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Abstract. We study a long standing conjecture on the necessary and sufficient conditions for the compatibility of multi-state characters: There exists a function \( f(r) \) such that, for any set \( C \) of \( r \)-state characters, \( C \) is compatible if and only if every subset of \( f(r) \) characters of \( C \) is compatible. We show that for every \( r \geq 2 \), there exists an incompatible set \( C \) of \( \left\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{r}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \) \( r \)-state characters such that every proper subset of \( C \) is compatible. Thus, \( f(r) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{r}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \) for every \( r \geq 2 \). This improves the previous lower bound of \( f(r) \geq r \) given by Meacham (1983), and generalizes the construction showing that \( f(4) \geq 5 \) given by Habib and To (2011). We prove our result via a result on quartet compatibility that may be of independent interest: For every integer \( n \geq 4 \), there exists an incompatible set \( Q \) of \( \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \) quartets over \( n \) labels such that every proper subset of \( Q \) is compatible. We contrast this with a result on the compatibility of triplets: For every \( n \geq 3 \), if \( R \) is an incompatible set of more than \( n-1 \) triplets over \( n \) labels, then some proper subset of \( R \) is incompatible. We show this upper bound is tight by exhibiting, for every \( n \geq 3 \), a set of \( n-1 \) triplets over \( n \) taxa such that \( R \) is incompatible, but every proper subset of \( R \) is compatible.
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1 Introduction

The multi-state character compatibility (or perfect phylogeny) problem is a basic question in computational phylogenetics [18]. Given a set \( C \) of characters, we are asked whether there exists a phylogenetic tree that displays every character in \( C \); if so, \( C \) is said to be compatible, and incompatible otherwise. The problem is known to be NP-complete [3,21], but certain special cases are known to be polynomially-solvable [16,12,14,15,16,19]. See [8] for more on the perfect phylogeny problem.

In this paper we study a long standing conjecture on the necessary and sufficient conditions for the compatibility of multi-state characters.

* This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grants CCF-1017189 and DEB-0829674.
Conjecture 1 There exists a function \( f(r) \) such that, for any set \( C \) of \( r \)-state characters, \( C \) is compatible if and only if every subset of \( f(r) \) characters of \( C \) is compatible.

If Conjecture 1 is true, it would follow that we can determine if any set \( C \) of \( r \)-state characters is compatible by testing the compatibility of each subset of \( f(r) \) characters of \( C \), and, in case of incompatibility, output a subset of at most \( f(r) \) characters of \( C \) that is incompatible.

A classic result on binary character compatibility shows that \( f(2) = 2 \); see [5,12,17,18]. In 1975, Fitch [9,10] gave an example of a set \( C \) of three 3-state characters such that \( C \) is incompatible, but every pair of characters in \( C \) is compatible, showing that \( f(3) \geq 3 \). In 1983, Meacham [17] generalized this example to \( r \)-state characters for every \( r \geq 3 \), demonstrating a lower bound of \( f(r) \geq r \) for all \( r \); see also [16]. A recent breakthrough by Lam, Gusfield, and Sridhar [16] showed that \( f(3) = 3 \). While the previous results could lead one to conjecture that \( f(r) = r \) for all \( r \), Habib and To [13] recently disproved this possibility by exhibiting a set \( C \) of five 4-state characters such that \( C \) is incompatible, but every proper subset of the characters in \( C \) are compatible, showing that \( f(4) \geq 5 \). They conjectured that \( f(r) \geq r + 1 \) for every \( r \geq 4 \).

The main result of this paper is to prove the conjecture stated in [13] by giving a quadratic lower bound on \( f(r) \). Formally, we show that for every integer \( r \geq 2 \), there exists a set \( C \) of \( r \)-state characters such that all of the following conditions hold.

1. \( C \) is incompatible.
2. Every proper subset of \( C \) is compatible.
3. \(|C| = \left\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{r}{2} \right\rceil + 1\).

Therefore, \( f(r) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{r}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \) for every \( r \geq 2 \).

Our proof relies on a new result on quartet compatibility which we believe is of independent interest. We show that for every integer \( n \geq 4 \), there exists a set \( Q \) of quartets over a set of \( n \) labels such that all of the following conditions hold.

1. \( Q \) is incompatible.
2. Every proper subset of \( Q \) is compatible.
3. \(|Q| = \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rceil + 1\).

