrivial lifted labels at all segments, less one for each unlabeled segment with a lifted label (necessarily a free root).

Definition 30. The upper bound substitution cost (UBSC) of a history graph \( G \) is \( s_u(G) = \sum_{x \in V_L(G)} \left( |\tilde{L}_x| - \delta_{l(x), \emptyset} \times \max_{\rho \in \tilde{L}_x} N_x(\rho) \right) \), i.e. the total number
of not necessarily distinct nontrivial lifted labels at all vertices, less the number of identical lifted labels of the most numerous type for each unlabeled segment (again, necessarily a free root).

The LBSC of the history graph in Figure 2(B) is 4 and its UBSC is 5. For the AVG in Figure 5, LBSC = UBSC = 4.

Definition 31. The *module graph* of a history graph $G$ is a multi-graph in which the vertices are the sides of segments in $L(G)$ that have incident bonds or lifted bonds, and the edges are the bonds and lifted bonds in $L(G)$ incident with these sides. Each connected component in a module graph is called a *module*. The set of modules in the module graph for $G$ is denoted $M(G)$.

Figure 4(B) shows the modules for Figure 4(A). It is easily verified that for a history graph that is an epoch, this definition is consistent with our earlier definition.

Definition 32. The *lower bound rearrangement cost* (LBRC) for a history graph $G$ is $r_l(G) = \sum_{M \in M(G)} \left( \left\lceil \frac{|V_M|}{2} \right\rceil - 1 \right)$, i.e. the Yancopoulos cost of its module graph.

Definition 33. The *upper bound rearrangement cost* (UBRC) of a history graph $G$ is $r_u(G) = \sum_{M \in M(G)} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x, \alpha \in V_M} |\bar{L}'_{x, \alpha}| - \prod_{x, \alpha \in V_M} \delta_{1,|\bar{L}'_{x, \alpha}|} \right)$, i.e. the total number of non-trivial lifted bonds in $L(G)$ minus the number of modules in $M(G)$ in which every side has exactly one incident non-trivial lifted edge.

The LBRC of the history graph in Figure 2(B) is 3 and its UBRC is 6. For the AVG in Figure 5, LBRC = UBRC = 3.
Theorem 1. For any history graph $G$ and any cost function $c$, $c(s_l(G), r_l(G)) \leq C(G, c) \leq c(s_u(G), r_u(G))$ with equality if $G$ is an AVG.

Proof. See Supplementary Appendix A.

Theorem 1 demonstrates that LBSC and LBRC are lower bounds on cost, UBSC and UCRC are upper bounds on cost, and that all these bounds become tight at the point of zero ambiguity. This implies that to assess cost of an arbitrary history graph $G$ we need only search for extensions of $G$ to the point that they have zero ambiguity, therefore avoiding the need to generate a larger number of potentially much larger evolutionary history extensions. For an AVG $H$, as the lower and upper bounds on cost are equivalent, we write $r(H) = r_l(H) = r_u(H)$ and $s(H) = s_l(H) = s_u(H)$.

11 $G$-Optimal AVGs

We now work towards sampling AVG extensions of any given history graph $G$ in order to assess cost and explore the set of most parsimonious interpretations of $G$, firstly by defining the notion of $G$-optimal AVGs. In what follows, we assume $G$ is a history graph that is not an AVG, else, by Theorem 1, it is trivial to assess its cost.

Definition 34. For $G \preceq H$, $H$ is $G$-parsimonious w.r.t a cost function $c$ if it is an AVG and $C(G, c) = c(s(H), r(H))$.

The set of $G$-parsimonious AVGs is too big to explore directly because it is always infinite, i.e. any AVG can be extended in infinitely many ways by adding extraneous material without increasing substitution or rearrangement costs. To avoid the redundant sampling of AVG extensions of $G$ and their own extensions we define the notion of minimality.

Definition 35. For $G \preceq H$, $H$ is $G$-minimal if it is an AVG and there does not exist an AVG $H'$ such that $G \prec H' \prec H$.

The set of $G$-minimal AVGs contains those AVGs that can not be reduced without either ceasing to be AVGs or extensions of $G$.

