

# COCONVEX CHARACTERS ON COLLECTIONS OF PHYLOGENETIC TREES

EVA CZABARKA, STEVEN KELK, VINCENT MOULTON, AND LÁSZLÓ A. SZÉKELY

ABSTRACT. In phylogenetics, a key problem is to construct evolutionary trees from collections of characters where, for a set  $X$  of species, a character is simply a function from  $X$  onto a set of states. In this context, a key concept is convexity, where a character is convex on a tree with leaf set  $X$  if the collection of subtrees spanned by the leaves of the tree that have the same state are pairwise disjoint. Although collections of convex characters on a single tree have been extensively studied over the past few decades, very little is known about *coconvex characters*, that is, characters that are simultaneously convex on a collection of trees. As a starting point to better understand coconvexity, in this paper we prove a number of extremal results for the following question: *What is the minimal number of coconvex characters on a collection of  $n$ -leaved trees taken over all collections of size  $t \geq 2$ , also if we restrict to coconvex characters which map to  $k$  states?* As an application of coconvexity, we introduce a new one-parameter family of tree metrics, which range between the coarse Robinson-Foulds distance and the much finer quartet distance. We show that bounds on the quantities in the above question translate into bounds for the diameter of the tree space for the new distances. Our results open up several new interesting directions and questions which have potential applications to, for example, tree spaces and phylogenomics.

---

*Date:* April 2, 2025.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 68R05, 92B10, 05C70, 05C30.

*Key words and phrases.* Phylogenetics, combinatorics, enumeration, partitions, convexity.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In phylogenetics a key problem is to infer evolutionary trees based on data arising from contemporary species [19, 22]. Mathematically speaking, given a collection of species  $X$ , the aim is to construct a *phylogenetic tree*, that is, a binary tree with leaf set  $X$  whose branching patterns indicate how the species evolved over time. Often evolutionary data comes in the form of *characters*, that is, maps from  $X$  into some set of states. For example, if  $X$  is a collection of animals a character could be the map that assigns each animal in  $X$  to the state of either having wings or no wings. Each character induces a partition on  $X$  where two elements in  $X$  are in the same class if and only if the character maps them to the same state (see e.g. Fig. 1). In this paper we shall consider two characters to be equivalent if they induce the same partition and thus, in particular, we consider characters as being partitions of  $X$  and the states of the character as being the classes in the associated partition.

In the context of constructing phylogenetic trees from characters a key concept is convexity. Formally, a character is *convex on a phylogenetic tree*  $T$  if the subtrees of  $T$  spanned by the leaves in each of its partition classes are pairwise disjoint in  $T$  (see e.g. Fig. 1). Convexity is motivated by the concept of *homoplasy-free* evolution in which a biological state (e.g. wings versus no wings) evolve only once (cf. [19, p.67]). Characters that contain at most one class of size at least 2 are *trivial*, as they are convex on every phylogenetic tree.




FIGURE 1. Two phylogenetic trees with leaf set  $\{1, \dots, 7\}$ . The character  $f : X \rightarrow \{A, G, T\}$  defined by  $f(1) = f(2) = f(3) = A$ ,  $f(4) = f(5) = G$ , and  $f(6) = f(7) = T$  induces the partition  $\{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{6, 7\}\}$ . On the picture, white, gray and black colors on the leaves correspond to  $A$ ,  $G$ , and  $T$  respectively. In particular,  $f$  is convex on both of the trees, and thus it is coconvex on the trees. In contrast, any character  $g$  on  $X$  which induces the partition  $\{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{5, 6, 7\}\}$  is not coconvex on these two trees, since  $g$  is convex on left tree but not on the right one.

In the past few decades there has been a great deal of work on understanding collections of convex characters on a single phylogenetic tree (see e.g. [19, Chapter 4], [22, Chapter 5]). Even so, to our best knowledge, very little is known about the behavior of collections of characters that are simultaneously convex on a set of phylogenetic trees. We call such a character *coconvex* (see e.g. Fig. 1).

The concept of coconvexity has recently surfaced in the algorithmic phylogenetics literature [10, 11, 12]. In particular, it has been observed that *agreement forests*, combinatorial

objects used to summarize the dissimilarity of a set of phylogenetic trees, project down onto characters that are coconvex. Counting (and enumerating) coconvex characters can thus, for example, provide an algorithmic bridge into counting and enumerating more complex phylogenetic structures. Coconvexity could also potentially be useful in present day phylogenomic studies which often involve processing collections of gene trees in order to construct phylogenetic trees (see e.g. [15]).

As a starting point to better understand coconvexity, in this paper we prove a number of extremal results for the following question.

**Question 1.** *What is  $s_n^{(t)}$ , the minimum number of coconvex characters on a collection of  $n$ -leaved trees taken over all collections of size  $t \geq 2$ ? What is  $s_{n,k}^{(t)}$ , the minimum number of coconvex characters with  $k$  classes on a collection of  $n$ -leaved trees taken over all collections of size  $t \geq 2$ ? In particular, what is the smallest  $k$ , for which  $s_{n,k}^{(t)}$  is more than the number of trivial characters?*

Note that any trivial character on  $X$  is coconvex on any collection of  $n$ -leaved trees. It follows that  $s_n^{(t)} \geq 2^n - n$  (see also Lemma 1 below). Moreover, it is known that there are at most  $F_{2n-1} = O(2.619^n)$  convex characters on any  $n$ -leaved tree [12, 24], where  $F_m$  denotes the  $m^{\text{th}}$  Fibonacci number, and so this is also an upper bound for  $s_n^{(t)}$ .

We now briefly summarise the content of the rest of this paper. Most of our results will focus on the special case of Question 1 where all trees in the collection are *caterpillars*, that is, trees for which the removal of all leaves from the tree results in a path (see e.g., the tree in the left of Fig. 1). In this situation, we denote the quantities analogous to  $s_n^{(t)}$  and  $s_{n,k}^{(t)}$  by  $c_n^{(t)}$  and  $c_{n,k}^{(t)}$ , respectively.

After presenting some preliminaries, we then concentrate on the case  $t = 2$ . In Section 3, we begin by presenting some basic relationships between the quantities  $s_n^{(2)}$ ,  $s_{n,k}^{(2)}$ ,  $c_n^{(2)}$  and  $c_{n,k}^{(2)}$ . Then, in Sections 4 to 6, we focus on finding bounds for pairs of caterpillar trees. More specifically, in Theorem 2 and Corollary 3 we give lower bounds for  $c_{n,k}^{(2)}$  and  $c_n^{(2)}$ , respectively, as well as precise values for  $c_{n,k}^{(2)}$ , which come from trivial characters, when  $k$  is at most  $\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$  in Theorem 5. Theorem 6 determines up to constant multiplicative factor the expected number of non-trivial coconvex characters of two randomly and uniformly selected caterpillar trees. This yields in turn an upper bound for  $c_n^{(2)}$ .

In Section 7, we consider more than two trees, and use some results from the theory of maximum agreement subtrees to give a lower bound for  $s_{n,k}^{(t)}$  and  $c_{n,k}^{(t)}$ . We also provide some precise values for  $c_{n,k}^{(t)}$ , when it boils down to the trivial characters with exactly  $k$  classes.

In Section 8 we present an application of coconvexity. Since many phylogenetic reconstruction methods optimize an objective function over the collection of phylogenetic trees on the same leaf set, the structure of such tree spaces have been studied extensively, see e.g., [9, 25]. In particular, metrics for comparing phylogenetic trees with  $n$  leaves, or *tree metrics*, are important in applications such as the reconstruction of evolutionary trees

where they help guide algorithmic searches for optimal trees [25]. Since different metrics can reveal alternative insights to the structure of tree spaces [9], it is topical in the phylogenetic literature to look for new metrics; see e.g. [3, 4, 5, 6].

In Section 8 we introduce a new family of metrics  $d_k$ , for  $2 \leq k \leq n - 2$ , on the set of  $n$ -leaved phylogenetic trees. Our new distances  $d_k$  provide a 1-parameter family of metrics that interpolate between the extremes of the well-known Robinson-Foulds [18] and quartet distances [2, 25], which are identical to our  $d_2$  and  $d_{n-2}$ , respectively. As we shall see, bounds on the quantity  $s_{n,k}$  translate into bounds for the diameter of the metric  $d_k$ . While the diameter of the Robinson-Foulds metric is easily seen to be  $2n - 6$  [25], the diameter of the quartet distance is a 40 year-old open problem. A conjecture of Bandelt and Dress [2, p.338] asserts that the diameter is at most  $(2/3 + o(1))\binom{n}{4}$ , achieved by caterpillar trees. Noga Alon, Humberto Naves, and Benny Sudakov [1] proved that the diameter is at most  $(0.69 + o(1))\binom{n}{4}$ , and verified that the conjecture is true for the *diameter of caterpillar trees*, instead of all phylogenetic trees.

We conclude the paper in Section 9 by stating some open problems.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In what follows we shall use the language of partitions rather than characters as this is more convenient for our arguments. Let  $\mathfrak{P}_n$  denote the set of partitions of the set  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  into non-empty classes. In the future, partition classes are non-empty by definition. Let  $\mathfrak{Q}_{n,t}$  denote the set of partitions of the set  $[n]$  with exactly  $t$  classes of size at least two (note  $t \geq 0$ ), and  $\mathfrak{Q}_n = \bigcup_{t \geq 2} \mathfrak{Q}_{n,t} = \mathfrak{P}_n \setminus (\mathfrak{Q}_{n,0} \cup \mathfrak{Q}_{n,1})$  be the set of partitions with at least two classes of size at least two.