This represents an improvement over the previous lower bound on the maximum cardinality of such an incompatible set of quartets of \( n - 2 \) given in [21].

We contrast our result on quartet compatibility with a result on the compatibility of triplets: For every \( n \geq 3 \), if \( R \) is an incompatible set of triplets over \( n \) labels, and \(|R| > n - 1 \), then some proper subset of \( R \) is incompatible. We show this upper bound is tight by exhibiting, for every \( n \geq 3 \), a set of \( n - 1 \) triplets over \( n \) labels such that \( R \) is incompatible, but every proper subset of \( R \) is compatible. The results given here on the compatibility of triplets appear to have been previously known [20], but are formally proven here.
2 Preliminaries

Given a graph $G$, we represent the vertices and edges of $G$ by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ respectively. We use the abbreviated notation $uv$ for an edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$. For any $e \in E(G)$, $G - e$ represents the graph obtained from $G$ by deleting edge $e$. For any integer $i$, we use $[i]$ to represent the set $\{1, 2, \cdots, i\}$.

2.1 Unrooted Phylogenetic Trees

An unrooted phylogenetic tree (or just tree) is a tree $T$ whose leaves are in one to one correspondence with a label set $L(T)$, and has no vertex of degree two. See Fig. 1(a) for an example. For a collection $\mathcal{T}$ of trees, the label set of $\mathcal{T}$, denoted $L(\mathcal{T})$, is the union of the label sets of the trees in $\mathcal{T}$. A tree is binary if every internal (non-leaf) vertex has degree three. A quartet is a binary tree with exactly four leaves. A quartet with label set $\{a, b, c, d\}$ is denoted $ab|cd$ if the path between the leaves labeled $a$ and $b$ does not intersect with the path between the leaves labeled $c$ and $d$.

For a tree $T$, and a label set $L \subseteq L(T)$, the restriction of $T$ to $L$, denoted by $T\mid L$, is the tree obtained from the minimal subtree of $T$ connecting all the leaves with labels in $L$ by suppressing vertices of degree two. See Fig. 1(b) for an example. A tree $T$ displays another tree $T'$, if $T'$ can be obtained from $T\mid L(T')$ by contracting edges. A tree $T$ displays a collection of trees $\mathcal{T}$ if $T$ displays every tree in $\mathcal{T}$. If such a tree $T$ exists, then we say that $\mathcal{T}$ is compatible; otherwise, we say that $\mathcal{T}$ is incompatible. See Fig. 1(a) for an example. Determining if a collection of unrooted trees is compatible is NP-complete [21].

2.2 Multi-State Characters

There is also a notion of compatibility for sets of partitions of a label set $L$. A character $\chi$ on $L$ is a partition of $L$; the parts of $\chi$ are called states. If $\chi$ has at most $r$ parts, then $\chi$ is an $r$-state character. Given a tree $T$ with $L = L(T)$ and a state $s$ of $\chi$, we denote by $T_s(\chi)$ the minimal subtree of $T$ connecting all leaves

![Diagram](a) and (b)
with labels having state $s$ for $\chi$. We say that $\chi$ is convex on $T$, or equivalently $T$ displays $\chi$, if the subtrees $T_i(\chi)$ and $T_j(\chi)$ are vertex disjoint for all states $i$ and $j$ of $\chi$ where $i \neq j$. A collection $C$ of characters is compatible if there exists a tree $T$ on which every character in $C$ is convex. If no such tree exists, then we say that $C$ is incompatible. See Fig. 1(a) for an example. The perfect phylogeny problem (or character compatibility problem) is to determine whether a given set of characters is compatible.

There is a natural correspondence between quartet compatibility and character compatibility that we now describe. Let $Q$ be a set of quartets, $n = |L(Q)|$, and $r = n - 2$. For each $q = ab|cd \in Q$, we define the $r$-state character corresponding to $q$, denoted $\chi_q$, as the character where $a$ and $b$ have state 0 for $\chi_q$; $c$ and $d$ have state 1 for $\chi_q$; and, for each $\ell \in L(Q) \setminus \{a, b, c, d\}$, there is a state $s$ of $\chi_q$ such that $\ell$ is the only label with state $s$ for character $\chi_q$ (see Example 1).

