Colloquium on Networks and Evolution - 2020-09-15 Sorbonne Université (Paris)

Phylogenetic networks: how advanced are the methods?

Philippe Gambette





Outline

- A quick introduction to phylogenetic networks
- Advances in phylogenetic networks:
 - simplifying models
 - knowing the network space
 - finding new techniques
 - using powerful tools
 - putting everything together!

Phylogenetic networks: generalizing phylogenetic trees

Phylogenetic networks: generalizing phylogenetic trees

Phylogenetic tree of a set of species:

- Classify them depending on common characters
 → classification
- Describe their evolution



Lamarck: *Histoire naturelle des animaux sans vertèbres* (1815)

Phylogenetic networks: generalizing phylogenetic trees

Phylogenetic tree of a set of species:

- Classify them depending on common characters
- Describe their evolution
 → modelization



Woese, Kandler, Wheelis: Towards a natural system of organisms: proposal for the domains Archaea, Bacteria, and Eucarya, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 87(12), 4576–4579 (1990)

Abstract and explicit phylogenetic networks

Phylogenetic network: network representing evolution data

• abstract / data-display phylogenetic networks: to classify, visualize data



minimum spanning network



Abstract and explicit phylogenetic networks

Phylogenetic network: network representing evolution data

• explicit phylogenetic networks: to model evolution



Abstract and explicit phylogenetic networks

Phylogenetic network: network representing evolution data

• **explicit** phylogenetic networks: to **model evolution**



reticulations: nodes with >1 parent, modeling hybridization, recombination, lateral gene transfer, etc.

Explicit phylogenetic networks



Quite hard.

Quite hard. Harder than reconstructing trees.

Quite hard. Harder than reconstructing trees. Often **NP-hard**.

Quite hard. Harder than reconstructing trees. Often **NP-hard**.

In practice:

« 9.1 Limitations

The biggest limitation of methods to infer introgression and hybridization, including species network methods, is **scalability**.

Methods which infer a species network directly from multilocus sequences have only been used with a handful of taxa, and less than 200 loci. »

R. A. Leo Elworth, Huw A. Ogilvie, Jiafan Zhu and Luay Nakhleh. Advances in Computational Methods for Phylogenetic Networks in the Presence of Hybridization. In Tandy Warnow (editor), *Bioinformatics and Phylogenetics. Seminal Contributions of Bernard Moret*, Vol. 29 of *Computational Biology*, 2019

So, what should we do?

So, what should we do? What has been done?



The "hybridization network" problem (ignore duplication, loss, ILS, etc.):

given 2 trees, find the smallest network **containing** both of them with the minimum number of reticulations

The "hybridization network" problem (ignore duplication, loss, ILS, etc.):

given 2 trees, find the smallest network containing both of them with the minimum number of reticulations

Easy to find a network containing the two trees!







The "hybridization network" problem (ignore duplication, loss, ILS, etc.):

given 2 trees, find the smallest network containing both of them with the minimum number of reticulations

Easy to find a network containing the two trees!

But *n* hybrid vertices for trees with *n* leaves: **not optimal!**





add a root above the two trees, glue the leaves together



The "hybridization network" problem (ignore duplication, loss, ILS, etc.):

given 2 trees, find the smallest network containing both of them with the minimum number of reticulations

NP-hard to minimize the number of reticulations Bordewich & Semple (2007) Discrete Appl Math

The "hybridization network" problem (ignore duplication, loss, ILS, etc.):

given 2 trees, find the smallest network containing both of them with the minimum number of reticulations

NP-hard to minimize the number of reticulations Bordewich & Semple (2007) Discrete Appl Math

Even checking a solution (Tree Containment Problem) is hard! Kanj, Nakhleh, Than & Xia (2008) Theoretical Computer Science

The Tree Containment Problem

Input: A binary phylogenetic network *N* and a tree *T* over the same set of taxa. **Question:** Does *N* display *T*?

 \rightarrow Can we remove one incoming arc, for each vertex with >1 parent in N, so that the obtained tree is equivalent to T (each arc in T is a path in N)?