For  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}_n$ , we let  $|\mathcal{P}|$  denote the number of classes in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Among the partitions of the set  $[n]$  we denote by  $\mathfrak{P}_{n,k}$  the set of those partitions with exactly  $k$  classes, and by  $\mathfrak{P}_n^\ell$  the set of those partitions with exactly  $\ell$  singleton classes. In addition, let  $S(\mathcal{P})$  denote the set  $\{c : \{c\} \in \mathcal{P}\}$ , so that  $\mathfrak{P}_n^\ell = \{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}_n : |S(\mathcal{P})| = \ell\}$ .

A *semilabeled binary tree* is tree that has only vertices of degree 3 and 1. Degree one vertices are called *leaves*. A semilabeled binary tree of *size*  $n$  has  $n$  leaves, which are labeled bijectively with the elements of  $[n]$ . The remaining  $n - 2$  vertices are called *internal* vertices of the tree. We denote by  $\mathbb{L}(T)$  the set of leaves of  $T$  (and we identify these leaves by their labels), as sometimes we use a label set different from  $[n]$ .

*Caterpillars* of size  $n$  are semilabeled binary trees of size  $n$  such that the removal of the  $n$  leaves (and their incident edges) results in a path of length  $n - 3$  (here we assume that  $n \geq 3$ ; for  $n \in [2]$ , we consider the unique  $n$ -leaf semilabeled tree as a caterpillar.) The *backbone* of the caterpillar, is the path obtained by removing all of its leaves. If  $\pi$  is a permutation on  $[n]$ ,  $T_\pi$  denotes the  $n$ -leaf caterpillar, where we draw the backbone as a straight line, the leaves appear on a straight line below the backbone, and the leaves are labeled in order as  $\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(n)$ . Note that interchanging the first two or last two elements of a permutation results in the same labeled caterpillar, and so does completely reversing the order of entries. Consequently, there is only one labeled caterpillar for  $n \leq 3$

and there are  $\frac{n!}{8}$  caterpillars for  $n \geq 4$ . For the identity permutation  $\text{id}_n$  on  $[n]$ , we refer to  $T_{\text{id}_n}$  as the standard caterpillar. See Fig. 2 for some examples of these definitions.




FIGURE 2. Some size 7 caterpillars.

In a semilabeled binary tree, the removal of  $k - 1 \geq 0$  edges partitions the tree into  $k$  connected components. Some of those, however, may not contain leaves. So the removal of  $k - 1$  edges induces a partition of  $[n]$  into *at most*  $k$  classes by the relation “being in the same connected component”. Given a semilabeled binary tree  $T$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{P}(T)$  the set of partitions of  $[n]$  induced by the removal of some edges from the tree. Note that, in the language used in the introduction,  $\mathfrak{P}(T)$  corresponds to the set of convex characters on  $T$ ; and if  $P \in \mathfrak{P}_n \setminus \mathfrak{Q}_n$ , then  $P$  is a trivial character, and for every size  $n$  semilabeled binary tree  $T$ ,  $P \in \mathfrak{P}(T)$ .

If  $T_\pi$  is a caterpillar with  $n$  leaves, and  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_{n,s} \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}$  for some  $0 \leq s \leq k$ , then  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$  is a *standard listing of  $\mathcal{P}$*  if  $(|P_i| \geq 2 \text{ iff } 1 \leq i \leq s)$ . The listing  $\{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$  is a *standard listing of  $\mathcal{P}$  with respect to  $\pi$*  if it is a standard listing and for  $1 \leq i < j \leq s$  we have  $\min(\pi^{-1}(P_i)) < \min(\pi^{-1}(P_j))$ . In particular, when  $s = 0$ , then any listing of  $\mathcal{P}$  is standard for any  $\pi$ ; and for  $s = 1$ , a listing is standard for a permutation  $\pi$  precisely when  $P_1$  is the unique class of size at least 2. Note that for any  $t \in [n]$  we have that  $t$  is in the  $\pi^{-1}(t)$ -th position in  $(\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(n))$ . We consider now  $s \geq 2$ . For simplicity, we will assume  $n \geq 4$ , i.e., that  $T_\pi$  has at least one backbone edge. It is easy to see that if  $E$  is an edge set of  $T_\pi$  inducing  $\mathcal{P}$ , then  $E$  contains none of the backbone edges on the path from  $\pi(\min(\pi^{-1}(P_i)))$  to  $\pi(\max(\pi^{-1}(P_i)))$  in  $T_\pi$ , and for  $i \neq s - 1$   $E$  must contain at least one backbone edge from the path from  $\pi(\max(\pi^{-1}(P_i)))$  to  $\pi(\min(\pi^{-1}(P_{i+1})))$ . In fact, any edge set  $E'$  of  $T_\pi$  that contains precisely one backbone edge from  $\pi(\max(\pi^{-1}(P_i)))$  to  $\pi(\min(\pi^{-1}(P_{i+1})))$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$  and contains all the leaf-edges leading to elements of  $S(\mathcal{P})$  will generate  $\mathcal{P}$  in  $T_\pi$ .

The structure of  $\mathfrak{P}(T)$  has been investigated in the literature. Steel [21] showed that  $|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}| = \binom{2n-k-1}{k-1}$  and  $|\mathfrak{P}(T)|$  is the Fibonacci number  $F_{2n-1}$  for *every* semilabeled binary tree on  $n$  leaves. Kelk and Stamoulis [12] showed that  $|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k} \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n| = \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}$ .

These results immediately imply that there is a  $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we have

$$(1) \quad |\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap (\cup_{\ell \geq \alpha n} \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell)| \leq \sum_{\ell \geq \alpha n} \binom{n}{\ell} \sum_k \binom{n - \ell - k - 1}{k - 1} = O(2^{(1-\epsilon)n}),$$

as all the binomial coefficients are small when  $\alpha$  is selected close to 1. We will need this estimate in the proof of Theorem 6.

## 3. TWO TREES

We begin by focusing on Question 1 for two trees. (In this special case we drop  $t$  from the notation.) For  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} s_{n,k} &= \min |\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}| \text{ for semilabeled binary trees } T, F \text{ of size } n, \\ c_{n,k} &= \min |\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}| \text{ for caterpillars } T, F \text{ of size } n, \\ s_n &= \min |\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F)| \text{ for semilabeled binary trees } T, F \text{ of size } n, \\ c_n &= \min |\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F)| \text{ for caterpillars } T, F \text{ of size } n. \end{aligned}$$

First, note that by definition

$$(2) \quad s_{n,k} \leq c_{n,k} \text{ and } s_n \leq c_n.$$

We also have

$$(3) \quad \sum_k s_{n,k} \leq s_n \text{ and } \sum_k c_{n,k} \leq c_n,$$

as the optimal tree (resp. caterpillar) pair providing  $c_n$  (resp.  $s_n$ ) is also considered when  $s_{n,k}$  (resp.  $c_{n,k}$ ) is defined.

**Lemma 1.** *For  $n \geq 1$ , we have  $s_{n,1} = s_{n,n} = c_{n,1} = c_{n,n} = 1$ . Furthermore,*

- (i) *for all  $n \geq 3$  and  $k \in [n-1]$ , we have  $s_{n,k} < s_{n+1,k+1}$  and  $c_{n,k} < c_{n+1,k+1}$ ;*
- (ii) *for all  $n \geq 1$ , we have  $s_n < s_{n+1}$  and  $c_n < c_{n+1}$ ;*
- (iii) *for all  $n \geq 2$  and  $k \in [n-1]$ , we have  $\binom{n}{k-1} \leq s_{n,k}$ ;*
- (iv) *for all  $n \geq 1$ , we have  $s_n \geq 2^n - n$ .*

*Proof.*  $1 = s_{n,1} = c_{n,1} = s_{n,n} = c_{n,n}$  is obvious, as there is only one partition on  $[n]$  that has  $n$  partition classes and there is only one partition that has 1 class, and these are clearly induced partitions for all semilabeled trees.

Let  $T_1, T_2$  be trees with  $n+1$  leaves for some  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $X \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(T_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_2) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n+1,k+1}$  be the set of partitions in which  $\{n+1\}$  is a partition class. For  $i \in [2]$ , create the  $n$ -leaf semilabeled trees  $T'_i$  by removing the leaf labeled  $n+1$  from  $T_i$  and suppressing the degree 2 vertices created. Clearly,  $\{\mathcal{P} \setminus \{\{n+1\}\} : \mathcal{P} \in X\} = \mathfrak{P}(T'_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T'_2) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}$ , consequently  $|X| = |\mathfrak{P}(T'_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T'_2) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}|$ . Moreover, if  $n \geq 3$  and  $k \in [n-1]$ , then  $\{\{i\} : i \in [k]\} \cup \{[n+1] - [k]\} \in (\mathfrak{P}(T_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_2) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n+1,k+1}) \setminus X$ , in other words,  $|\mathfrak{P}(T_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_2) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n+1,k+1}| > |X|$ . Obviously when  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are caterpillars, so are  $T'_1$  and  $T'_2$ .

The strict inequalities in (i) follow if we choose  $T_1, T_2$  be optimal binary trees (resp. caterpillars) on  $n+1$  leaves such that  $|\mathfrak{P}(T_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_2) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n+1,k+1}|$  is  $s_{n+1,k+1}$  (resp.  $c_{n+1,k+1}$ ).

If  $T_1, T_2$  are optimal  $(n+1)$ -leaf trees (resp. caterpillars) providing the value  $s_{n+1}$  (resp.  $c_{n+1}$ ), then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{P}(T_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_2)| &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n |\mathfrak{P}(T_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_2) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n+1, k+1}| \\ &\geq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n |\mathfrak{P}(T'_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T'_2) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n, k}| > |\mathfrak{P}(T'_1) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T'_2)|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (ii).