We define the set of $r$-state characters corresponding to $Q$ by $C_Q = \bigcup_{q \in Q} \{\chi_q\}$.

Example 1. Consider the quartets and characters given in Fig. 1(a): $\chi_{q_1}$ is the character corresponding to $q_1$, $\chi_{q_2}$ is the character corresponding to $q_2$, and $\chi_{q_3}$ is the character corresponding to $q_3$.

The proof of the following lemma relating quartet compatibility to character compatibility is straightforward, and given in the appendix.

**Lemma 1.** A set $Q$ of quartets is compatible if and only if $C_Q$ is compatible.

### 2.3 Quartet Graphs

We now give a brief overview of quartet graphs which were introduced in [11], and characterize when a collection of quartets is compatible.

Let $Q$ be a collection of quartets with label set $L$. The quartet graph $G_Q$ on $Q$ is the edge-colored graph defined as follows.

1. There is a vertex $\ell$ in $G_Q$ for each $\ell \in L$.
2. For every quartet $q = ab|cd \in Q$, $G_Q$ has two edges $ab$ and $cd$, both labeled by $q$. We call an edge labeled by $q$ a $q$-colored edge.

![Quartet Graph](image)

**Fig. 2:** The quartet graph $G_Q$ for the set of quartets given in Fig. 1 is shown in (a). A complete unification sequence for $G_Q$ is shown in (a)–(d). In the figures, the unification of vertices $U$ to a new vertex $u$ is denoted $U \rightarrow u$. 
An example of a quartet graph is given in Fig. 2(a). Let $G$ be any edge colored graph. Let $U \subseteq V(G)$ such that for any color $c$, at most one $c$-colored edge is incident on the vertices of $U$. The unification of vertices $U$ in $G$ is the graph $G'$ obtained from $G$ as follows:

1. Add a new vertex $u$ to $G'$.
2. For each $c$-colored edge $vw$ in $G$ where $v \in U$ and $w \notin U$, add a $c$-colored edge $uw$ to $G'$.
3. For each $c$-colored edge $vw$ in $G$ where both $v \in U$ and $w \in U$, delete all $c$-colored edges from $G'$.
4. Delete all vertices in $U$, and edges incident to vertices in $U$, from $G'$.

See Figures 2 and 3 for examples of unification. A unification sequence for $G$ is a sequence $G_0 = G, G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k$ of graphs where, for any $i > 0$, $G_i$ is derived from $G_{i-1}$ by a unification operation. Note that every graph in a unification sequence that begins with a quartet graph is also a quartet graph. A unification sequence is complete if $G_k$ has no edges. See Fig. 2(a)-(d) for an example of a complete unification sequence. The following theorem is from [11].

**Theorem 1.** A collection $Q$ of quartets is compatible if and only if there exists a complete unification sequence for the quartet graph $G_Q$.

For a quartet graph $G$, we define the quartet set corresponding to $G$ as the set of quartets $Q_G = \{ab|cd : \text{there exists edges } ab \text{ and } cd \text{ of the same color in } G\}$.

### 3 Compatibility of Quartets

For every $s, t \geq 2$, we fix a set of labels $L_{s,t} = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_s, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_t\}$ and define the set $Q_{s,t} = \{a_1b_1|a_s,b_t\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{s-1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{t-1} \{a_i,a_{i+1}|b_j,b_{j+1}\}$ of quartets with label set $L_{s,t}$. We denote the quartet $a_1b_1|a_s,b_t$ by $q_0$, and a quartet of the form $a_i,a_{i+1}|b_j,b_{j+1}$ by $q_{i,j}$. See Fig. 3(a) for an illustration.

![a](a) The quartet graph for $Q_{4,3}$.

![b](b) $\{a_2,a_4\} \rightarrow u$

Fig. 3: The set of quartets $Q_{4,3}$. 
Observation 1 For all \( s, t \geq 2 \), \(|Q_{s,t}| = (s - 1)(t - 1) + 1\).

The proof of the next lemma is straightforward and given in the appendix.

Lemma 2. \( Q_{s,t} \) is compatible if and only if \( Q_{s_1,s} \) is compatible.

Lemma 3. For all \( s, t \geq 2 \), \( Q_{s,t} \) is incompatible.

Proof. We use induction on the size of \( s + t \).