Definition 36. An AVG is $G$-optimal w.r.t a cost function $c$ if it is both $G$-parsimonious w.r.t to $c$ and $G$-minimal.

By definition, any $G$-parsimonious AVG is either $G$-minimal or has a $G$-minimal reduction, therefore we can implicitly represent and explore the set of most parsimonious interpretations of $G$ by sampling $G$-optimal. Unfortunately, because the history graph cost problem is NP-hard, it is unlikely that there is an efficient way to sample only $G$-optimal. Instead, we must construct a finite bounding set that contains $G$-optimal that can be efficiently searched. It is especially convenient if the same bounding set works for all monotone cost functions. We construct such a bounding set now.
12 G-Bounded History Graphs

Definition 37. A label of a segment $x$ is a junction if $|L'_x| > 1$, i.e. $x$ has more than one lifted label, else it is a bridge if $|L'_x| = 1$, $l(A(x)) = l(x)$ and $\tilde{L}_{A(x)} \neq \{\}$, i.e. $x$ has one lifted label, its lifted label is non-trivial, the most recent labeled ancestor of $x$ is labeled the same as $x$ and this ancestor has at least one non-trivial lifted label (see Figure 6(A,B)).

Definition 38. A bond $\{x_{\alpha}, y_{\beta}\}$ is a junction if either $x_{\alpha}$ or $y_{\beta}$ are junction sides, i.e. it is the MRCA of two attached, indirectly related sides, else it is a bridge if $|L'_x| \leq 1$, $|L'_y| \leq 1$, $\tilde{L}'_{A(x)} \cup \tilde{L}'_{A(y)} \neq \{\}$, $\{A(x_{\alpha}), A(y_{\beta})\}$ is a trivial lifted bond, $\tilde{L}'_{A(x_{\alpha})} \cup \tilde{L}'_{A(y_{\beta})} \neq \{\}$, $\{A(x_{\alpha}), A(y_{\beta})\}$ is a trivial lifted bond, and $(\tilde{L}'_{A(x_{\alpha})} \cup \tilde{L}'_{A(y_{\beta})}) \{x_{\alpha}, y_{\beta}\} \geq 2$ and/or $(\tilde{L}'_{A(y_{\beta})} \cup \tilde{L}'_{A(x_{\alpha})}) \{x_{\alpha}, y_{\beta}\} \geq 2$, i.e. analogously with the definition of bridge for a label, with the added provision that its removal from the graph must leave the bond $\{A(x_{\alpha}), A(y_{\beta})\}$ a junction (see Figure 6(C,D)).

Definition 39. An element is non-minimal if it is a branch with a free-child or free-parent, an isolated segment, or label or bond that is not a junction or bridge.

Figure 6: (A) A junction label. (B) A bridge label. (C) A junction bond. (D) A bridge bond. (E) An example of a pair of ping-pong bonds. The named elements are outlined in red.

Definition 40. For $G \subsetneq G'$, an element in $G'$ is $G$-reducible if there exists a reduction operation in a reduction sequence from $G'$ to $G$ that either deletes the element if it is a bond, label or segment or contracts it if it is a branch.

Definition 41. For $G \subsetneq G'$, the $G$-unbridged graph of $G'$ is the reduction resulting from the deletion of all $G$-reducible bridge bonds in $G'$.

Definition 42. The endpoint $y_{\beta}$ of a bond such that $y_{\beta}$ has no attached descendants, i.e. so that $L'_{y_{\beta}} = \{\}$, is hanging. A pair of hanging bonds $e$ and $e'$ such that $e$ has an endpoint whose most recent attached ancestor is incident with $e'$, form a pair of ping-pong bonds. We call $e$ the ping bond and $e'$ the pong bond (Figure 6(E)).

Definition 43. For $G \subsetneq G'$, $G'$ is $G$-bounded if it does not contain a $G$-reducible non-minimal element and its $G$-unbridged graph does not contain a $G$-reducible ping bond.
Theorem 2. The $G$-bounded AVGs contain the $G$-optimal AVGs for every cost function.

Proof. See Supplementary Appendix B.

Importantly, the following theorem demonstrates that there is a constant $k$ such that any $G$-bounded history graph is at most $k$ times the cardinality of $G$.