(iii) holds since, for any two semilabeled binary trees, selecting any  $k-1$  subset of leaf labels and deleting the corresponding  $k-1$  leaf edges results in the same size  $k$  partition with from the two trees, but repeating this procedure for a different  $k-1$  subset of leaves results in a different partition as long as  $k < n$ .  $s_1 = 1 = 2^1 - 1$ , and for  $n \geq 2$  the statement in (iv) follows from  $s_{n, n} = 1$ , (3) and (iii).  $\square$

**Remark 1.** *We are not aware of any examples where equality holds in (2), and it would be interesting to show that these inequalities are always strict (see Section 9).*

#### 4. LOWER BOUNDS FOR $c_{n, k}$

In this section we prove the following lower bounds for  $c_{n, k}$  and, as a corollary, also give a lower bound for  $c_n$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $n$  be a multiple of 4. If  $n \geq 8$ , then for every  $\ell$  with  $\frac{n}{2} \leq \ell \leq n-4$ , the partitions of any two caterpillars  $T, F$  share some partitions consisting of exactly 2 classes of size at least 2 and exactly  $\ell$  singletons, in fact at least*

$$(4) \quad \sum_{i=\max(2, n-\ell-\frac{n}{4})}^{\min(n-\ell-2, \frac{n}{4})} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n/4}{n-\ell-i}$$

many such partitions. Consequently, for every  $k$  with  $\frac{3n}{4} \leq k \leq n-2$  we have

$$(5) \quad c_{n, k} \geq \binom{n}{k-1} + \left(1 - \frac{4}{n-k+3}\right) \binom{n/2}{n-k+2},$$

and for every  $k$  with  $\frac{n}{2} + 2 \leq k \leq \frac{3n}{4} - 1$

$$(6) \quad c_{n, k} \geq \binom{n}{k-1} + \sum_{i=\frac{3n}{4}-k+2}^{\frac{n}{4}} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n/4}{n-k+2-i}.$$

*Proof.* Note that for  $n \geq 8$  and  $\ell \leq n-4$  we have  $2 \leq \min(n-\ell-2, \frac{n}{4})$ , and for  $n \geq 8$  and  $\ell \geq \frac{n}{2}$  we have  $n-\ell-\frac{n}{4} \leq \min(n-\ell-2, \frac{n}{4})$ , so the sum in (4) has a non-empty range.

Without loss of generality take  $T = T_{\text{id}_n}$  and  $F = T_\pi$  for an arbitrary permutation  $\pi$ . Consider  $A = \{1, 2, \dots, \frac{n}{2}\}$ ,  $B = \{\frac{n}{2} + 1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $X = \pi(A) = \{\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(\frac{n}{2})\}$ ,

$Y = \pi(B) = \{\pi(\frac{n}{2} + 1), \dots, \pi(n)\}$ . Observe  $n = |A \cap X| + |A \cap Y| + |B \cap X| + |B \cap Y|$ , and hence

$$\frac{n}{2} \leq \max(|A \cap X| + |B \cap Y|, |A \cap Y| + |B \cap X|).$$

Assume that the first term achieves the maximum (the other case will follow similarly). Set  $m = |A \cap X|$ . Then  $|B \cap Y| = |Y| - |A \cap Y| = |A| - |A \cap Y| = |A \cap X| = m$ , and, as  $2m \geq \frac{n}{2}$ ,  $m \geq \frac{n}{4}$ .

Fix an  $\ell$  such that  $\frac{n}{2} \leq \ell \leq n - 4$ .

Set  $t = n - \ell \leq \frac{n}{2}$ . Then  $4 \leq t \leq \frac{n}{2} \leq 2m$ . For a set  $C$  and integer  $j : 0 \leq j \leq |C|$ ,  $\binom{C}{j}$  denotes the collection of  $j$ -element subsets of  $C$ . For every  $i : \max(2, t - \frac{n}{4}) \leq i \leq \min(t - 2, \frac{n}{4})$ , define the family of partitions

$$\mathbb{Z}_{i,t} = \left\{ \{Z_1, Z_2\} \cup \{\{j\} : j \in [n] \setminus (Z_1 \cup Z_2)\} : Z_1 \in \binom{A \cap X}{i}, Z_2 \in \binom{B \cap Y}{t-i} \right\}.$$

As per the conditions we have  $2 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{4} \leq m$  and  $2 \leq t - i \leq \frac{n}{4} \leq m$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_{i,t}$  is well defined. As  $t - 2 \geq 2$  and  $t - \frac{n}{4} \leq \frac{n}{4}$ , for every  $t$  there is at least one  $i$  to be selected, so  $\mathbb{Z}_{i,t} \neq \emptyset$ . Clearly,  $\mathbb{Z}_{i,t} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_{n,2} \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell$  and  $|\mathbb{Z}_{i,t}| = \binom{m}{i} \binom{m}{t-i} \geq \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n/4}{t-i}$ . In particular,

$$|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_{n,2} \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell| \geq \sum_{i=\max(2, t-\frac{n}{4})}^{\min(t-2, \frac{n}{4})} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n/4}{t-i},$$

This proves (4).

Assume now  $\ell \geq \frac{3n}{4} - 2$ , and consequently  $t = n - \ell \leq \frac{n}{4} + 2$ . Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{n,\ell+2} &= \binom{n}{\ell+1} \geq \sum_{i=\max(2, t-\frac{n}{4})}^{\min(t-2, \frac{n}{4})} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n/4}{t-i} = \sum_{i=2}^{t-2} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n/4}{t-i} \\ &\geq \binom{n/2}{t} \left(1 - \frac{4}{t+1}\right) = \binom{n/2}{n-\ell} \left(1 - \frac{4}{n-\ell+1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

as the terms in this truncated Vandermonde convolution are symmetric and unimodal, and the missing 4 terms are at most 4 times the average expansion term. This yields (5).

On the other hand, if  $\frac{n}{2} \leq \ell < \frac{3n}{4} - 2$ , then for  $t = n - \ell$  we have  $\frac{n}{4} < t - 2 \leq \frac{n}{2}$ ,  $\min(t - 2, \frac{n}{4}) = \frac{n}{4}$  and  $\max(2, t - \frac{n}{4}) = t - \frac{n}{4}$ , and as before, we have

$$c_{n,\ell+2} = \binom{n}{\ell+1} \geq \sum_{i=t-\frac{n}{4}}^{\frac{n}{4}} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n/4}{t-i} = \sum_{i=\frac{3n}{4}-\ell}^{\frac{n}{4}} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n/4}{n-\ell-i},$$

which gives (6). □

We remark here that  $c_{n,n-1} = \binom{n}{n-3}$ .

**Corollary 3.** *We have  $c_n \geq 2^n + (\frac{1}{2} - o(1))2^{2\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor}$ .*



*Proof.* Consider  $n \geq 52$ . This implies that  $0.9n + 3 < n - 2$ , and for  $k \leq 0.9n + 3$  we have  $n - k + 3 \geq 0.1n$  and  $1 - \frac{4}{n-k+3} \geq 1 - \frac{40}{n}$ .

First assume that  $n$  is a multiple of 4, and sum up the conclusion of Theorem 2:

$$\begin{aligned} c_n - 2^n + n &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \left( c_{n,k} - \binom{n}{k-1} \right) \geq \sum_{k=\frac{3n}{4}}^{0.9n+3} \binom{n/2}{n-k+2} \left( 1 - \frac{4}{n-k+3} \right) \\ &\geq \left( 1 - \frac{40}{n} \right) \sum_{k=\frac{3n}{4}}^{0.9n+3} \binom{n/2}{n-k+2} \geq \left( \frac{1}{2} - o(1) \right) 2^{n/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the normal convergence of the binomial coefficients.

If  $n$  is not a multiple of 4, i.e.  $n = 4\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor + r$  with  $r = 1, 2$  or  $3$ , then on the one hand  $\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F)$  contains  $2^n - n$  partitions with at most one class of size at least 2, while after removing leaves  $4\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor + 1, \dots, 4\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor + r$  from the trees  $T$  and  $F$  allows us to repeat the same argument, using the second term from (5) with  $4\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$  substituted to the place of  $n$ , with a slightly changed range for  $\ell$ .  $\square$

## 5. CATERPILLARS AVOIDING NON-TRIVIAL COMMON PARTITIONS

In this section, we shall show that for small values of  $k$ ,  $c_{n,k} = \binom{n}{k-1}$  actually holds. To this end, we need to first make some observations concerning properties of partitions and sets of integers.

First, for partitions of sets of integers, we introduce the concept of a *gap*. For a finite set  $X$  of positive integers, define  $\text{gap}(X) = (\max X) - (\min X) + 1 - |X|$ . Less formally, writing the elements of  $X$  in increasing order,  $\text{gap}(X)$  is the number of integers that are missing between consecutive elements of  $X$ . For a family  $\mathcal{X}$  of disjoint sets of positive integers (e.g., a partition of  $[n]$ ), define  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{X}) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \text{gap}(X)$ . Observe that

$$(7) \quad \text{gap}(X) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{gap}(\mathcal{X}) \geq 0.$$

Assume that every element of  $X$  gives the same residue modulo  $q$ . Then it is easy to see that

$$(8) \quad \text{gap}(X) \geq (q-1)(|X| - 1).$$

**Lemma 4.** *The following hold*

- (i) *If  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n})$ , then  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{P}) \leq |S(\mathcal{P})|$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{Q}_{n,0}$ , then  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{P}) = 0$ .*
- (iii) *If  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{Q}_{n,s}$  for some  $s \geq 1$  and  $\{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$  is a standard listing of  $\mathcal{P}$ , then  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{i=1}^s \text{gap}(P_i)$ .*

Now, for a set of positive integers  $A$ ,  $A_o$  and  $A_e$  denotes the set of odd and even integers in  $A$ , respectively. We use the interval notation  $[a, b] = \{z \in \mathbb{Z} : a \leq z \leq b\}$ . In other words,  $[n] = [1, n]$  for positive integers  $n$ . The following results will be frequently used in the proof of the next theorem. They are straight-forward to show and therefore presented without proof.