**Base case:** Let \( s = 2, t = 2 \) and thus, \( s + t = 4 \). The set \( Q_{2,2} \) contains only the two incompatible quartets \( q_0 = a_1b_1a_2b_2 \) and \( q_1 = a_1b_1a_2b_2 \). Thus, \( Q_{2,2} \) is incompatible.

**Induction step:** Assume that for every \( s' \leq s \) and \( t' \leq t \), where \( s \geq 2, t \geq 2, s' \geq 2, t' \geq 2 \) and \( s + t \geq s' + t' + 1 \), we have that \( Q_{s',t'} \) is incompatible.

To prove that \( Q_{s,t} \) is incompatible, we will show that there is no complete unification sequence for the quartet graph \( G = G_{Q_{s,t}} \). For sake of contradiction, assume that there exists a complete unification sequence \( S \) for \( G \). Let \( U \) be the set of vertices unified in the first unification operation of \( S \).

For each \( i \in \{s\} \) and \( j \in \{t\} \), there exists edges of the same color incident on \( a_i \) and \( b_j \). Thus, if \( U \) contains a vertex \( a_i \), it cannot contain a vertex \( b_j \). Then, w.l.o.g., by Lemma 2, we may assume that \( U \) does not contain any vertex \( b_j \) for \( j \in \{t\} \). Also, since the quartet \( q_0 = a_1b_1|a_2b_2 \in Q_{s,t} \), it cannot be the case that \( U \) contains both \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \). W.l.o.g., we assume that \( U \) does not contain \( a_1 \).

Let \( a_x \) and \( a_y \) be the two vertices in \( U \) where \( x \) is the smallest index over all of the vertices in \( U \), and \( y \) is the largest index over all of the vertices in \( U \). Let \( G' \) be the graph resulting from the unification of the vertices of \( U \) in \( G \), and let \( u \) be the unique vertex in \( V(G') \setminus V(G) \). Note that all edges between \( a_{x-1} \) and \( a_x \) in \( G \) become edges between \( a_{x-1} \) and \( u \) in \( G' \), and all edges between \( a_y \) and \( a_{y-1} \) in \( G \) become edges between \( u \) and \( a_{y+1} \) in \( G' \). See Fig 3 for an illustration.

Let \( Q = Q_{G'} \). Since the unification sequence \( S = G', G', G_1, \ldots, G_k \) is complete, the sequence \( G', G_1, \ldots, G_k \) is also complete. Hence, the quartet set \( Q \) is compatible.

Let \( L = L(Q_{G'}) \). Consider the quartet set \( Q_{s-(y-x),t} \). Since \(|U| > 1\), and, by assumption, \( a_1 \notin U \), we have that \( 1 < x < y \leq s \). Also, by assumption, \( t \geq 2 \). Hence, \( Q_{s-(y-x),t} \) is well defined. Let \( h \) be an injective mapping from \( L_{s-(y-x),t} \) to \( L \) defined by

\[
h(\ell) = \begin{cases} a_i & \text{if } \ell \text{ is of the form } a_i \text{ where } 1 \leq i < x \\ u & \text{if } \ell \text{ is of the form } a_i \text{ where } i = x \\ a_i + y - x & \text{if } \ell \text{ is of the form } a_i \text{ where } x < i \leq s - y + x \\ b_i & \text{if } \ell \text{ is of the form } b_i \text{ where } 1 \leq i \leq t \end{cases}
\]

We will show that for every quartet \( q = \ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4 \in Q_{s-(y-x),t} \), there exists a quartet \( h(\ell_1)h(\ell_2)h(\ell_3)h(\ell_4) \in Q \). Since \( y > x, s - y + x + t < s + t \). By the inductive hypothesis, \( Q_{s-(y-x),t} \) is incompatible. It follows that \( Q \) contains an incompatible subset of quartets, contradicting that \( Q \) is compatible. We have the following cases.
Lemma 4. In every case, we present a tree witnessing that $h(\ell_1) = a_1, h(\ell_2) = b_1$, and $h(\ell_4) = b_4$. If $y = s$, then $h(\ell_3) = h(a_{s-y+x}) = h(a_x) = u$, and $a_1b_1|b_2 \in Q$. If $y < s$, then $h(\ell_3) = h(a_{s-y+x}) = a_{s-y+x+y-x} = a_s$, and $a_1b_1|a_2b_2 \in Q$.