Theorem 3. A $G$-bounded history graph contains less than or equal to $\max(0, 10n - 8)$ $G$-reducible bonds and $\max(0, 2m - 2, 20n - 16, 20n + 2m - 18)$ additional segments, where $n$ is the number of bonds in $G$ and $m$ is the number of labeled segments in $G$. This bound is tight for all values of $n$ and $m$.

The graphs in $G$-bounded are therefore only exponential, not infinite, in number.

Proof. See Supplementary Appendix C.

13 The $G$-bounded Poset

We now define an ordering between $G$-bounded history graphs, by defining a characteristic set of operations that allow navigation between them.

Definition 44. For a segment $x$ in a $G$-bounded history graph, the composite minimisation of $x$ is as follows:

- If $x$ is unattached and unlabeled and has a $G$-reducible parent branch, the contraction of the parent branch.
- If $x$ is then an unattached, unlabeled root and has a single $G$-reducible child branch, the contraction of the child branch.
- The deletion of $x$ if subsequently isolated, unlabeled and $G$-reducible.

Definition 45. In a $G$-bounded extension, for a $G$-reducible label of a segment $x$, a label detachment is the deletion of the label of $x$ and then composite minimisation of $x$ (Figure 7(A-C)).

Definition 46. In a $G$-bounded extension, for a $G$-reducible bond $\{x_\alpha, y_\beta\}$, a bond detachment is the deletion of $\{x_\alpha, y_\beta\}$ and then composite minimisation of $x$ and $y$ (Figure 7(D-F)).

Definition 47. In a $G$-bounded extension, for a pair of $G$-reducible junction bonds $\{x_\alpha, y_\beta\}$ and $\{w_\alpha, z_\beta\}$, such that $w_\alpha = A(x_\alpha)$ and $z_\beta = A(y_\beta)$ a lateral-bond detachment is the bond detachment of both $\{x_\alpha, y_\beta\}$ and $\{w_\alpha, z_\beta\}$ and subsequent bond attachment creating $\{v_\gamma, x_\alpha\}$, where $v$ is newly created or an existing segment whose side $z_\gamma$ was previously unattached (Figure 7(D-E)).
Definition 48. A *G*-bounded reduction operation on a *G*-bounded history graph is a label/bond/lateral-bond detachment operation that results in a *G*-bounded history graph. As with reduction operations, the inverse of an *G*-bounded reduction operation is a *G*-bounded extension operation.

Definition 49. A *G*-bounded history graph *G′* is a *G*-bounded reduction (resp. extension) of another *G*-bounded history graph *G′′* if *G′* is isomorphic to a graph that can be obtained from *G′′* by a sequence of *G*-bounded reduction (resp. extension) operations.

Lemma 6. The *G*-bounded reduction relation is a partial order.

*Proof.* Easily verified. □

Definition 50. The *G*-bounded poset is the set of *G*-bounded history graphs with the *G*-bounded reduction relation. We write ≺ to denote the *G*-bounded reduction relation and ·≈G to denote its covering relation (transitive reduction).

We characterise the *G*-bounded poset in the following theorem.

Theorem 4. The *G*-bounded poset is finite, has a single least element *G*, its set of maximal elements are AVGs, and if and only if there exists a *G*-bounded reduction operation to transform *G′′* into *G′* then *G′* ≺ ·≈G *G′′*.

*Proof.* See Supplementary Appendix D. □

As the *G*-bounded poset is finite, it can be represented by a Hasse diagram whose nodes are the *G*-bounded history graphs and whose edges, which are the covering relation, represent equivalence classes of *G*-bounded operations. Figure 8 shows a simple *G*-bounded poset Hasse diagram.
14 A Basic Implementation

The previous four theorems establish the mechanics of everything we need to sample, crudely, in finite time the set of $G$-optimal AVGs, and thus, amongst other things, determine the cost of a history graph. Although it will require considerable further work to establish practical, efficient sampling algorithms, we have implemented a simple graph library in Python that for an input history graph $G$ can sample $G$-bounded AVGs (https://github.com/dzerbino/pyAVG) by generating sequences of $G$-bounded extension operations.