**Observation 1.** *Let  $1 \leq a < b$  be integers and  $x \in [a, b]$ . Then we have*

$$|[a, x-1]_o| + |[x+1, b]_e| = \begin{cases} |[a, b]_e| - 1, & a \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ |[a, b]_e|, & a \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ |[a, b]_o| - 1, & b \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ |[a, b]_o|, & b \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \end{cases}$$

and

$$|[a, x-1]_e| + |[x+1, b]_o| = \begin{cases} |[a, b]_o| - 1, & a \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ |[a, b]_o|, & a \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ |[a, b]_e| - 1, & b \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ |[a, b]_e|, & b \equiv 1 \pmod{2}. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\min \left( |[a, x-1]_o| + |[x+1, b]_e|, |[a, x-1]_e| + |[x+1, b]_o| \right) \geq \left\lceil \frac{b-a-1}{2} \right\rceil.$$

Armed with the above observations, we now prove the main result of this section.

**Theorem 5.** *For any  $n \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq k \leq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ , we have  $c_{n,k} = \binom{n}{k-1}$ .*

*Proof.* The statement is true for  $n \leq 3$ , as in this case  $\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil = 1$ , and  $c_{n,1} = 1 = \binom{n}{0}$ . We assume for the rest of the proof that  $n \geq 4$ , i.e.,  $1 \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor$  and  $2 \leq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ .

Let  $\pi$  be the permutation that lists the elements of the sets as given: first the elements of  $[1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_o$  in decreasing order, then the elements of  $[\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1, n]_o$  in increasing order, then the elements of  $[\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1, n]_e$  in decreasing order, then the elements of  $[1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_e$  in increasing order. Note that  $\pi$  lists the elements of  $[\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_o$  before the elements of  $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]_o$ , and it lists the elements of  $[\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_e$  after the elements of  $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]_e$ . Moreover,  $n = \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + \lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor$  and  $\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil \geq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + \lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor$ . In particular, none of the intervals  $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]$ ,  $[\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]$  and  $[\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1, n]$  is empty.

Assume to the contrary that for some  $k \leq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$  we have  $\mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k} \neq \emptyset$ . Then for some  $2 \leq s \leq k \leq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$  we have a  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_{n,s} \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}$ . In particular,  $|S(\mathcal{P})| = k - s$ .

Let  $\{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$  be a standard listing of  $\mathcal{P}$  with respect to  $\pi$ . Since  $\pi([n/2]) = [n]_o$ , there is a  $t$  with  $1 \leq t \leq s$  such that for every  $i$  with  $1 \leq i < t$ ,  $P_i$  contains only odd integers, and for every  $i$  with  $t < i \leq s$ ,  $P_i$  contains only even integers. Moreover, as  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n})$ , we also have that for every  $i \in [s] \setminus \{t\}$  we have  $P_i \subseteq [1, \min(P_t) - 1]$  or  $P_i \subseteq [\max(P_t) + 1, n]$ ; in particular  $[\min(P_t), \max(P_t)] \setminus P_t \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$ .

We will bound  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{P})$ . By Lemma 4 (i),  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{P}) \leq |S(\mathcal{P})| = k - s$ . Using (8) with  $q = 2$ , we have that  $\text{gap}(P_i) \geq |P_i| - 1$  for all  $i \in [s] \setminus \{t\}$ , therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{gap}(\mathcal{P}) &\geq \sum_{i \in [s] \setminus \{t\}} \text{gap}(P_i) \geq \left( \sum_{i \in [s] \setminus \{t\}} |P_i| \right) - (s-1) = |[n] \setminus (P_t \cup S(\mathcal{P}))| - s + 1 \\ &= n - (|P_t| + k - s) - s + 1 = n - k + 1 - |P_t|. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing these two bounds gives

$$|P_t| \geq n - 2k + s + 1 \geq n - 2 \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil + 3 \geq \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil + 1.$$

If  $P_t$  contains only odd or only even integers, then  $|\lceil \min(P_t), \max(P_t) \rceil| \geq 2|P_t| - 1$ . Since  $\lceil \min(P_t), \max(P_t) \rceil \setminus P_t \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$ , we have  $k \geq |S(\mathcal{P})| + 2 \geq (|P_t| - 1) + 2 > \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $P_t$  must contain both even and odd integers,  $\min(P_t) \leq n - |P_t| + 1 \leq \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$  and  $\max(P_t) \geq |P_t| > \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ . In addition, we also have

$$\min(P_t) \leq \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil \quad \text{or} \quad \max(P_t) \geq \left\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \right\rceil + 1,$$

otherwise we would have  $|P_t| \leq \max(P_t) - \min(P_t) + 1 \leq \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil - (\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1) + 1 \leq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ , which is again a contradiction.

**Case A:**  $\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil < \max(P_t) \leq \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$ .

Then we have  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1, n] = \emptyset$ . As  $P_t$  contains both even and odd integers and  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi)$ , we have that  $[\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1, n] \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$ , which in turn gives  $k \geq |S(\mathcal{P})| + 2 \geq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 2 > \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ , a contradiction. Therefore we must have  $\max(P_t) \geq \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1$ .

**Case B:**  $\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1 \leq \min(P_t) < \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$ .

We have  $[\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil] \cap P_t \neq \emptyset$ . If neither  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_o$  nor  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_e$  is empty, then from  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi)$  we get  $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil] \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$  and  $k > \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ , a contradiction. Assume that  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_o \neq \emptyset$  and  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_e = \emptyset$  (the other possibility follows similarly). As we have  $\lceil \min(P_t), \max(P_t) \rceil \subseteq P_t \cup S(\mathcal{P})$ , we have  $\lceil \min(P_t) + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil \rceil_e \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$ . From  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi)$  we have  $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]_o \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$  and  $[\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \min(P_t) - 1]_o \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$ . These together with Claim 1 give

$$\begin{aligned} |S(\mathcal{P})| &\geq \left| \left[ 1, \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil \right]_o \right| + \left| \left[ \min(P_t) + 1, \left\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \right\rceil \right]_e \right| + \left| \left[ \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil + 1, \min(P_t) - 1 \right]_o \right| \\ &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \left( \left\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \right\rceil - \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil - 2 \right) \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{3} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor - 1 \\ &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{3} \right\rfloor - 1, \end{aligned}$$

and  $k \geq |S(\mathcal{P})| + 2 > \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ , which is a contradiction. Thus we must have  $\min(P_t) \leq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ .

**Case C:**  $\min(P_t) \leq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ ,  $\max(P_t) \geq \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1$ .

Recall that  $P_t$  contains both even and odd integers. Since for all  $i \in [s] \setminus \{t\}$  we have  $P_i \cap \lceil \min(P_t), \max(P_t) \rceil = \emptyset$ , we have  $[\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil] \setminus P_t \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$ .

**Subcase a:**  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil] = \emptyset$ .

We have  $|S(\mathcal{P})| \geq |[\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]| = \lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor \geq \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil - 1$ , and  $k \geq |S(\mathcal{P})| + 2 > \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ , a contradiction. Thus we have  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil] \neq \emptyset$ .

**Subcase b:**  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]$  contains both even and odd integers.

$\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\rho)$  yields that for all  $i \in [s] \setminus \{t\}$  we have  $P_i \cap ([1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil] \cup [\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1, n]) = \emptyset$ , which together with the earlier  $P_i \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil] = \emptyset$  gives  $s = 1$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]$  either contains only even integers, or only odd integers.

**Subcase c:**  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_e = \emptyset$  and  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_o \neq \emptyset$ .

(Note that the other remaining case follows similarly, so we omit it.)

We have that for all  $i \in [s] \setminus \{t\}$ ,  $P_i \cap [1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]_o = \emptyset$ , and consequently  $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]_o \setminus P_t \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$  and also  $P_i \subseteq [1, \min(P_t) - 1]_e$  or  $P_i \subseteq [\max(P_t) + 1, n]$ . If  $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]_e \cap P_t \neq \emptyset$ , then from  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\rho)$  we get for all  $i \in [s] \setminus \{t\}$  that  $P_i \cap [1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]_e = \emptyset$  and  $P_i \cap [\max(P_t) + 1, n] = \emptyset$ , in other words  $s = 1$ , a contradiction. Therefore we have  $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil]_e \cap P_t = \emptyset$ . Since  $P_t$  contains some even integers,  $P_t \cap [\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil + 1, n]_e \neq \emptyset$ . In particular, we have that  $[1, \min(P_t) - 1]_o \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$  and  $[\min(P_t) + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil]_e \subseteq S(\mathcal{P})$ . Using Claim 1 we get

$$|S(\mathcal{P})| \geq |[1, \min(P_t) - 1]_o| + \left| \left[ \min(P_t) + 1, \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil \right]_e \right| \geq \left\lceil \frac{1}{2} \left( \left\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \right\rceil - 2 \right) \right\rceil \geq \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil - 1,$$

which gives  $k \geq |S(\mathcal{P})| + 2 > \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

## 6. AN UPPER BOUND FOR $c_n$

In this section, we prove that the following upper bound holds for  $c_n$ .

**Theorem 6.** *For two uniformly and independently selected random permutations, create the corresponding caterpillars  $F$  and  $T$ . Then we have*

$$(9) \quad \mathbb{E} [|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n|] = \Theta \left( \frac{2^n}{n^2} \right).$$

As a consequence, we have

$$(10) \quad \mathbb{E} [|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F)|] = 2^n \left( 1 + \Theta \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right).$$

and

$$(11) \quad c_n = 2^n \left( 1 + O \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right).$$

*Proof.* Clearly,  $\mathbb{E} [|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n|] = \mathbb{E} [|\mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n|]$ , where the second expectation is computed over uniform selection of the permutation  $\pi$ .