Case 2: $q = q_{x,y}$ for some $1 \leq i < s - y + x$ and $1 \leq j < t$. Then $\ell_1 = a_1$ and $\ell_2 = a_{i+1}$, $\ell_3 = b_j$, and $\ell_4 = b_{j+1}$. So, $h(\ell_3) = b_j$, and $h(\ell_4) = b_{j+1}$. Note that since $i < s - y + x$, we have that if $i \geq x$, then $y < s$. Hence, we have the following four possibilities to consider.

Case 2a: $1 \leq i < x - 1$. Since both $i < x$ and $i + 1 < x$, $h(\ell_1) = a_i$, $h(\ell_2) = a_{i+1}$, and $a_ia_{i+1}|b_jb_{j+1} \in Q$.

Case 2b: $i = x - 1$. Then $h(\ell_1) = a_{x-1}$, $h(\ell_2) = u$, and $a_{x-1}u|b_jb_{j+1} \in Q$.

Case 2c: $i = x$ and $y < s$. Then, $h(\ell_1) = h(a_x) = u$, $h(\ell_2) = h(a_{x+y}) = a_{x+y-x} = a_{y+1}$, and $ua_{y+1}|b_jb_{j+1} \in Q$.

Case 2d: $i > x$ and $y < s$. Then $h(\ell_1) = h(a_{i+1}) = a_{i+y-x}$ and $h(\ell_2) = h(a_{i+1} + 1) = a_{i+y-x}$. Since $i > x$, it follows that both $i + y - x > y$ and $i + 1 + y - x > y$. Since $i < s - y + x$, it follows that both $i + y - x < s$ and $i + y - x + 1 < s$. Hence, $a_{i+y-x}a_{i+y-x}|b_jb_{j+1} \in Q$.

In every case, we have shown that $h(\ell_1)h(\ell_2)|h(\ell_3)h(\ell_4) \in Q$. \hfill \Box

Lemma 4. For all $s,t \geq 2$, and every $q \in Q_{s,t}$, $Q_{s,t} \setminus \{q\}$ is compatible.

Proof. Let $q \in Q_{s,t}$. Either $q = q_0$ or $q = q_{x,y}$ for some $1 \leq x < s$ and $1 \leq y < t$. In every case, we present a tree witnessing that $Q_{s,t} \setminus \{q\}$ is compatible.

Case 1. Suppose $q = q_0$. Create the tree $T$ as follows: There is a node for each label in $L_{s,t}$, and two additional nodes $a$ and $b$. There is an edge $ab$. For every $x \in L_{s,t}$ there is an edge $ax$. For every $b \in L_{s,t}$, there is an edge $bx$. There are no other nodes or edges in $T$. See Fig. 4(a) for an illustration of $T$. Consider any quartet $q \in Q_{s,t} \setminus \{q_0\}$. Then $q = a_ia_{i+1}|b_jb_{j+1}$ for some $1 \leq i < s$ and $1 \leq j < t$. Then, the minimal subgraph of $T$ connecting leaves with labels in $\{a_i, a_{i+1}, b_j, b_{j+1}\}$ is the quartet $q$.

Case 2. Suppose $q = q_{x,y}$ for some $1 \leq x < s$ and $1 \leq y < t$. Create the tree $T$ as follows: There is a node for each label in $L_{s,t}$, and six additional nodes $a_\ell, b_\ell, t, h, a_\ell h$, and $b_\ell h$. There are edges $a_\ell t$, $b_\ell t$, $h$, $a_\ell h$, and $b_\ell h$. For every $a_\ell \in L_{s,t}$, there is an edge $a_\ell a_\ell$ if $i < x$, and an edge $a_\ell a_\ell$ if $i > x$. For every $b_\ell \in L_{s,t}$, there is an edge $b_\ell b_\ell$ if $j < x$, and an edge $b_\ell b_\ell$ if $j > y$. There are no other nodes or edges in $T$. See Fig. 4(b). Now consider any quartet $q \in Q_{s,t} \setminus \{q_{x,y}\}$. Either $q = q_0$ or $q = q_{x,y}$ where $i \neq x$ or $j \neq y$. If $q = q_0$, then the minimal subgraph of $T$ connecting leaves with labels in $\{a_1, b_1, a_s, b_t\}$ is the subtree of $T$ induced by the nodes in $\{a_1, a_\ell, b_\ell, b_t, a_s, a_\ell h, b_\ell h, b_t\}$. 
Theorem 2. For every integer $n \geq 4$, there exists a set $Q$ of quartets over $n$ taxa such that all of the following conditions hold.