To test the library we used simulations. For each simulation we first generated an evolutionary history $H$ by forward simulation, starting from a genome with 5 segments in a single thread and simulating through 4 epochs in which either whole chromosome replication or rearrangements occurred and substitutions were made at a constant rate at each branch. The alphabet of labels in the simulation had cardinality four, i.e. as in the case with single base labels. To ensure we considered interesting histories we considered only those with both substitutions and rearrangements that had been through at least two epochs of replication.

To create a reduction $G$ of $H$ we removed from $H$ all labels of internal segments and bonds connecting internal segments and then contracted the parent branch of all internal segments, so that the beginning history contained only the leaf threads and branch trees that, containing no internal segments, simply represented the homologies between the segments. To represent further potential uncertainty about the leaf threads we then randomly removed, on average, 10% of the bonds, labels and segments from these threads. From $G$ we then sampled
G-bounded AVGs, each created by iteratively sampling G-bounded extension operations starting from G, picking each G-bounded extension operation in the sequence at random from those possible. Figure 9 shows the upper and lower bound rearrangement cost of members of the sequences of G-bounded extensions, until we reached zero ambiguity, for each of 2,000 starts. We observe that the most parsimonious AVGs sampled involve relatively few extension operations, while the least parsimonious generally have more.

To investigate a more efficient search strategy, in a subsequent experiment we restarted the search if we reached an extension with a higher total sum of lower bound substitution and rearrangement costs than $s_u(G) + r_u(G)$, initially, and then subsequently the sum of the substitution and rearrangement costs of the the best AVG found up to that point. We sampled 20,000 starts/restarts for each of 20 randomly sampled pairs $(H, G)$. For each graph $G$, we recorded the substitution and rearrangement costs $s(H)$ and $r(H)$ of the evolutionary history from which $G$ is derived, the ambiguity, lower cost bound, and upper cost bound for substitutions in $G$ ($s_u(G), s_l(G), s_u(G)$, resp.), as well as for rearrangements ($u_r(G), r_l(G), r_u(G)$, resp.), along with the minimum and maximum substitution (and rearrangement) costs for the G-bounded AVG extensions found by sampling, denoted $s(H_{smin}), s(H_{smax}),$ and $r(H_{rmin}), r(H_{rmax})$, resp. Tables 1 and 2 show the results of these 20 sampling runs. For these simulations $r(H_{rmin})$ is often close or equal to $r_l(G)$, while $r(H_{rmax})$ is generally slightly greater than $r_u(G)$. Notably, we found that AVG extensions sometimes had lower cost than the original evolutionary history, this occurring because of the information loss that resulted from reducing $H$ to $G$. Figure 10 shows one example of $H$, $G$ and a sampled AVG that is an example of $H_{rmin}$ and $H_{smin}$ such that $r(H) = r_l(G) = r(H_{rmin}) = 2$ (i.e. a minimum possible rearrangement cost extension), and $s(H) = 3$ but $s_l(G) = s(H_{rmin}) = 1$ (i.e. also a minimum possible substitution cost extension, and with lower substitution cost than the original history). The G-bounded extension sequence from $G$ to this AVG involved the creation of just 7 bonds, 5 segments and 7 labels.

Repeating these experiments with histories that started with 10 root segments in the evolutionary history, but which were otherwise simulated identically, demonstrates that the naive random search procedure implemented here fails to find reasonable histories within a set of only 20,000 random samples (data not shown), so, as might be expected, more intelligent sampling strategies will be needed to find parsimonious interpretations of even moderately complex datasets.