In order to prove (11), by Lemma 1 (iv), we only have to prove that the right hand side is an upper bound to  $c_n$ . Using (9) we get

$$\mathbb{E} [|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F)|] = 2^n - n + \Theta \left( \frac{2^n}{n^2} \right) = 2^n \left( 1 + \Theta \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right),$$

which is (10). In turn, this gives that there is a caterpillar  $F'$ , such that  $|\mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F')| \leq 2^n \left( 1 + O \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right)$ , which implies (11).

Therefore we only need to bound  $\mathbb{E} [|\mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n|]$ . Clearly,

$$\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E} [|\mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n|] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n \cap \left( \bigcup_{\ell=0}^n \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell \right) \right| \right]$$

By (1) there is  $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n \cap \left( \bigcup_{\ell \leq \alpha n} \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell \right) \right| \right] \leq \left| \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \left( \bigcup_{\ell \leq \alpha n} \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell \right) \right| = O(2^{(1-\epsilon)n}).$$

Therefore by linearity of expectation and the fact that  $2^{(1-\epsilon)n} = o\left(\frac{2^n}{n^2}\right)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} &= \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \mathbb{E} [|\mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell|] \right) + o\left(\frac{2^n}{n^2}\right) \\ &= \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi)] \right) + o\left(\frac{2^n}{n^2}\right) \\ &= \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell} |\{\pi : \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi)\}| \right) + o\left(\frac{2^n}{n^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that for every  $\ell$  and  $m \geq 2$  we have

$$(12) \quad \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,m+\ell}} |\{\pi : \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi)\}| = \binom{n}{\ell} \frac{m!}{(n-\ell)!} \sum_{\substack{a_1+a_2+\dots+a_m=n-\ell \\ a_1 \geq 2, \dots, a_m \geq 2}} \prod_{j=1}^m (a_j!).$$

To verify this claim, take  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,m+\ell}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}$  has  $\ell$  singleton classes and  $m$  classes of size at least 2. Let  $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\}$  be a standard listing of  $\mathcal{P}$  with respect to  $\text{id}_n$ , i.e.,  $|P_i| \geq 2$  precisely when  $i \in [s]$ , and for  $1 \leq i < j \leq s$  we have  $\min(P_i) < \min(P_j)$ . For  $i \in [s]$ , let  $a_i = |P_i|$ , then we have  $a_i \geq 2$  and  $a_1 + \dots + a_m = n - \ell$ . It follows that for  $1 \leq i < j \leq s$  we also have  $\max(P_i) < \min(P_j)$ , and listing the elements of  $[n] - S(\mathcal{P})$  in increasing order, for each  $i < j$  all elements of  $P_i$  come before any element of  $P_j$ . To create a permutation  $\pi$  for which  $\mathcal{P} \in T_\pi$ , we need to put down the elements of  $S(\mathcal{P})$  into the  $n$  possible positions in any way (which can be done in  $\binom{n}{\ell} \ell! = \frac{n!}{(n-\ell)!}$  ways) and then on the remaining  $n - \ell$  places put any permutation of the remaining  $n - \ell$  elements that keep the elements of each  $P_i$  consecutive (which can be done in  $m! \prod_i (a_i!)$  ways).

Therefore for a fixed  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,m+\ell}$  with given  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  there are  $\frac{n!}{(n-\ell)!} m! \prod_i (a_i!)$  permutations  $\pi$  such that  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi)$ . We also need to count the partitions of  $\mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,m+\ell}$  that give the same ordered  $m$ -tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ . However, that should be clear, as we can choose in  $\binom{n}{\ell}$  ways the elements that are to become singleton classes, and the rest of the permutation is given by the fixed  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ . Formula (12) follows. This implies that

$$(13) \quad \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_{\text{id}_n}) \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n \cap \mathfrak{P}_n^\ell} |\{\pi : \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\pi)\}| = \binom{n}{\ell} \sum_{m=2}^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor} \frac{m!}{(n-\ell)!} \sum_{\substack{a_1+a_2+\dots+a_m=n-\ell \\ a_1 \geq 2, \dots, a_m \geq 2}} \prod_{j=1}^m (a_j!).$$

The proof of the theorem boils down to giving a good upper bound on the sum of the right hand side of (13) over the range  $\ell \leq \alpha n$ . More precisely, give good uniform upper bounds for the sum following the binomial coefficient  $\binom{n}{\ell}$  in the range above.

To do so, we set

$$(14) \quad C_m^\ell = \frac{m!}{(n-\ell)!} \sum_{\substack{a_1+a_2+\dots+a_m=n-\ell \\ a_1 \geq 2, \dots, a_m \geq 2}} \prod_{j=1}^m (a_j!).$$

For each  $m$ , consider the tuples  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$  in which exactly  $s$  of the  $a_i$  equals to 2. If  $s = m$ , then we have  $n - \ell$  is even,  $m = \frac{n-\ell}{2}$ , and  $\prod_{j=1}^m (a_j!) = 2^m = 2^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}$ , and we have  $C_{(n-\ell)/2}^\ell = \frac{2^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}}{(n-\ell)_{(n-\ell)/2}} \leq \left(\frac{4}{n-\ell}\right)^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}$ . Assume  $s < m$ . We can select the  $s$  indices for which  $a_i = 2$  in  $\binom{m}{s}$  ways, moreover, if  $a_j \neq 2$  we have  $a_j \geq 3$ . The number of tuples with exactly  $s$  of the  $a_i$  equals 2 (and consequently the remaining  $m - s$  terms are each at least 3 and add up to  $n - \ell - 2s$ ) is

$$\binom{m}{s} \binom{(n-\ell-2s) - 3(m-s) + (m-s) - 1}{(m-s) - 1} = \binom{m}{s} \frac{(n-\ell-2m-1)!}{(m-s-1)!(n-\ell-3m+s)!}.$$

As for any  $4 \leq r \leq q$  we have  $r!q! < (r-1)!(q+1)!$  and  $r+q = (r-1) + (q+1)$ , if for each  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$  where exactly  $s$  of the  $a_i$  equals to 2 we have that

$$\prod_{i=1}^m (a_i!) \leq 2^s (3!)^{m-s-1} (n-\ell-2s-3(m-s-1))! = 2^s 6^{m-s-1} (n-\ell-3m+s+3)!$$

and we must have  $n-\ell-3m+s+3 \geq 3$ , in other words  $\max(0, 3m-(n-\ell)) \leq s \leq m-1$ .

Therefore, when  $m \leq \lfloor \frac{n-\ell-1}{2} \rfloor$  we have

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} C_m^\ell &\leq \frac{m!}{(n-\ell)!} \sum_{s=\max(0, 3m-(n-\ell))}^{m-1} \frac{2^s 6^{m-s-1} \binom{m}{s} (n-\ell-2m-1)!}{(m-s-1)!(n-\ell-3m+s)!} (n-\ell-3m+s+3)! \\ &= \sum_{s=\max(0, 3m-(n-\ell))}^{m-1} \frac{2^s 6^{m-s-1} \binom{m}{s} m! (n-\ell-2m-1)! (n-\ell-3m+s+3)!}{(m-s-1)!(n-\ell)!(n-\ell-3m+s)!} \\ &= \sum_{s=\max(0, 3m-(n-\ell))}^{m-1} \frac{2^s 6^{m-s-1} \binom{m}{s} m_{s+1} (n-\ell-3m+s+3)_3}{(n-\ell)_{2m+1}} \end{aligned}$$

We want to bound the following quantity by breaking it up to 3 sums (where we keep in mind that  $\ell \leq \alpha n$ , and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ )

$$(16) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \sum_{m=2}^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor} C_m^\ell = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \sum_{m=2}^4 C_m^\ell + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \sum_{m=5}^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor} C_m^\ell + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \sum_{m=\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor} C_m^\ell.$$

**Case:**  $\frac{n-\ell}{3} < m \leq \lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor$ .

We have  $\binom{m}{s+1} \leq \lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor!$ ,  $(n-\ell-3m+s+3)_3 \leq n^3$ ,  $\sum_s 2^s 6^{m-s} \binom{m}{s} = 8^m < 8^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}$ . For

$\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor < m \leq \lfloor \frac{n-\ell-1}{2} \rfloor$  formula (15) gives

$$\begin{aligned} C_m^\ell &\leq \frac{n^3 \lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor! 8^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}}{(n-\ell)_{2\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor+1}} \leq \frac{n^3 8^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}}{(\lceil \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rceil)_{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{6} \rfloor+1}} \cdot \frac{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor!}{(n-\ell)_{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor}} < \frac{n^3 8^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}}{(\lceil \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rceil)_{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{6} \rfloor+1}} \\ &< \frac{n^3 8^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}}{\left(\frac{n-\ell}{3}\right)^{\frac{n-\ell}{6}}} < n^3 \left(\frac{3 \cdot 8^3}{n-\ell}\right)^{\frac{n-\ell}{6}} < n^3 \left(\frac{3 \cdot 8^3}{(1-\alpha)n}\right)^{\frac{n-\ell}{6}} \end{aligned}$$

and if  $\frac{n-\ell}{2}$  is an integer, then

$$C_{(n-\ell)/2}^\ell \leq \left(\frac{4}{n-\ell}\right)^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}} < \frac{n^3 8^{\frac{n-\ell}{2}}}{\left(\frac{n-\ell}{3}\right)^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{6} \rfloor}} < n^3 \left(\frac{3 \cdot 8^3}{(1-\alpha)n}\right)^{\frac{n-\ell}{6}}$$

and

$$\sum_{m=\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor+1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor} C_m^\ell < n^4 \left(\frac{3 \cdot 8^3}{(1-\alpha)n}\right)^{\frac{n-\ell}{6}}.$$