1. $Q$ is incompatible.
2. Every proper subset of $Q$ is compatible.
3. $|Q| = \left\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rceil \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor + 1$.

Proof. By letting $s = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor$ and $t = \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil$, it follows from Observation 1 and Lemmas 3 and 4 that $Q_{s,t}$ is of size $(\left\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \right\rfloor - 1) \cdot (\left\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \right\rfloor - 1) + 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rceil + 1$ and is incompatible, but every proper subset of $Q_{s,t}$ is compatible.

The following theorem allows us to use our result on quartet compatibility to establish a lower bound on $f(r)$.

Theorem 3. Let $Q$ be a set of incompatible quartets over $n$ labels such that every proper subset of $Q$ is compatible, and let $r = n - 2$. Then, there exists a set $C$ of $|Q|$ $r$-state characters such that $C$ is incompatible, but every proper subset of $C$ is compatible.
Proof. We claim that \( C_Q \) is such a set of incompatible \( r \)-state characters. Since for two quartets \( q_1, q_2 \in Q \), \( \chi_{q_1} \neq \chi_{q_2} \), it follows that \( |C_Q| = |Q| \). Since \( Q \) is incompatible, it follows by Lemma \( \text{III} \) that \( C_Q \) is incompatible. Let \( C' \) be any proper subset of \( C \). Then, there is a proper subset \( Q' \) of \( Q \) such that \( C' = C_{Q'} \). Then, since \( Q' \) is compatible, it follows by Lemma \( \text{III} \) that \( C' \) is compatible. \( \square \)

Theorem \( \text{IV} \) together with Theorem \( \text{III} \) gives the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.** For every integer \( r \geq 2 \), there exists a set \( C \) of \( r \)-state characters such that all of the following hold.

1. \( C \) is incompatible.
2. Every proper subset of \( C \) is compatible.
3. \( |C| = \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor \cdot \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 1 \).

**Proof.** By Theorem \( \text{IV} \) and Observation \( \text{I} \) there exists a set \( Q \) of \( \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor \cdot \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 1 \) quartets over \( r + 2 \) labels that are incompatible, but every proper subset is compatible, namely \( Q|_{\{a,b,c,d,e,f\}} \). The theorem follows from Theorem \( \text{IV} \). \( \square \)

The quadratic lower bound on \( f(r) \) follows from Theorem \( \text{IV} \).

**Corollary 1.** \( f(r) \geq \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor \cdot \lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 1 \).

## 4 Compatibility of Triplets

A **rooted phylogenetic tree** (or just **rooted tree**) is a tree whose leaves are in one to one correspondence with a label set \( L(T) \), has a distinguished vertex called the **root**, and no vertex other than root has degree two. See Fig. 5(a) for an example. A rooted tree is **binary** if the root vertex has degree two, and every other internal (non-leaf) vertex has degree three. A **triplet** is a rooted binary tree with exactly three leaves. A triplet with label set \( \{a, b, c\} \) is denoted \( ab|c \) if the path between the leaves labeled \( a \) and \( b \) does include the root vertex. For a tree \( T \), and a label set \( L \subseteq L(T) \), let \( T' \) be the minimal subtree of \( T \) connecting all the leaves with labels in \( L \). The **restriction** of \( T \) to \( L \), denoted by \( T|L \), is the rooted tree obtained from \( T' \) by distinguishing the vertex closest to the root of \( T \) as the root of \( T' \), and suppressing every vertex other than the root having degree

(a) A tree \( T \) witnessing that the triplets \( ab|c \), \( de|b \), \( ef|c \), and \( ec|b \) are compatible

(b) \( T|\{a, b, c, e\} \)

Fig. 5: Rooted Phylogenetic Trees
two. A rooted tree \( T \) displays another rooted tree \( T' \) if \( T' \) can be obtained from \( T|L(T') \) by contracting edges. A rooted tree \( T \) displays a collection of rooted trees \( \mathcal{T} \) if \( T \) displays every tree in \( \mathcal{T} \). If such a tree \( T \) exists, then we say that \( \mathcal{T} \) is compatible; otherwise, we say that \( T \) is incompatible. Given a collection of rooted trees \( \mathcal{T} \), it can be determined in polynomial time if \( \mathcal{T} \) is compatible \[2\].