The Tree Containment Problem

Input: A binary phylogenetic network *N* and a tree *T* over the same set of taxa. **Question:** Does *N* display *T*?

 \rightarrow Can we remove **one incoming arc**, for each vertex with >1 parent in *N*, so that the obtained tree is equivalent to *T* (each arc in *T* is a path in *N*)?



The Tree Containment Problem

w

tree containment

6 6 5 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2020 1990 1995 2000 2005 2010 2015

Tushar Agarwal, Philippe Gambette & David Morrison (2016), Who is Who in Phylogenetic Networks: Articles, Authors and Programs, arXiv

http://phylnet.univ-mlv.fr/publications.php

Subclasses of phylogenetic networks



The class of binary nearly stable networks contains the class of binary tree-child networds:

every binary tree-child network is a binary nearly stable network

Subclasses of phylogenetic networks













Bounding the size of phylogenetic networks

How many nodes can a network on *n* leaves have?

- \rightarrow unbounded for general networks
- \rightarrow for nearly-stable networks:
- 26*n*-24

Philippe Gambette, Andreas Gunawan, Anthony Labarre, Stéphane Vialette and Louxin Zhang. Locating a Tree in A Phylogenetic Network in Quadratic Time. *RECOMB 2015*

• 8*n*-7

Andreas Gunawan and Louxin Zhang. *Bounding the Size of a Network Defined By Visibility Property*. arXiv, 2015.

How big is the **search space**?

 \rightarrow analytic combinatorics techniques to count the number of networks in some subclasses

n	g_{n-1}	r_n	u_{n-1}	ℓ_n
1	0	1	0	1
2	1	3	1	18
3	2	36	6	1 143
4	15	723	135	120 078
5	192	20 280	$5\ 052$	17 643 570
6	3 450	730 755	$264 \ 270$	$3 \ 332 \ 111 \ 850$
as $n \to \infty$	$c_1 \approx 0.20748$	$c_1 \approx 0.1339$	$c_1 \approx 0.07695$	$c_1 \approx 0.02931$
$x_n \sim c_1 c_2^n n^{n-1}$ with	$c_2 \approx 1.89004$	$c_2 \approx 2.943$	$c_2 \approx 5.4925$	$c_2 \approx 15.4333$
OEIS reference	A328121	A328122	A333005	A333006

Mathilde Bouvel, Philippe Gambette & Marefatollah Mansouri, Counting Phylogenetic Networks of Level 1 and 2, accepted to *JOMB*

How big is the **search space**?

 \rightarrow analytic combinatorics techniques to count the number of networks in some subclasses

$$\begin{split} \phi(z)^n &= \sum_{i \ge 0} \sum_{k=0}^i \sum_{p=0}^k \sum_{q=0}^p \sum_{s=0}^q \times \binom{n+i-1}{i} \binom{i}{k} \binom{k}{p} \binom{p}{q} \binom{q}{s} \left(\frac{12z}{4(1-z)^4}\right)^{i-k} \left(\frac{-30z^2}{4(1-z)^4}\right)^{k-p} \\ &\left(\frac{32z^3}{4(1-z)^4}\right)^{p-q} \left(\frac{-16z^4}{4(1-z)^4}\right)^{q-s} \left(\frac{3z^5}{4(1-z)^4}\right)^s \\ &= \sum_{i \ge 0} \sum_{k=0}^i \sum_{p=0}^k \sum_{q=0}^p \sum_{s=0}^q \binom{n+i-1}{i} \binom{i}{k} \binom{k}{p} \binom{p}{q} \binom{q}{s} \frac{(3)^i (\frac{-15}{6})^k (\frac{-16}{15})^p (\frac{-1}{2})^q (\frac{-3}{16})^s}{(1-z)^{4i}} \\ &\times z^{i+k+p+q+s}. \end{split}$$

Mathilde Bouvel, Philippe Gambette & Marefatollah Mansouri, Counting Phylogenetic Networks of Level 1 and 2, accepted to *JOMB*

How big is the **search space**?