As the above quantity goes to 0 superexponentially fast as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$(17) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \binom{n}{\ell} \sum_{m=\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor+1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{2} \rfloor} C_m^\ell < 2^n n^4 \left(\frac{3 \cdot 8^3}{(1-\alpha)n}\right)^{\frac{n-\ell}{6}} = o\left(\frac{2^n}{n^2}\right).$$

**Case:**  $5 \leq m \leq \frac{n-\ell}{3}$ .

For  $\ell \leq \alpha n$  we have  $n-\ell \geq (1-\alpha)n > 7$  for large enough  $n$ , therefore for large enough  $n$  for  $0 \leq \ell \leq \alpha n$  we have  $\frac{n-\ell}{3} < \frac{n-\ell}{2}$ , and consequently  $s < m$ . As when  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\ell \leq \alpha n$  we have  $(n-\ell) \rightarrow \infty$ , for large enough  $n$  there is a constant  $K$  such that

$$\frac{(n-\ell-3m+s+3)_3}{(n-\ell)_{2m+1}} = \frac{(n-\ell-3m+s+3)_3}{(n-\ell-2m+2)_3} \cdot \frac{1}{(n-\ell)_{2m-2}} < \frac{K}{(n-\ell)_{2m-2}}.$$

As before,  $\sum_s 2^s 6^{m-s} \binom{m}{s} = 8^m$ , and  $s \leq m-1$ ,  $m \leq \frac{n-\ell}{3}$  together with (15) gives

$$\begin{aligned} C_m^\ell &\leq \frac{K \cdot 8^m \left(\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor\right)_m}{(n-\ell)_{2m-2}} = \frac{K \cdot 8^m}{(n-\ell)_{m-2}} \cdot \frac{\left(\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor\right)_m}{(n-\ell-m+2)_m} < \frac{K \cdot 8^m}{(n-\ell)_{m-2}} < \frac{K \cdot 8^m}{\left(\frac{n-\ell}{3}\right)^{m-2}} \\ &= 64K \left(\frac{24}{n-\ell}\right)^{m-2} < 64K \left(\frac{24}{(1-\alpha)n}\right)^{m-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we have for large enough  $n$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=5}^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor} C_m^\ell &\leq \sum_{5 \leq m \leq \frac{n-\ell}{3}} 64K \left(\frac{24}{(1-\alpha)n}\right)^{m-2} < 64K \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \left(\frac{24}{(1-\alpha)n}\right)^k \\ &= \frac{64 \cdot 24^3 K}{(1-\alpha)^3 n^3} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{24}{(1-\alpha)n}} < \frac{70 \cdot 24^3 K}{(1-\alpha)^3 n^3} \end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$(18) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \binom{n}{\ell} \sum_{m=5}^{\lfloor \frac{n-\ell}{3} \rfloor} C_m^\ell < 2^n \cdot \frac{70 \cdot 24^3 K}{(1-\alpha)^3 n^3} = o\left(\frac{2^n}{n^2}\right).$$

**Case:**  $2 \leq m \leq 4$

Again,  $s \leq m-1$ ,  $m \leq 4$  and as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n-\ell \rightarrow \infty$  there is a constant  $D$  such that

$$\frac{(m)_{s+1}(n-\ell-3m+s+3)_3}{(n-\ell)_{2m+1}} \leq \frac{m!(n-\ell-2m+2)^3}{(n-\ell-2m)^{2m+1}} = \frac{D}{(n-\ell-2m)^{2m-2}}$$

When  $2 \leq m \leq 4$ , by (15) we get  $C_{m,\ell} = O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2m-2}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)$ , and consequently

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \sum_{m=2}^4 C_m^\ell = O\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right).$$

Now (14) gives that

$$C_2^\ell = 2 \sum_{a_1=2}^{n-\ell-2} \frac{1}{\binom{n-\ell}{a_1}} \geq 2 \frac{1}{\binom{n-\ell}{2}} > \frac{8}{(n-\ell)^2} \geq \frac{8}{n^2}.$$

Now we get by any large deviation theorem and  $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$  that for large enough  $n$

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \binom{n}{\ell} \sum_{m=2}^4 C_m^\ell \geq \frac{8}{n^2} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \binom{n}{\ell} \geq \frac{8}{n^2} (1+o(1)) 2^n = \Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n^2}\right),$$

which gives

$$(19) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^{\alpha n} \binom{n}{\ell} \sum_{m=2}^4 C_m^\ell = \Theta\left(\frac{2^n}{n^2}\right).$$

Now (9) follows from (13), (14), (16), (17), (18) and (19).  $\square$

## 7. MORE THAN TWO TREES

In this section, we give some bounds for the number of coconvex characters on a collection of  $n$ -leaved trees using results from the theory of maximum agreement subtrees. Analogues of the quantities  $s_{n,k}$ ,  $c_{n,k}$ ,  $s_n$ ,  $c_n$  can clearly be defined for minimizing over  $t \geq 3$  semilabeled binary trees or caterpillars, and as in the introduction these analogous quantities will be denoted by  $s_{n,k}^{(t)}$ ,  $c_{n,k}^{(t)}$ ,  $s_n^{(t)}$ ,  $c_n^{(t)}$ .

**7.1. Agreement subtrees.** We first state some of the results from the theory of agreement forests. An *induced binary subtree*  $T|_Y$  of a semilabeled tree  $T$  induced by a subset of leaves  $Y$  is defined as follows: take the subtree induced by  $Y$  in  $T$ , and substitute paths in which all internal vertices have degree 2 by edges.  $T|_Y$  is a semilabeled binary tree, but its labels are from  $Y$ , not from  $[n]$ .

An important algorithmic problem, known as the *Maximum Agreement Subtree Problem*, is the following: given two semilabeled binary trees,  $T, F$ , find a common induced binary



subtree of the largest possible size. In other words, find a maximum size set  $Y \subseteq [n]$  such that  $T|_Y \simeq F|_Y$ . Somewhat surprisingly, this problem can be solved in polynomial time [23] (see also [8] and [14]). The maximum agreement subtree problem is closely related to the topic of this paper, and in part motivated it. Let  $\text{mast}(n)$  denote the smallest order (number of leaves, or vertices) of the maximum agreement subtree of two semilabeled trees with the same  $n$  leaves. In 1992, Kubicka, Kubicki, and McMorris [13] showed that  $d_1(\log \log n)^{1/2} < \text{mast}(n) < d_2 \log n$  with some explicit constants. After a long series of improvements, Markin [16] settled that  $\text{mast}(n) = \Theta(\log n)$ .

Similarly, one can define the size of the maximum agreement subtree of  $t$  trees,  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_t$ , denoted by  $\text{mast}(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_t)$ , and extend the extremal problem as

$$(20) \quad \text{mast}_t(n) = \min_n \text{mast}(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_t),$$

where  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_t$  are binary semilabeled trees on the same  $n$  leaves. One defines  $\text{mastcat}_t(n)$  as in (20), but the minimum is taken over  $t$ -tuples of caterpillar trees.

For caterpillar trees, there is always a substantially bigger agreement subtree. The reason is that a permutation always contains a  $\lfloor \sqrt{n-1} \rfloor$  length increasing or decreasing subsequence, due to the Erdős–Székere theorem on sequences. Assume without loss of generality that one of our caterpillar trees is  $T_{\text{id}_n}$ , described by the identity permutation, and the other by an arbitrary permutation  $\pi$ . Leaves labeled by the  $\lfloor \sqrt{n-1} \rfloor$  length increasing or decreasing subsequence give an agreement subtree.

We need asymptotic lower bounds for  $\text{mast}_t(n)$  and  $\text{mastcat}_t(n)$ . Here  $t$  is fixed and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The following bounds can be shown by induction from the cited result of Markin [16] and the observation above:

$$(21) \quad c \underbrace{\log \log \cdots \log n}_{t-1 \text{ times}} \leq \text{mast}_t(n) \text{ for some } c > 0 \text{ and}$$

$$(22) \quad n^{2^{1-t}} - t + 1 \leq \text{mastcat}_t(n).$$

**7.2. Application of agreement subtrees.** We show that with fixed number  $t$  of caterpillars or trees, for sufficiently large  $n$  and  $k$ , the trees still have a common partition in  $\Omega_n$ . Formally,

**Theorem 7.** *For every fixed  $t \geq 2$ , for every sufficiently large  $n$ , for all  $k$  with  $n - g_t(n) \leq k \leq n - 4$ ,*

$$s_{n,k}^{(t)} > \binom{n}{k-1};$$

*and for every  $t$ , for every sufficiently large  $n$ , for all  $k$  with  $n - f_t(n) \leq k \leq n - 4$ ,*

$$c_{n,k}^{(t)} > \binom{n}{k-1}.$$

*The choice  $f_t(n) = n^{2^{1-t}} - t + 1$  and  $g_t(n) = c' \underbrace{\log \log \cdots \log n}_{t-1 \text{ times}}$  with a certain  $c' > 0$  suffices.*

*Proof.* Any  $g_t(n) \leq \max\{s : \text{mast}_t(n) \geq 2s\}$  and  $f_t(n) \leq \max\{s : \text{mastcat}_t(n) \geq 2s\}$  functions suffice. Indeed, with the bounds for  $k$  we have  $4 \leq n - k \leq g_t(n)$  (resp.  $4 \leq n - k \leq f_t(n)$ ). Therefore with any  $t$  given trees (resp. caterpillars), we can select a size  $2(n - k)$  common subtree (resp. subcaterpillar) of them. From the leaves of that we can select  $n - k$  two-element common partition classes for the given  $t$  trees (caterpillars) of size  $n$ , while keeping the remaining  $2k - n$  leaves all singletons (note that the bounds imply that for sufficiently large  $n$  we have  $2k - n > 0$ ). This yields a partition of  $n$  elements into  $n - k$  (at least 2) doubletons and  $2k - n$  singletons, i.e., a partition into  $k$  classes. In view of (21) and (22), the limitation for  $k$  is sufficient.  $\square$