The following theorems follow from the connection between collections of unrooted trees with at least one common label across all the trees, and collections of rooted trees \[21\].

**Theorem 5.** Let \( \mathcal{Q} \) be a collection of quartets where every quartet in \( \mathcal{Q} \) shares a common label \( \ell \). Let \( \mathcal{R} \) be the set of triplets such that there exists a triplet \( ab|c \) in \( \mathcal{R} \) if and only if there exists a quartet \( ab|c\ell \) in \( \mathcal{Q} \). Then, \( \mathcal{Q} \) is compatible if and only if \( \mathcal{R} \) is compatible.

Let \( \mathcal{R} \) be a collection of triplets. For a subset \( S \subseteq L(\mathcal{R}) \), we define the graph \([\mathcal{R}, S]\) as the graph having a vertex for each label in \( S \), and an edge \( \{a, b\} \) if and only if \( ab|c \in \mathcal{R} \) for some \( c \in S \). The following theorem is from \[4\].

**Theorem 6.** A collection \( \mathcal{R} \) of rooted triplets is compatible if and only if \([\mathcal{R}, S]\) is not connected for every \( S \subseteq L(\mathcal{R}) \) with \( |S| \geq 3 \).

**Corollary 2.** Let \( \mathcal{R} \) be a set of rooted triplets such that \( \mathcal{R} \) is incompatible but every proper subset of \( \mathcal{R} \) is compatible. Then, \([\mathcal{R}, L(\mathcal{R})]\) is connected.

We now contrast our result on quartet compatibility with a result on triplets.

**Theorem 7.** For every \( n \geq 3 \), if \( \mathcal{R} \) is an incompatible set of triplets over \( n \) labels, and \( |\mathcal{R}| > n - 1 \), then some proper subset of \( \mathcal{R} \) is incompatible.

**Proof.** For sake of contradiction, let \( \mathcal{R} \) be a set of triplets such that \( \mathcal{R} \) is incompatible, every proper subset of \( \mathcal{R} \) is compatible, \( |L(\mathcal{R})| = n \), and \( |\mathcal{R}| > n - 1 \). The graph \([\mathcal{R}, L(\mathcal{R})]\) will contain \( n \) vertices and at least \( n \) edges. Since each triplet in \( \mathcal{R} \) is distinct, there will be a cycle \( C \) of length at least three in \([\mathcal{R}, L(\mathcal{R})]\). Since \( \mathcal{R} \) is incompatible but every proper subset of \( \mathcal{R} \) is compatible, by Corollary 2, \([\mathcal{R}, L(\mathcal{R})]\) is connected.

Consider any edge \( e \) in the cycle \( C \). Let \( t \) be the triplet that contributed edge \( e \) in \([\mathcal{R}, L(\mathcal{R})]\). Let \( \mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R}\setminus t \). Since the graph \([\mathcal{R}, L(\mathcal{R})]\setminus e \) is connected, \([\mathcal{R}', L(\mathcal{R}')]\) is connected. By theorem 6, \( \mathcal{R}' \) is incompatible. But \( \mathcal{R}' \subset \mathcal{R} \), contradicting that every proper subset of \( \mathcal{R} \) is compatible.

To show the bound is tight, we first prove a more restricted form of Theorem 7.

**Theorem 8.** For every \( n \geq 4 \), there exists a set of quartets \( \mathcal{Q} \) with \( |L(\mathcal{Q})| = n \), and a label \( \ell \in L(\mathcal{Q}) \), such that all of the following hold.

1. Every \( q \in \mathcal{Q} \) contains a leaf labeled by \( \ell \).
2. \( \mathcal{Q} \) is incompatible.
3. Every proper subset of \( \mathcal{Q} \) is compatible.
4. \( |\mathcal{Q}| = n - 2 \).
Proof. Consider the set of quartets \( Q_{2,n-2} \). From Lemmas 3 and 4, \( Q_{2,n-2} \) is incompatible but every proper subset of \( Q_{2,n-2} \) is compatible. The set \( Q_{2,n-2} \) contains exactly \( n-2 \) quartets. From the construction, there are two labels in \( L \) which are present in all the quartets in \( Q_{2,n-2} \). Set one of them to be \( \ell \).