 \rightarrow analytic combinatorics techniques to count the number of networks in some subclasses



How big is the **search space**?

 \rightarrow analytic combinatorics techniques to count the number of networks in some subclasses

The next step: random generation of phylogenetic networks?



-

Local moves

How to explore the search space?

\rightarrow NNI moves

Katharina Huber, Vincent Moulton and Taoyang Wu. Transforming phylogenetic networks: Moving beyond tree space. *JTB* 404:30-39, 2016.

Philippe Gambette, Leo van Iersel, Mark Jones, Manuel Lafond, Fabio Pardi and Celine Scornavacca. Rearrangement Moves on Rooted Phylogenetic Networks. *PLoS Computational Biology* 13(8): e1005611.1-21, 2017.



Local moves

How to explore the search space?

\rightarrow NNI moves, SPR moves

Katharina Huber, Vincent Moulton and Taoyang Wu. Transforming phylogenetic networks: Moving beyond tree space. *JTB* 404:30-39, 2016.

Philippe Gambette, Leo van Iersel, Mark Jones, Manuel Lafond, Fabio Pardi and Celine Scornavacca. Rearrangement Moves on Rooted Phylogenetic Networks. *PLoS Computational Biology* 13(8): e1005611.1-21, 2017.

Magnus Bordewich, Simone Linz and Charles Semple. Lost in space? Generalising subtree prune and regraft to spaces of phylogenetic networks. *JTB* 423:1-12, 2017







New techniques developed for phylogenetic networks

 agreement forests: to compute the SPR distance between trees and to solve the hybridization problem between 2 trees



New techniques developed for phylogenetic networks

- agreement forests: to compute the SPR distance between trees and to solve the hybridization problem between 2 trees
- cherry picking: to solve the hybridization problem between > 2 trees





New techniques developed for phylogenetic networks

- agreement forests: to compute the SPR distance between trees and to solve the hybridization problem between 2 trees
- cherry picking: to solve the hybridization problem between > 2 trees
- network decompositions: to solve the tree containment problem on reticulation visible networks







Fixed parameter tractability (FPT algorithms)

- find an appropriate parameter k which is **small**: number of reticulations, level of the network, etc.
- look for an FPT algorithm in k: computation time in O(f(k)×poly(n))
 - computation time may be huge depending on k
 - the problem remains tractable when *n* (the number of taxa) increases

Laurent Bulteau & Mathias Weller, Parameterized Algorithms in Bioinformatics: An Overview, *Algorithms* 12(12):256, 2019



Visualization minimizing edge crossings

NP-hard horizontal-style



FPT algorithm snake-style



polynomial-time solvable! ear-style



Jonathan Klawitter & Peter Stumpf. Drawing Tree-Based Phylogenetic Networks with Minimum Number of Crossings. arXiv preprint, 2020

Use mathematical properties of abstract networks



Philippe Gambette, Vincent Berry & Christophe Paul: Quartets and Unrooted Phylogenetic Networks, *JBCB* 10(4):1250004, 2012

Philippe Gambette, Katharina Huber & Guillaume Scholz, Uprooted phylogenetic networks, *BMB*, 79(9):2022-204, 2017



Use solvers

• SAT, ILP (integer linear programming), CSP (constraint satisfaction problem), maximum clique solvers are available



- work in progress with Pierre Bourhis and Marion Tommasi:
 - \circ an ad hoc algorithm is faster most of the time
 - the time taken by the solver does not vary much: more efficient when the ad hoc algorithm takes too long



Put everything together

- requires some good engineering work: use multicore processors, parallel or distributed computing, etc.
- requires easy-to-use software:
 - cross-platform software: <u>SplitsTree</u> (1998), <u>Dendroscope</u> (2007),
 <u>PhyloSketch</u> (2020)
 - web applications: <u>T-REX online</u> (2012)
 - packages or pipeline bricks: R package <u>Phangorn</u> (2011), Julia package <u>PhyloNetworks</u> (2017)





phylnet.info