15 Discussion

We have introduced a general parsimony model for genome evolution, though not without some seemingly arbitrary choices with respect to the particular reduction relation and the definition of the set G-bounded. In this discussion we highlight the reasons for our choice of reduction relation, how reduction relates to other orderings over graphs, and how we can easily approximate a
Figure 9: Top main panel: The UBRC vs. the number of $G$-bounded extension operations performed for sampled $G$-bounded extensions. Bottom main panel: As top, but showing LBRC instead of UBRC. The contour lines show the number of extensions. The two labeled red paths show the cost bounds for individual extension sequences, one which results in a minimum rearrangement cost extension, and one which results in a maximum amongst those sampled rearrangement cost extension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>exp.</th>
<th>$s(H)$</th>
<th>$u_s(G)$</th>
<th>$s_l(G)$</th>
<th>$s_u(G)$</th>
<th>$s(H_{smin})$</th>
<th>$s(H_{smax})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Results for substitution ambiguity and cost. Each row represents a separate initial evolutionary history.
Figure 10: History graphs each shown with the addition of free roots and non-trivial lifted bonds. (A) $H$, (B) $G$, (C) An example of $H_{\text{rmin}}$ and $H_{\text{smin}}$. Example corresponds to experiment 1 in Tables 1 and 2. Segments are represented as circles, bonds as black arcs, with sides indicated by the orientations of the arrow heads at the ends of the arcs, branches are the dotted arrows, the colour depending on if their most recent labeled descendant generates a trivial or non-trivial lifted label. Non-trivial lifted bonds are shown in red. The free roots are shown as grey circles. Colours are used as labels.
Table 2: Follows format of Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>exp.</th>
<th>$r(H)$</th>
<th>$u_r(G)$</th>
<th>$r_1(G)$</th>
<th>$r_u(G)$</th>
<th>$r(H_{r_{\text{min}}})$</th>
<th>$r(H_{r_{\text{max}}})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

set of $G$-reducible elements, something critical to the sampling of $G$-bounded extensions of a given graph. We then briefly discuss the possibilities of yet more compact graphical representations.

In the reduction relation, we allow the deletion of segments, segment labels and bonds, but we forbid branch deletion. This is because in the opposite direction, used as an extension, it would allow the invention of homology between segments (see Figure 11(A)). Unlike branches, we forbid the contraction of bonds because in the opposite direction it would allow interstitial segments to be created without any rearrangements (see Figure 11(B)).

We disallow the non-trivial contraction of the incoming branch of attached and labeled segments, with the one exception for branches with free-parents, because it would allow previously separate threads to merge in a reduction (see Figure 11(C)), and because segments could be reduced to become ancestors of originally indirectly related segments (see Figure 11(D)). We allow the one exception for the contraction of the incoming branch of attached or labeled segments when the branch has a free-parent because disallowing it would forbid reductions that removed information from root segments (see Figure 11(E)) and allowing it does not permit the issues highlighted in Figures 11(C-D).

It is informative to consider the relationship between reduction operations and the reduction relation. When a graph contains multiple copies of isomorphic structures, distinct reduction operations can result in isomorphic reductions (see
Figure 11(F-I)), therefore each possible reduction in the covering set (transitive reduction) of the reduction relation represents an equivalence class of reduction operations.

**Definition 51.** A valid permutation of a reduction sequence is a permutation in which all operations remain reduction operations when performed in sequence.

Clearly not all permutations of a reduction sequence have this property, however the following lemma illustrates the relationship between valid permutations.

**Lemma 7.** All valid permutations of a reduction sequence create isomorphic reductions.

**Proof.** Easily verified.

Reduction is somewhat analogous to a restricted form of the graph minor. Importantly, the graph minor is a well-quasi-ordering (WQO) (Bienstock and [Langston 1994]), i.e. in any infinite set of graphs there exists a pair such that one is the minor of the other.

**Lemma 8.** Reduction is not a WQO.

**Proof.** Consider the infinite set of cyclic threads, they are not reductions of one another.

An ordering is a WQO if and only if every set has a finite subset of minimal elements. In contrast, it can be shown that for the reduction relation, even the set of AVG extensions of a single base history $G$ can have an infinite set of minimal elements.

**Lemma 9.** There exists a history graph $G$ with an infinite number of $G$-minimal extensions.

**Proof.** See Supplementary Appendix E.

One barrier to exploring the $G$-bounded poset is deciding for a pair of history graphs $G$ and $G'$ such that $G \preceq G'$ if an element is $G$-reducible. This problem is of unknown complexity, and may well be NP-hard. To avoid the potential complexity of this problem we can define an alternative notion of reducibility.