**Theorem 8.** *For every fixed  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{3}$ , and  $n$  sufficiently large, there are at most  $\lceil \frac{3}{\delta} \rceil - 2$  caterpillar trees with  $n$  leaves, such that for all  $k < (1 - \delta)n$ , there is no  $k$ -partition  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{Q}_n$  that is a common partition of these caterpillars. In other words, with the conditions above,*

$$c_{n,k}^{(3\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 2)} = \binom{n}{k-1}.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $m = \lceil 1/\delta \rceil$  and observe for large enough  $n$  we have  $3 \leq m < n$ . For  $i : 0 \leq i \leq m - 1$  let the block  $D_i$  be the set of integers in  $[n]$  that are  $i$  modulo  $m$ . Let  $\rho$  be an arbitrary permutation that lists the element of  $[n]$  in the order  $D_0, D_1, \dots, D_{m-1}$  (where the order within each block is arbitrary). Using  $\rho$ , we define a few more permutations:

- (i)  $\rho_i$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, m - 1$  is obtained from  $\rho$  by reversing the order among the elements of  $D_i$  and not changing anything else ( $m$  new permutations).
- (ii)  $\rho^{(0,i)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m - 2$  is obtained from  $\rho$  by interchanging the blocks  $D_0$  and  $D_i$  and not changing anything else ( $m - 2$  new permutations).
- (iii)  $\rho^{(i,m-1)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m - 2$  is obtained from  $\rho$  by interchanging the blocks  $D_i$  and  $D_{m-1}$  and not changing anything else ( $m - 2$  new permutations).

Create caterpillar trees  $T_\pi$  for permutations  $\pi$  of the form  $\text{id}_n$ ,  $\rho$ ,  $\rho_i$ ,  $\rho^{(0,i)}$  and  $\rho^{(i,m-1)}$ , a total of  $3m - 2$  trees.

**Claim 1.** *If  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{Q}_n$  is a common partition of the  $3m - 2$  trees above, then for every  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  there is an  $i$  such that  $P \subseteq D_i$ .*

*Proof.* The claim is trivially true for singletons, so we need to consider only partition classes of size at least 2. Let  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $|P| \geq 2$ , and let  $P' \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{P\}$  such that  $|P'| \geq 2$ . Since  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{Q}_n$ ,  $P'$  exists. Set  $H = \{j : P \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}$  and  $H' = \{j : P' \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}$ . Then  $H, H' \neq \emptyset$ . Assume to the contrary that  $|H| \geq 2$ , i.e.,  $\min(H) < \max(H)$ ; in particular  $1 \leq \max(H)$  and  $\min(H) \leq m - 2$ .

Choose an  $i$  such that  $P' \cap D_i \neq \emptyset$  (i.e.  $i \in H'$ ). Since  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T_\rho)$ , we must have  $i \leq \min(H)$  or  $i \geq \max(H)$ . If  $i \in \{\min(H), \max(H)\}$ , then both  $P \cap D_i$  and  $P' \cap D_i$  are non-empty, therefore  $\mathcal{P} \notin \mathfrak{P}(T_{\rho_i})$  (this uses the fact that  $|H| \geq 2$ ), which is a contradiction. Therefore  $i < \min(H)$  or  $i > \max(H)$ ; in particular we have  $0 < \min(H)$  or  $\max(H) < m - 1$ . We also must have  $\max(H') < \min(H)$  or  $\max(H) < \min(H')$ : this is trivially true when  $|H'| = 1$ , otherwise we can just exchange the role of  $P$  and  $P'$  in the previous argument. If  $0 \leq \max(H') < \min(H) \leq m - 2$ , then  $\mathcal{P} \notin \mathfrak{P}(T_{\rho^{(0,\min(H))}})$ , a contradiction.

If  $1 \leq \max(H) < \min(H') \leq m - 1$ , then  $\mathcal{P} \notin \mathfrak{P}(T_{\rho(\max(H), m-1)})$ , another contradiction. Therefore  $P$  cannot intersect more than one block, and the claim follows.  $\square$

To conclude the proof of the theorem, consider a common partition  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{Q}_n \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}$  of the  $3m - 2$  caterpillars, and let  $s$  be the number of size at least 2 partition classes of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $\{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$  be a standard listing of  $\mathcal{P}$ . By Claim 1 there is a sequence  $0 \leq q_1 < q_2 < \dots < q_s \leq m - 1$  such that for every  $j \in [s]$  we have  $P_j \subseteq D_{q_j}$ . By (8) we have for every  $i \in [s]$ ,  $\text{gap}(P_i) \geq (m - 1)(|P_i| - 1)$ , consequently  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{P}) \geq (m - 1)(n - |S(\mathcal{P})| - s)$ . As  $|S(\mathcal{P})| = k - s$ , we get  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{P}) \geq (m - 1)(n - k)$ . On the other hand, Lemma 4 (i) gives  $\text{gap}(\mathcal{P}) \leq |S(\mathcal{P})| = k - s$ . Comparison of these two results gives  $k - s \geq (m - 1)(n - k)$ , or equivalently

$$k \geq \frac{m-1}{m}n + \frac{s}{m} > \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right)n \geq (1 - \delta)n,$$

contradicting the assumption  $k < (1 - \delta)n$ .  $\square$

## 8. A NEW FAMILY OF TREE METRICS

We now present the application of coconvex characters mentioned in the introduction. Let  $n \geq 4$  and  $2 \leq k \leq n - 2$ . We define the  $k$ -character distance  $d_k(T, F)$  between two  $n$ -leaf trees  $T, F$  to be

$$d_k(T, F) = |(\mathfrak{P}(T) \Delta \mathfrak{P}(F)) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}|,$$

and the character distance  $d(T, F)$  to be

$$d(T, F) = |\mathfrak{P}(T) \Delta \mathfrak{P}(F)|.$$

We first show that  $d_k$  and  $d$  are both tree metrics.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $n \geq 4$ . Then for all  $2 \leq k \leq n - 2$ ,  $d_k$  is a metric on the  $n$ -leaf trees. Moreover,*

$$d(T, F) = \sum_{k=2}^{n-2} d_k(T, F),$$

and so  $d$  is also a metric on the collection of  $n$ -leaf trees.

*Proof.* As  $\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,1} = [n]$  and  $\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap (\mathfrak{P}_{n,n-1} \cup \mathfrak{P}_{n,n}) \subseteq \mathfrak{Q}_{n,0} \cup \mathfrak{Q}_{n,1}$ , it is clear that  $d(T, F) = \sum_{k=2}^{n-2} d_k(T, F)$ . So we only need to prove the statement concerning  $d_k$ .

Clearly,  $d_k(T, F) = d_k(F, T) \geq 0$ ,  $d_k(T, T) = 0$ , and, as  $|A \Delta B| + |B \Delta C| \geq |A \Delta C|$ ,  $d_k(\cdot, \cdot)$  satisfies the triangle inequality. Thus to show that  $d_k$  is a metric it suffices to show that for all  $n$ -leaved trees  $T \neq F$  we have  $d_k(T, F) > 0$ .

So, suppose that  $T, F$  are two trees with  $n$  leaves such that  $T \neq F$ . Then, in particular,  $n \geq 4$ , and so there are 4 leaves  $a, b, c, d$  such that the quartet subtrees spanned by these leaves in  $T$  and  $F$  are different. Assume without loss of generality that the bipartition corresponding to the central edge of the quartet in  $T$  is  $ab|cd$  while in  $F$  it is  $ac|bd$ . Let  $k$  be an integer satisfying  $2 \leq k \leq n - 2$ . Then  $0 \leq k - 2 \leq n - 4$ , and consequently we can select a  $k - 2$ -element subset  $A$  of  $[n] \setminus \{a, b, c, d\}$ . Let  $e_0$  be one of the edges in  $T$  that separates  $a, b$  from  $c, d$ , and let  $e_1, \dots, e_{k-2}$  be the leaf-edges of  $T$  incident to the elements

in  $A$ . Then removing  $\{e_i : i \in [k-2] \cup \{0\}\}$  from  $T$  generates a partition  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{Q}_{n,2}$ , where  $\mathcal{P} = \{C_1, C_2\} \cup \{\{a\} : a \in A\}$  and  $a, b \in C_1$ ,  $c, d \in C_2$ .

Now, consider the tree  $F$  and an edge  $f$  of  $F$ . The removal of  $f$  either does not separate  $a, b, c, d$ , or separates exactly one of  $a, b, c, d$  from the other three, or it puts  $a, c$  in one class and  $b, d$  in another class. Thus,  $\mathcal{P} \notin \mathfrak{P}(F)$ , showing that  $d_k(T, F) > 0$ .  $\square$

We now show that  $d_2$  and  $d_{n-2}$  are well known tree metrics. Recall that the Robinson-Foulds distance between two  $n$ -leaf trees is the number of bipartitions contained one but not both of the trees [18], and that the quartet distance is the number of 4-tuples of leaves that span different quartet trees in the two trees [25]. We will show that  $d_2$  is the Robinson-Foulds distance and  $d_{n-2}$  is the quartet distance on  $n$ -leaved trees. To this end, we shall employ the following useful observation.

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -leaf tree, and  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T)$ . Then*

- (i)  $|S(\mathcal{P})| \neq n - 1$ .
- (ii) *If  $|S(\mathcal{P})| \in \{n, n - 2, n - 3\}$ , then  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{Q}_{n,0} \cup \mathfrak{Q}_{n,1}$ .*
- (iii) *If  $|S(\mathcal{P})| \geq n - 3$ , then  $|S(\mathcal{P})| \geq 2|\mathcal{P}| - n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $j = |S(\mathcal{P})|$ , and  $k = |\mathcal{P}|$ . We have that  $j \leq k \leq n$ .