The following is a consequence of Theorem 8 and Theorem 5.

**Corollary 3.** For every \( n \geq 3 \), there exists a set \( R \) of triplets with \( L(R) = n \) such that all of the following hold.

1. \( R \) is incompatible.
2. Every proper subset of \( R \) is compatible.
3. \( |R| = n - 1 \).

The generalization of the Fitch-Meacham examples given in [16] can also be expressed in terms of triplets. For any \( r \geq 2 \), let \( L = \{a, b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_r\} \). Let

\[
R_r = ab_r|b_1 \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{r-1} ab_i|b_{i+1}
\]

Let \( Q = \{ab|c\ell : ab|c \in R_r\} \) for some label \( \ell \notin L \). The set \( C_Q \) of \( r \)-state characters corresponding to the quartet set \( Q \) is exactly the set of characters built for \( r \) in [16]. In the partition intersection graph of \( C_Q \), (following the terminology in [16]) labels \( \ell \) and \( a \) correspond to the end cliques and the rest of the \( r \) labels \( \{b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_r\} \) correspond to the \( r \) tower cliques. From Lemma 1 and Theorem 5, \( R_r \) is compatible if and only of \( Q \) is compatible.

## 5 Conclusion

We have shown that for every \( r \geq 2 \), \( f(r) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{r}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \), by showing that for every \( n \geq 4 \), there exists an incompatible set \( Q \) of \( \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \) quartets over a set of \( n \) labels such that every proper subset of \( Q \) is compatible. Previous results show that our lower bound on \( f(r) \) is tight for \( r = 2 \) and \( r = 3 \) [5, 12, 16, 17, 18].

We give the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 2** For every \( r \geq 2 \), \( f(r) = \left\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{r}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \).

Note that, due to Theorem 8, a proof of Conjecture 2 would also show that the number of incompatible quartets given in the statement of Theorem 2 is also as large as possible. Another direction for future work is to show an upper bound on the function \( f(r) \), which would prove Conjecture 1. For quartets, we have a trivial upper bound of \( \binom{n}{4} \) on the cardinality of a set of quartets over \( n \) labels such that every proper subset is compatible. However, the question for multi-state characters remains open.
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Technical Appendix

5.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Let \( T \) be any tree. It suffices to show that \( T \) displays \( q = ab|cd \) if and only if \( \chi_q \) is convex on \( T \). (\( \Rightarrow \)) Suppose \( T \) displays \( q \). It follows that the path from the leaf labeled \( a \) to the leaf labeled \( b \) does not intersect the path from the leaf labeled \( c \) to the leaf labeled \( d \). Every other state \( s \) of \( \chi_q \) has only one label \( \ell_s \) with state \( s \) for \( \chi_q \); hence the minimal subtree connecting all leaves with labels having state \( s \) for \( \chi \) is a single leaf. It follows that \( \chi_q \) is convex on \( T \). (\( \Leftarrow \)) Now suppose that \( \chi_q \) is convex on \( T \). Then the minimal subtree containing both the leaf labeled \( a \) and the leaf labeled \( b \) is pairwise disjoint from the minimal subtree containing both the leaf labeled \( c \) and the leaf labeled \( d \). It follows that the path from the leaf labeled \( a \) to the leaf labeled \( b \) does not intersect the path from the leaf labeled \( c \) to the leaf labeled \( d \). Hence \( T \) displays \( q \). \( \square \)

5.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. We define the function \( g : L_{s,t} \to L_{t,s} \) by

\[
g(\ell) = \begin{cases} 
  b_i & \text{if } \ell \text{ is of the form } a_i \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq s \\
  a_i & \text{if } \ell \text{ is of the form } b_i \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq t.
\end{cases}
\]

It is straightforward to verify that \( \ell_1|\ell_2|\ell_3|\ell_4 \in Q_{s,t} \) if and only if \( g(\ell_1)g(\ell_2)g(\ell_3)g(\ell_4) \in Q_{t,s} \). The theorem follows. \( \square \)