**Definition 52.** A fix for $(G, G')$, where $G \preceq G'$, is a history subgraph of $(V_{G'}, E_{G'}, B_{G'}^+)$ isomorphic to $G$, where $B_{G'}^+$ is the transitive closure of $B_{G'}$.

Starting from an input history graph $G$ and a fix isomorphic to it, we can easily update the fix as we create extensions of $G$. For an extension of $G$, elements in the fix become the equivalent of $G$-irreducible, while elements not in the fix become the equivalent of $G$-reducible. From a starting graph we can therefore explore a completely analogous version of $G$-bounded, replacing the question of $G$-reducibility with membership of the fix.
Following from Lemma 7 there is a bijection between the set of fixes for $G \preceq G'$ and the set of equivalence classes of reduction sequences that are all valid permutations of each other. This is the limitation of considering membership of a fix instead of assessing if an element is $G$-reducible, it limits us to considering only a single equivalence class of reduction sequences in exploring the analogous poset to $G$-bounded.

It is in general possible to reduce the size of the set $G$-bounded while still maintaining the properties that it can be efficiently sampled and contains $G$-optimal. However, this is likely to be at the expense of making the definition of $G$-bounded more complex. One approach is to add further “forbidden configurations” to the definition of $G$-bounded, like the $G$-reducible pings bonds that are forbidden in the current definition of $G$-bounded. Forbidding these was essential to making $G$-bounded finite, but we might consider also forbidding other configurations just to make $G$-bounded smaller.

Finally, it is possible to consider a graph representation of histories that use fewer segment nodes if we are willing to allow for the possibility that a subrange of the sequence of a segment be ancestral to a subrange of the sequence of another segment. This is a common approach in ancestral recombination graphs (Song and Hein [2005]). Such a representation entails the additional complexity of needing to specify the sequence subranges for every branch, but may in some applications be a worthwhile trade off for reducing the number of segments in the graph. The theory of such graphs is mathematically equivalent to the theory of the history graphs presented here, but the implementation would differ.
16 Conclusion

We have introduced a graph-based parsimony model in which a set of chromosomes evolves via the processes of whole chromosome replication, gain and loss, substitution and DCJ rearrangements. We have demonstrated upper and lower bounds on parsimony cost that are trivial to compute. Though these cost bounding functions are relatively simple and can almost certainly be tightened for many cases, importantly, despite their simplicity and the underlying intractability of the problem, they become tight for AVGs. This implies that we only need to reach AVG extensions to assess cost when sampling extensions.

This is the first, to our knowledge, fully general parsimony model of chromosome evolution to be proposed. However, it is still limited in that it costs rearrangements and substitutions as crude sums over inferred events, and costs all rearrangements including recombinations as a function of the number of inferred breakends. In the future we therefore anticipate extensions that incorporate more complex cost functions, as well as models that use a probabilistic framework in place of a parsimony framework.

The constructive definition of the $G$-bounded poset, coupled with the upper and lower bound functions, provides a path towards simple branch and bound based sampling algorithms for exploring low-cost genome histories. Again, this is the first description of such an ordering over genome histories, and though more complex sampling strategies than those introduced here will likely need to be built upon the $G$-bounded poset, this should facilitate the practical exploration of the space of optimal and near optimal genome histories in this general model.

In related work we consider the problem of sampling genome histories when the input genomes are also potentially unphased [Zerbino et al.], as is typical with current generation sequencing data, using a linear algebra framework that is a natural fit to describe mixtures of possible genomes and evolutionary operations upon them. In the graph model of this paper, this is somewhat analogous to moving from requiring segments to be part of threads to being part of more general sequence graphs in which there is balance in the number of incidences with the two sides of each segment. This simplifies aspects of the problem while complicating other aspects, simplifying it in that homologous recombination operations turn out to be invisible, but complicating it in requiring more complex accounting of underlying possible histories.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dent Earl for his help with figures and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Dr. and Mrs. Gordon Ringold, NIH grant 2U41 HG002371-13 and NHGRI/NIH grant 5U01HG004695 for providing funding.
References


D. R. Zerbino, B. Paten, G. Hickey, and D. Haussler. An algebraic framework to sample the rearrangement histories of a cancer metagenome with double cut and join, duplication and deletion events. *submitted*. 