Since the partition classes of  $\mathcal{P}$  are disjoint and cover all elements of  $[n]$ ,  $j \neq n - 1$ , which is (i). If  $j \geq n - 3$ , then  $\mathcal{P}$  can have only one class with size bigger than 1 (as two such classes would cover at least 4 elements), which implies (ii). Moreover,

$$n = \left| \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P \right| \geq j + 2(k - j) = 2k - j,$$

i.e.  $j \geq 2k - j$ , which is (iii).  $\square$

**Proposition 11.**  *$d_2$  is the Robinson-Foulds distance on  $n$ -leaf trees and for  $n \geq 4$ ,  $d_{n-2}$  is the quartet distance.*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -leaf tree. Since elements in  $\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,2}$  are bipartitions,  $d_2$  is trivially the Robinson-Foulds distance.

Assume that  $n \geq 4$ . By Lemma 10, for any  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,n-2} \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n$  we have  $|S(\mathcal{P})| = n - 4$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{P}$  has exactly 2 partition classes of size exactly 2 and  $n - 4$  partition classes of size 1. Thus,  $\mathcal{P}$  can be obtained from  $T$  by removing the  $n - 4$  leaf-edges leading to the leaves corresponding to elements of  $S(\mathcal{P})$ , and removing an extra edge separating the remaining 4-leaves into two classes of size 2, i.e., these two classes form a bipartition induced by the central edge of a quartet tree. Hence  $d_{n-2}$  is the quartet distance.  $\square$

We conclude this section by explaining how the distance  $d_k$  related to the quantity  $s_{n,k}$ . As we cited before,  $|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}| = \binom{2n-k-1}{k-1}$  by [24]. Thus

$$d_k(T, F) = 2 \binom{2n-k-1}{k-1} - 2 |\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}|$$

and

$$d(T, F) = 2 \sum_{k=2}^{n-2} \binom{2n-k-1}{k-1} - 2 |\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F)|.$$

Therefore determining  $s_{n,k}$  is equivalent to finding the largest possible value of  $d_k$  over all possible pairs of  $n$ -leaved trees, that is, the *diameter* of  $d_k$ . As mentioned in the introduction, even though the diameter of the Robinson-Foulds distance is well-known to be  $2n - 6$  [25], there is a 40 year-old conjecture by Bandelt and Dress that concerns the asymptotics of the diameter of the quartet distance. Note also that various algorithms have been devised to compute the quartet distance (see e.g. [17]); it would be interesting to see if similar algorithms can be found for computing  $d_k$ .

## 9. OPEN PROBLEMS

Naturally defined combinatorial sequences are very frequently unimodal, consisting of an increasing run followed by a decreasing run, see [20]. Unimodality is often caused by log-concavity, i.e., the concavity of the sequence of the logarithms of the terms.

- (1) For two fixed  $n$ -leaf phylogenetic trees,  $T$  and  $F$ , is the sequence of the number of common partitions,  $|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k}|$ , unimodal for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ ? Is the sequence log-concave?
- (2) What is the answer of the previous question for the sequence of the number of *non-trivial* common partitions,  $|\mathfrak{P}(T) \cap \mathfrak{P}(F) \cap \mathfrak{P}_{n,k} \cap \mathfrak{Q}_n|$ ?
- (3) What is the answer for the analogue of the previous two questions for  $t > 2$  fixed  $n$ -leaf phylogenetic trees?
- (4) For a fixed  $n$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , are the sequences  $s_{n,k}$  and  $c_{n,k}$  unimodal? Log-concave?
- (5) For a fixed  $n$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ , are the sequences  $s_{n,k} - \binom{n}{k-1}$ ,  $c_{n,k} - \binom{n}{k-1}$  unimodal? Log-concave?
- (6) Assuming that for a fixed  $n$  the  $c_{n,k}$  sequence is unimodal, which is first  $k$  with  $c_{n,k} > \binom{n}{k-1}$ ? (In Theorems 5 and 2 we have shown  $n/3 < k < n/2 + 2$ .)
- (7) Show separation between  $s_{n,k}$  and  $c_{n,k}$  or show that  $s_{n,k} = c_{n,k}$ . (the above cited conjecture of Bandelt and Dress [2] and the results of Alon et al. [1] exhibit the difficulty of separating  $s_{n,n-2}$  from  $c_{n,n-2}$ .)
- (8) Show separation between  $s_n$  and  $c_n$  or show that they are equal.
- (9) Find the expected number of common  $k$ -partitions for two uniformly selected random semilabelled binary trees of size  $n$ .
- (10) Is it possible to strengthen Theorem 8? Is there a fixed  $t$  such that  $s_{n,k}^{(t)} = \binom{n}{k-1}$  for some large  $k$ ? (say for all  $k < n - f(n)$  for some  $f(n) = o(n)$  function.)
- (11) How fast we can compute the  $d_k$  distance of  $n$ -leaved phylogenetic trees? (Distance  $d_{n-2}$  can be computed in  $O(n \log n)$  time [7, 17].)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors SK and VM thank the Institut Mittag-Leffler for inviting them to the “Emerging Mathematical Frontiers in Molecular Evolution” conference, where they began to discuss coconvexity. Part of this work was done while EC, VM and LS were in residence at the Institute for Computational and Experimental Research in Mathematics (ICERM) in Providence (RI, USA) during the *Theory, Methods, and Applications of Quantitative Phylogenomics* program (supported by grant DMS-1929284 of the National Science Foundation (NSF)).

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. ALON, H. NAVES, AND B. SUDAKOV, *On the maximum quartet distance between phylogenetic trees*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, 30 (2016).
- [2] H.-J. BANDELT AND A. DRESS, *Reconstructing the shape of a tree from observed dissimilarity data*, Advances in Applied Mathematics, 7 (1986), pp. 309–343.
- [3] D. BOGDANOWICZ AND K. GIARO, *Comparing phylogenetic trees by matching nodes using the transfer distance between partitions*, Journal of Computational Biology, 24 (2017).
- [4] S. BRIAND, C. DESSIMOZ, N. EL-MABROUK, M. LAFOND, AND G. LOBINSKA, *A generalized robinson-fooulds distance for labeled trees*, BMC Genomics, 21 (2020).
- [5] G. CARDONA, A. MIR, F. ROSSELLÓ, L. ROTGER, AND D. SÁNCHEZ, *Cophenetic metrics for phylogenetic trees, after sokal and rohlf*, BMC Bioinformatics, 14 (2013), p. 3.
- [6] C. CHAUVE, C. COLIJN, AND L. ZHANG, *A vector representation for phylogenetic trees*, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B, 380 (2025).
- [7] B. DUDEK AND P. GAWRYCHOWSKI, *Computing quartet distance is equivalent to counting 4-cycles*, STOC 2019: Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, (2019), pp. 733–743.
- [8] W. GODDARD, E. KUBICKA, G. KUBICKI, AND F. MCMORRIS, *The agreement metric for labeled binary trees*, Mathematical Biosciences, 123 (1994), pp. 215–226.
- [9] K. S. JOHN, *Review paper: The shape of phylogenetic treespace*, Systematic Biology, 66 (2017), pp. e83–e94.
- [10] S. KELK AND R. MEUWESE, *Sharp upper and lower bounds on a restricted class of convex characters*, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, 29 (2022).
- [11] S. KELK, R. MEUWESE, AND S. WAGNER, *Convex characters, algorithms, and matchings*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, 38 (2024), pp. 380–411.
- [12] S. KELK AND G. STAMOULIS, *A note on convex characters, fibonacci numbers and exponential-time algorithms*, Advances in Applied Mathematics, 84 (2017), pp. 34–46.
- [13] E. KUBICKA, G. KUBICKI, AND F. MCMORRIS, *On agreement subtrees of two binary trees*, Congressus Numerantium, 88 (1992), pp. 217–224.
- [14] ———, *An algorithm to find agreement subtrees*, Journal of Classification, 12 (1995), pp. 91–99.
- [15] J. LOZANO-FERNANDEZ, *A practical guide to design and assess a phylogenomic study*, Genome Biology and Evolution, 14 (2022), p. evac129.
- [16] A. MARKIN, *On the extremal maximum agreement subtree problem*, Discrete Applied Mathematics, 285 (2020), pp. 612–620.
- [17] J. NIELSEN, A. K. KRISTENSEN, T. MAILUND, AND C. N. PEDERSEN, *A sub-cubic time algorithm for computing the quartet distance between two general trees*, Algorithms for Molecular biology, 6 (2011), pp. 1–8.
- [18] D. F. ROBINSON AND L. R. FOULDS, *Comparison of phylogenetic trees*, Mathematical Biosciences, 53 (1981), pp. 131–147.

- [19] C. SEMPLE AND M. STEEL, *Phylogenetics*, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [20] R. P. STANLEY, *Log-concave and unimodal sequences in algebra, combinatorics, and geometry*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 576 (1989), pp. 500–535.
- [21] M. STEEL, *The complexity of reconstructing trees from qualitative characters and subtrees*, Journal of Classification, 9 (1992), pp. 91–116.
- [22] M. STEEL, *Phylogeny: Discrete and Random Processes in Evolution*, SIAM, 2016.
- [23] M. STEEL AND T. WARNOW, *Kaikoura tree theorems: computing the maximum agreement subtree*, Information Processing Letters, 48 (1993), pp. 77–82.
- [24] M. A. STEEL, *The complexity of reconstructing trees from qualitative characters and subtrees*, Journal of Classification, 9 (1992), pp. 91–116.
- [25] M. A. STEEL AND D. PENNY, *Distributions of tree comparison metrics—some new results*, Systematic Biology, 42 (1993), pp. 126–141.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA