

Computing the Skewness of the Phylogenetic Mean Pairwise Distance in Linear Time

Constantinos Tsirogiannis and Brody Sandel

MADALGO* and Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, Denmark
{constant, brody.sandel}@cs.au.dk

Abstract. The phylogenetic Mean Pairwise Distance (MPD) is one of the most popular measures for computing the phylogenetic distance between a given group of species. More specifically, for a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} and for a set of species R represented by a subset of the leaf nodes of \mathcal{T} , the MPD of R is equal to the average cost of all possible simple paths in \mathcal{T} that connect pairs of nodes in R .

Among other phylogenetic measures, the MPD is used as a tool for deciding if the species of a given group R are closely related. To do this, it is important to compute not only the value of the MPD for this group but also the expectation, the variance, and the skewness of this metric. Although efficient algorithms have been developed for computing the expectation and the variance the MPD, there has been no approach so far for computing the skewness of this measure.

In the present work we describe how to compute the skewness of the MPD on a tree \mathcal{T} optimally, in $\Theta(n)$ time; here n is the size of the tree \mathcal{T} . So far this is the first result that leads to an exact, let alone efficient, computation of the skewness for any popular phylogenetic distance measure. Moreover, we show how we can compute in $\Theta(n)$ time several interesting quantities in \mathcal{T} that can be possibly used as building blocks for computing efficiently the skewness of other phylogenetic measures.

1 Introduction

Communities of co-occurring species may be described as “clustered” if species in the community tend to be close phylogenetic relatives of one another, or “overdispersed” if they are distant relatives [7]. To define these terms we need a function that measures the phylogenetic relatedness of a set of species, and also a point of reference for how this function should behave in the absence of ecological and evolutionary processes. One such function is the mean pairwise distance (MPD); given a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} and a subset of species R that are represented by leaf nodes of \mathcal{T} , the MPD of the species in R is equal to average cost of all possible simple paths that connect pairs of nodes in R .

To decide if the value of the MPD for a specific set of species R is large or small, we need to know the average value (expectation) of the MPD for all sets

* Center for Massive Data Algorithmics, a Center of the Danish National Research Foundation.

of species in \mathcal{T} that consist of exactly $r = |R|$ species. To judge how much larger or smaller is this value from the average, we also need to know the standard deviation of the MPD for all possible sets of r species in \mathcal{T} . Putting all these values together, we get the following index that expresses how clustered are the species in R [7]:

$$\text{NRI} = \frac{\text{MPD}(\mathcal{T}, R) - \text{expec}_{\text{MPD}}(\mathcal{T}, r)}{sd_{\text{MPD}}(\mathcal{T}, r)},$$

where $\text{MPD}(\mathcal{T}, R)$ is the value of the MPD for R in \mathcal{T} , and $\text{expec}(\mathcal{T})$ and $sd_{\text{MPD}}(\mathcal{T}, r)$ are the expected value and the standard deviation respectively of the MPD calculated over all subsets of r species in \mathcal{T} .

In a previous paper we presented optimal algorithms for computing the expectation and the standard deviation of the MPD of a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} in $\Theta(n)$ time, where n is the number of the edges of \mathcal{T} [5]. This enabled exact computations of these statistical moments of the MPD on large trees, which were previously infeasible using traditional slow and inexact resampling techniques. However, one important problem remained unsolved; quantifying our degree of confidence that the NRI value observed in a community reflects non-random ecological and evolutionary processes.

This degree of confidence is a statistical P value, that is the probability that we would observe an NRI value as extreme or more so if the community were randomly assembled. Traditionally, estimating P is accomplished by ranking the observed MPD against the distribution of randomized MPD values [3]. If the MPD falls far enough into one of the tails of the distribution (generally below the 2.5 percentile or above the 97.5 percentile, yielding $P < 0.05$), the community is said to be significantly overdispersed or significantly clustered. However, this approach relies on sampling a large number of random subsets of species in \mathcal{T} , and recomputing the MPD for each random subset. Therefore, this method is slow and imprecise.

We can approximate the P value of an observed NRI by assuming a particular distribution of the possible MPD values and evaluating its cumulative distribution function at the observed MPD. Because the NRI measures the difference between the observed values and expectation in units of standard deviations, this yields a very simple rule if we assume that possible MPD values are normally distributed: any NRI value larger than 1.96 or smaller than -1.96 is significant. Unfortunately, the distribution of MPD values is often skewed, such that this simple rule will lead to incorrect P value estimates [1,6]. Of particular concern, this skewness introduces a bias towards detecting either significant clustering or significant overdispersion [2]. Calculating this skewness analytically would enable us to remove this bias and improve the accuracy of P value estimates obtained analytically. However, so far there has been no result in the related literature that shows how to compute this skewness value.

Hence, given a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} and an integer r there is the need to design an efficient and exact algorithm that can compute the skewness of the MPD for r species in \mathcal{T} . This would provide the last critical piece required for

the adoption of a fully analytical and efficient approach for analysing ecological communities using the MPD and the NRI.

Our Results In the present work we tackle the problem of computing efficiently the skewness of the MPD. More specifically, given a tree \mathcal{T} that consists of n edges and a positive integer r , we prove that we can compute the skewness of the MPD over all subsets of r leaf nodes in \mathcal{T} optimally, in $\Theta(n)$ time. For the calculation of this skewness value we consider that every subset of exactly r species in \mathcal{T} is picked uniformly out of all possible subsets that have r species. The main contribution of this paper is a constructive proof that leads straightforwardly to an algorithm that computes the skewness of the MPD in $\Theta(n)$ time. This is clearly very efficient, especially if we consider that it outperforms the best algorithms that are known so far for computing lower-order statistics for other phylogenetic measures; for example the most efficient known algorithm for computing the variance of the popular Phylogenetic Distance (PD) runs in $O(n^2)$ time [5].

More than that, we prove how we can compute in $\Theta(n)$ time several quantities that are related with groups of paths in the given tree; these quantities can be possibly used as building blocks for computing efficiently the skewness (and other statistical moments) of phylogenetic measures that are similar to the MPD. Such an example is the measure which is the equivalent of the MPD for computing the distance between two subsets of species in \mathcal{T} [4].

The rest of this paper is, in its entirety, an elaborate proof for computing the skewness of the MPD on a tree \mathcal{T} in $\Theta(n)$ time. In the next section we define the problem that we want to tackle, and we present a group of quantities that we use as building blocks for computing the skewness of the MPD. We prove that all of these quantities can be computed in linear time with respect to the size of the input tree. In Section 3 we provide the main proof of this paper; there we show how we can express the value of the skewness of the MPD in terms of the quantities that we introduced earlier. The proof implies a straightforward linear time algorithm for the computation of the skewness as well.

2 Description of the Problem and Basic Concepts

Definitions and Notation Let \mathcal{T} be a phylogenetic tree, and let E be the set of its edges. We denote the number of the edges in \mathcal{T} by n , that is $n = |E|$. For an edge $e \in E$, we use w_e to indicate the weight of this edge. We use S to denote the set of the leaf nodes of \mathcal{T} . We call these nodes the *tips* of the tree, and we use s to denote the number of these nodes.

Since a phylogenetic tree is a rooted tree, for any edge $e \in E$ we distinguish the two nodes adjacent to e into a *parent* node and a *child* node; among these two, the parent node of e is the one for which the simple path from this node to the root does not contain e . We use $\text{Ch}(e)$ to indicate the set of edges whose parent node is the child node of e , which of course implies that $e \notin \text{Ch}(e)$. We indicate the edge whose child node is the parent node of e by $\text{parent}(e)$. For any

edge $e \in E$, tree $\mathcal{T}(e)$ is the subtree of \mathcal{T} whose root is the child node of edge e . We denote the set of tips that appear in $\mathcal{T}(e)$ as $S(e)$, and we denote the number of these tips by $s(e)$.

Given any edge $e \in E$, we partition the edges of \mathcal{T} into three subsets. The first subset consists of all the edges that appear in the subtree of e . We denote this set by $\text{Off}(e)$. The second subset consists of all edges $e' \in E$ for which e appears in the subtree of e' . We use $\text{Anc}(e)$ to indicate this subset. For the rest of this paper, we define that $e \in \text{Anc}(e)$, and that $e \notin \text{Off}(e)$. The third subset contains all the tree edges that do not appear neither in $\text{Off}(e)$, nor in $\text{Anc}(e)$; we indicate this subset by $\text{Ind}(e)$.

For any two tips $u, v \in S$, we use $p(u, v)$ to indicate the simple path in \mathcal{T} between these nodes. Of course, the path $p(u, v)$ is unique since \mathcal{T} is a tree. We use $\text{cost}(u, v)$ to denote the cost of this path, that is the sum of the weights of all the edges that appear on the path. Let u be a tip in S and let e be an edge in E . We use $\text{cost}(u, e)$ to represent the cost of the shortest simple path between u and the child node of e . Therefore, if $u \in S(e)$ this path does not include e , otherwise it does. For any subset $R \subseteq S$ of the tips of the tree \mathcal{T} , we denote the set of all pairs of elements in R , that is the set of all combinations that consist of two distinct tips in R , by $\Delta(R)$. Given a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} and a subset of its tips $R \subseteq S$, we denote the Mean Pairwise Distance of R in \mathcal{T} by $\text{MPD}(\mathcal{T}, R)$. Let $r = |R|$. This measure is equal to:

$$\text{MPD}(\mathcal{T}, R) = \frac{2}{r(r-1)} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(R)} \text{cost}(u, v) .$$

2.1 Aggregating the Costs of Paths

Let \mathcal{T} be a phylogenetic tree that consists of n edges and s tips, and let r be a positive integer such that $r \leq s$. We use $\text{sk}(\mathcal{T}, r)$ to denote the skewness of the MPD on \mathcal{T} when we pick a subset of r tips of this tree with uniform probability. In the rest of this paper we describe in detail how we can compute $\text{sk}(\mathcal{T}, r)$ in $O(n)$ time, by scanning \mathcal{T} only a constant number of times. Based on the formal definition of the concept of skewness, the value of $\text{sk}(\mathcal{T}, r)$ is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sk}(\mathcal{T}, r) &= E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S, r)} \left[\left(\frac{\text{MPD}(\mathcal{T}, R) - \text{expec}(\mathcal{T}, r)}{\text{var}(\mathcal{T}, r)} \right)^3 \right] \\ &= \frac{E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S, r)} [\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)] - 3 \cdot \text{var}(\mathcal{T}, r)^2 - \text{expec}(\mathcal{T}, r)^3}{\text{var}(\mathcal{T}, r)^3} , \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{expec}(\mathcal{T}, r)$ and $\text{var}(\mathcal{T}, r)$ are the expectation and the variance of the MPD for subsets of exactly r tips in \mathcal{T} , and $E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S, r)}[\cdot]$ denotes the function of the expectation over all subsets of exactly r tips in S . In a previous paper, we showed how we can compute the expectation and the variance of the MPD on \mathcal{T} in $O(n)$ time [5]. Therefore, in the rest of this work we focus on analysing

the value $E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)]$ and expressing this quantity in a way that can be computed efficiently, in linear time with respect to the size of \mathcal{T} .

To make things more simple, we break the description of our approach into two parts; in the first part, we define several quantities that come from adding and multiplying the costs of specific subsets of paths between tips of the tree. We also present how we can compute all these quantities in $O(n)$ time in total by scanning \mathcal{T} a constant number of times. Then, in Section 3, we show how we can express the skewness of the MPD on \mathcal{T} based on these quantities, and hence compute the skewness in $O(n)$ time as well. Next we provide the quantities that we want to consider in our analysis; these quantities are described in Table 1.

Table 1. The quantities that we use for expressing the skewness of the MPD.

I) $\text{TC}(\mathcal{T}) = \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u, v)$	II) $\text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) = \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^3(u, v)$
III) $\forall e \in E, \text{TC}(e) = \sum_{\substack{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S) \\ e \in p(u,v)}} \text{cost}(u, v)$	IV) $\forall e \in E, \text{SQ}(e) = \sum_{\substack{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S) \\ e \in p(u,v)}} \text{cost}^2(u, v)$
V) $\forall e \in E, \text{Mult}(e) = \sum_{\substack{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S) \\ e \in p(u,v)}} \text{TC}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(v)$	VI) $\forall u \in S, \text{SM}(u) = \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}(u, v) \cdot \text{TC}(v)$
VII) $\forall e \in E, \text{TC}_{\text{sub}}(e) = \sum_{u \in S(e)} \text{cost}(u, e)$	VIII) $\forall e \in E, \text{SQ}_{\text{sub}}(e) = \sum_{u \in S(e)} \text{cost}^2(u, e)$
IX) $\forall e \in E, \text{PC}(e) = \sum_{u \in S} \text{cost}(u, e)$	X) $\forall e \in E, \text{PSQ}(e) = \sum_{u \in S} \text{cost}^2(u, e)$
XI) $\forall e \in E, \text{QD}(e) = \sum_{u \in S(e)} \left(\sum_{v \in S(e) \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}(u, v) \right)^2$	

For any tip $u \in S$, we define that $\text{SQ}(u) = \text{SQ}(e)$, and $\text{TC}(u) = \text{TC}(e)$, where e is the edge whose child node is u . The proof of the following lemma is provided in the full version of this paper.

Lemma 1. *Given a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} that consists of n edges, we can compute all the quantities that are presented in Table 1 in $O(n)$ time in total.*

3 Computing the Skewness of the MPD

In the previous section we defined the problem of computing the skewness of the MPD for a given phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} . Given a positive integer $r \leq s$, we showed that to solve this problem efficiently it remains to find an efficient algorithm for computing $E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)]$; this is the mean value of the cube of the MPD among all possible subsets of tips in \mathcal{T} that consist of exactly r elements. To compute this efficiently, we introduced in Table 1 ten different quantities which we want to use in order to express this mean value. In Lemma 1 we proved that these quantities can be computed in $O(n)$ time, where n is the size of \mathcal{T} .

Next we prove how we can calculate the value for the mean of the cube of the MPD based on the quantities in Table 1. In particular, in the proof of

the following lemma we show how the value $E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)]$ can be written analytically as an expression that contains the quantities in Table 1. This expression can then be straightforwardly evaluated in $O(n)$ time, given that we have already computed the aforementioned quantities ¹.

Lemma 2. *For any given natural $r \leq s$, we can compute $E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)]$ in $\Theta(n)$ time.*

Proof. The expectation of the cube of the MPD is equal to:

$$E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)] = \frac{8}{r^3(r-1)^3} \cdot E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)} \left[\sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(R)} \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \Delta(R)} \sum_{\{c,d\} \in \Delta(R)} \text{cost}(u,v) \cdot \text{cost}(x,y) \cdot \text{cost}(c,d) \right].$$

From the last expression we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)} \left[\sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(R)} \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \Delta(R)} \sum_{\{c,d\} \in \Delta(R)} \text{cost}(u,v) \cdot \text{cost}(x,y) \cdot \text{cost}(c,d) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \Delta(S)} \sum_{\{c,d\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \cdot \text{cost}(x,y) \cdot \text{cost}(c,d) \cdot \\ & \quad E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[AP_R(u,v,x,y,c,d)], \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $AP_R(u,v,x,y,c,d)$ is a random variable whose value is equal to one in the case that $u,v,x,y,c,d \in R$, otherwise it is equal to zero. For any six tips $u,v,x,y,c,d \in S$, which may not be all of them distinct, we use $\theta(u,v,x,y,c,d)$ to denote the number of distinct elements among these tips. Let t be an integer, and let $(t)_k$ denote the k -th falling factorial power of t , which means that $(t)_k = t(t-1) \dots (t-k+1)$. For the expectation of the random variables that appear in the last expression it holds that:

$$E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[AP_R(u,v,x,y,c,d)] = \frac{(r)^{\theta(u,v,x,y,c,d)}}{(s)^{\theta(u,v,x,y,c,d)}} \tag{3}$$

Notice that in (3) we have $2 \leq \theta(u,v,x,y,c,d) \leq 6$. The value of the function $\theta(\cdot)$ cannot be smaller than two in the above case because we have that $u \neq v$, $x \neq y$, and $c \neq d$. Thus, we can rewrite (2) as:

$$\sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \Delta(S)} \sum_{\{c,d\} \in \Delta(S)} \frac{(r)^{\theta(u,v,x,y,c,d)}}{(s)^{\theta(u,v,x,y,c,d)}} \cdot \text{cost}(u,v) \cdot \text{cost}(x,y) \cdot \text{cost}(c,d) \tag{4}$$

¹ Because the full form of this expression is very long (it consists of a large number of terms), we have chosen not to include it in the definition of the following lemma. We chose to do so because we considered that including the entire expression would not make this work more readable. In any case, the full expression can be easily inferred from the proof of the lemma

Hence, our goal now is to compute a sum whose elements are the product of costs of triples of paths. Recall that for each of these paths, the end-nodes of the path are a pair of distinct tips in the tree. Although the end-nodes of each path are distinct, in a given triple the paths may share one or more end-nodes with each other. Therefore, the distinct tips in any triple of paths may vary from two up to six tips. Indeed, in (4) we get a sum where the triples of paths in the sum are partitioned in five groups; a triple of paths is assigned to a group depending on the number of distinct tips in this triple. In (4) the sum for each group of triples is multiplied by the same factor $(r)^{\theta(u,v,x,y,c,d)}/(s)^{\theta(u,v,x,y,c,d)}$, hence we have to calculate the sum for each group of triples separately.

However, when we try to calculate the sum for each of these groups of triples we see that this calculation is more involved; some of these groups of triples are divided into smaller subgroups, depending on which end-nodes of the paths in each triple are the same. To explain this better, we can represent a triple of paths schematically as a graph; let $\{u, v\}, \{x, y\}, \{c, d\} \in \Delta(S)$ be three pairs of tips in \mathcal{T} . As mentioned already, the tips within each pair are distinct, but tips between different pairs can be the same. We represent the similarity between




Fig. 1. (a) A phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} and (b) an example of the tripartite graph induced by the triplet of its tip pairs $\{\alpha, \gamma\}, \{\delta, \gamma\}, \{\epsilon, \delta\}$, where $\{\alpha, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon\} \subset S$. The dashed lines in the graph distinguish the partite subsets of vertices; the vertices of each partite subset correspond to tips of the same pair.

tips of these three pairs as a graph of six vertices. Each vertex in the graph corresponds to a tip of these three pairs. Also, there exists an edge in this graph between two vertices if the corresponding tips are the same. Thus, this graph is tripartite; no vertices that correspond to tips of the same pair can be connected to each other with an edge. Hence, we have a tripartite graph where each partite set of vertices consists of two vertices—see Fig. 1 for an example.

For any triple of pairs of tips $\{u, v\}, \{x, y\}, \{c, d\} \in \Delta(S)$ we denote the tripartite graph that corresponds to this triple by $G[u, v, x, y, c, d]$. We call this graph the *similarity* graph of this triple. Based on the way that similarities may occur between tips in a triple of paths, we can partition the five groups of triples in (4) into smaller subgroups. Each of these subgroups contains triples whose similarity graphs are isomorphic. For a tripartite graph that consists of three partite sets of two vertices each, there can be eight different isomorphism classes. Therefore, the five groups of triples are partitioned into eight subgroups. Figure 2 illustrates the eight isomorphism classes that exist for the specific kind

of tripartite graphs that we consider. Since we refer to isomorphism classes, each of the graphs in Fig. 2 represents the combinatorial structure of the similarities between three pairs of tips, and it does not correspond to a particular planar embedding, or ordering of the tips.




Fig. 2. The eight isomorphism classes of a tripartite graph of 3×2 vertices that represent schematically the eight possible cases of similarities between tips that we can have when we consider three paths between pairs of tips in a tree \mathcal{T} .

Let X be any isomorphism class that is illustrated in Figure 2. We denote the set of all triples of pairs in $\Delta(S)$ whose similarity graphs belong to this class by \mathcal{B}_X . More formally, the set \mathcal{B}_X can be defined as follows :

$$\mathcal{B}_X = \{ \{ \{u, v\}, \{x, y\}, \{c, d\} \} : \{u, v\}, \{x, y\}, \{c, d\} \in \Delta(S) \\ \text{and } G[u, v, x, y, c, d] \text{ belongs to class } X \text{ in Figure 2} \} .$$

We introduce also the following quantity:

$$\text{TRS}(X) = \sum_{\{ \{u, v\}, \{x, y\}, \{c, d\} \} \in \mathcal{B}_X} \text{cost}(u, v) \cdot \text{cost}(x, y) \cdot \text{cost}(c, d) .$$

Hence, we can rewrite (4) as follows:

$$\frac{\binom{r}{2}}{\binom{s}{2}} \cdot \text{TRS}(A) + 3 \cdot \frac{\binom{r}{3}}{\binom{s}{3}} \cdot \text{TRS}(B) + 6 \cdot \frac{\binom{r}{3}}{\binom{s}{3}} \cdot \text{TRS}(C) + 6 \cdot \frac{\binom{r}{4}}{\binom{s}{4}} \cdot \text{TRS}(D) \\ + 3 \cdot \frac{\binom{r}{4}}{\binom{s}{4}} \cdot \text{TRS}(E) + 6 \cdot \frac{\binom{r}{4}}{\binom{s}{4}} \cdot \text{TRS}(F) + 6 \cdot \frac{\binom{r}{5}}{\binom{s}{5}} \cdot \text{TRS}(G) + 6 \cdot \frac{\binom{r}{6}}{\binom{s}{6}} \cdot \text{TRS}(H) \quad (5)$$

Notice that some of the terms $\frac{\binom{r}{i}}{\binom{s}{i}} \cdot \text{TRS}(X)$ in (5) are multiplied with an extra constant factor. This happens for the following reason; the sum in $\text{TRS}(X)$ counts each triple once for every different combination of three pairs of tips. However, in the triple sum in (4) some triples appear more than once. For example, every triple that belongs in class B appears three times in (4), hence there is an extra factor three in front of $\text{TRS}(B)$ in (5).

To compute efficiently $E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S, r)}[\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)]$, it remains to compute efficiently each value $\text{TRS}(X)$ for every isomorphism class X that is presented in Figure 2. Next we show in detail how we can do that by expressing each quantity $\text{TRS}(X)$ as a function of the quantities that appear in Table 1.

For the triples that correspond to the isomorphism class A we have:

$$\text{TRS}(A) = \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^3(u,v) = \text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) .$$

For $\text{TRS}(B)$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TRS}(B) &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^2(u,v) \left(\sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}(u,x) + \sum_{y \in S \setminus \{v\}} \text{cost}(v,y) - 2 \cdot \text{cost}(u,v) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^2(u,v) (\text{TC}(u) + \text{TC}(v) - 2 \cdot \text{cost}(u,v)) \\ &= \sum_{u \in S} \text{SQ}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(u) - 2 \cdot \text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) . \end{aligned}$$

The quantity $\text{TRS}(C)$ is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{6} \sum_{u \in S} \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \\ &= \frac{1}{6} \sum_{e \in E} w_e \sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S - S(e)} \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) . \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For any $e \in E$ we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S - S(e)} \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \\ &= \sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{u\}} \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \quad (7) \\ &- 2 \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) . \quad (7b) \end{aligned}$$

The first of the two sums in (7) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{u\}} \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \\ &= \sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{u\}} \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,v) \cdot \text{cost}(v,x) \\ &= \sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{u\}} (\text{cost}(u,v) \cdot \text{TC}(v) - \text{cost}^2(u,v)) \\ &= \sum_{u \in S(e)} \text{SM}(u) - \text{SQ}(u) . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

According to Lemma 2, we can compute $\text{SM}(u)$ and $\text{SQ}(u)$ for all tips $u \in S$ in linear time with respect to the size of \mathcal{T} . Given these values, we can compute $\sum_{u \in S(e)} \text{SM}(u) - \text{SQ}(u)$ for every edge $e \in E$ in \mathcal{T} with a single bottom-up scan of the tree. For any edge e in E , the second sum in (7b) is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \\ &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S(e) \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$+ \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) . \quad (9b)$$

We can express the first sum in (9) as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S(e) \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S(e)} \left(\sum_{v \in S(e) \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}(u,v) \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S(e) \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}^2(u,v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{QD}(e) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S(e) \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}^2(u,v) . \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The last sum in (10) is equal to:

$$\sum_{u \in S(e)} \sum_{v \in S(e) \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}^2(u,v) = \sum_{u \in S(e)} \text{SQ}(u) - \text{SQ}(e) . . \quad (11)$$

The value of the sum $\sum_{u \in S(e)} \text{SQ}(u)$ can be computed for every edge e in $\Theta(n)$ time in total as follows; for every tip $u \in S$ we store $\text{SQ}(u)$ together with this tip, and then scan bottom-up the tree adding those values that are in the subtree of each edge. For the remaining part of (9b) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \\ &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} (\text{cost}(u,e) + \text{cost}(x,e)) (\text{cost}(v,e) + \text{cost}(x,e)) \\ &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}(u,e) \cdot \text{cost}(v,e) \\ &+ \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}(x,e) \cdot (\text{cost}(u,e) + \text{cost}(v,e)) \\ &+ \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}^2(x,e) . \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The first sum in (12) is equal to:

$$\sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}(u, e) \cdot \text{cost}(v, e) = (s - s(e)) (\text{TC}_{\text{sub}}^2(e) - \text{SQ}_{\text{sub}}(e)) . \quad (13)$$

For the second sum in (12) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}(x, e) \cdot (\text{cost}(u, e) + \text{cost}(v, e)) \\ &= (s(e) - 1) \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}(x, e) \cdot \text{TC}_{\text{sub}}(e) = (s(e) - 1) \cdot \text{TC}_{\text{sub}}(e) \cdot (\text{PC}(e) - \text{TC}_{\text{sub}}(e)) . \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The last sum in (12) can be written as:

$$\sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S(e))} \sum_{x \in S \setminus S(e)} \text{cost}^2(x, e) = \frac{s(e)(s(e) - 1)}{2} (\text{PSQ}(e) - \text{SQ}_{\text{sub}}(e)) . \quad (15)$$

Combining the analyses that we did from (6) up to (15) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TRS}(C) &= \frac{1}{6} \sum_{e \in E} w_e \sum_{u \in S(e)} \left(\text{SM}(u) - \frac{3}{2} \text{SQ}(u) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{QD}(e) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{SQ}(e) \\ &+ (s - 2s(e) + 1) \cdot \text{TC}_{\text{sub}}^2(e) - \frac{2s - 2 \cdot s(e) + s(e)(s(e) - 1)}{2} \cdot \text{SQ}_{\text{sub}}(e) \\ &+ (s(e) - 1) \cdot \text{TC}_{\text{sub}}(e) \cdot \text{PC}(e) + \frac{s(e)(s(e) - 1)}{2} \cdot \text{PSQ}(e) . \end{aligned}$$

The value of $\text{TRS}(D)$ can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{u \in S} \sum_{\substack{v, x, y \in S \setminus \{u\} \\ v, x, y \text{ are distinct}}} \text{cost}(u, v) \cdot \text{cost}(u, x) \cdot \text{cost}(u, y) \\ &= \frac{1}{6} \left(\sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}^3(u) - 2 \cdot \text{TRS}(A) - 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(B) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{6} \cdot \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}^3(u) + \frac{2}{3} \cdot \text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{SQ}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(u) . \end{aligned}$$

For $\text{TRS}(E)$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \Delta(S \setminus \{u,v\})} \text{cost}^2(u, v) \cdot \text{cost}(x, y) \\ &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^2(u, v) (\text{TC}(\mathcal{T}) - \text{TC}(u) - \text{TC}(v) + \text{cost}(u, v)) \\ &= \text{TC}(\mathcal{T}) \sum_{e \in E} w_e \cdot \text{TC}(e) - \sum_{u \in S} (\text{SQ}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(u)) + \text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) . \end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite $\text{TRS}(F)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \left(\text{TC}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(v) - \text{cost}^2(u,v) - \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{cost}(x,v) \right) \\
&= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \cdot \text{TC}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(v) - \text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) - 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(C) \\
&= \sum_{e \in E} w_e \cdot \text{Mult}(e) - \text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) - 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(C) .
\end{aligned}$$

For the value of $\text{TRS}(G)$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{TRS}(G) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} (\text{cost}(u,x) + \text{cost}(v,x)) \left(\text{TC}(\mathcal{T}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \text{TC}(u) - \text{TC}(v) - \text{TC}(x) + \text{cost}(u,v) + \text{cost}(u,x) + \text{cost}(v,x) \right) .
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

We now break the sum in (16) into five pieces and express each piece of this sum in terms of the quantities in Table 1. The first piece of the sum is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} (\text{cost}(u,x) + \text{cost}(v,x)) \cdot \text{TC}(\mathcal{T}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{TC}(\mathcal{T}) \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}^2(u) - \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^2(u,v) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{TC}(\mathcal{T}) \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}^2(u) - \sum_{e \in E} w_e \cdot \text{TC}(e) .
\end{aligned}$$

The second piece that we take from the sum in (16) can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} (\text{cost}(u,x) + \text{cost}(v,x)) (\text{TC}(u) + \text{TC}(v)) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) (\text{TC}(u) + \text{TC}(v) - 2 \cdot \text{cost}(u,v)) (\text{TC}(u) + \text{TC}(v)) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \left(\text{TC}^2(u) + \text{TC}^2(v) + 2 \cdot \text{TC}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(v) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \cdot \text{cost}(u,v) \cdot (\text{TC}(u) + \text{TC}(v)) \right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}^3(u) - \sum_{\{v,x\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(v,x) \cdot \text{TC}(v) \cdot \text{TC}(x) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\{y,z\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^2(y,z) (\text{TC}(y) + \text{TC}(z)) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}^3(u) - \sum_{e \in E} w_e \cdot \text{Mult}(e) + \sum_{u \in S} \text{SQ}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(u) . \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

The next piece that we select from (16) is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} (\text{cost}(u,x) + \text{cost}(v,x)) \cdot \text{TC}(x) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}(u,x) \cdot \text{TC}(x) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{u\}} \text{cost}^2(u,v) \cdot \text{TC}(v) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}(u) \cdot \text{SM}(u) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^2(u,v) (\text{TC}(u) + \text{TC}(v)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}(u) (\text{SQ}(u) - \text{SM}(u)) . \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

For the fourth piece of the sum in (16) we get:

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}^2(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} \text{cost}(u,x) + \text{cost}(v,x) \tag{19}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{TRS}(B) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \text{SQ}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(u) - \text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) . \tag{20}$$

The last piece of the sum in (16) can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} (\text{cost}(u,x) + \text{cost}(v,x))^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \sum_{x \in S \setminus \{u,v\}} (\text{cost}^2(u,x) + \text{cost}^2(v,x)) + 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(C) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) (\text{SQ}(u) + \text{SQ}(v) - 2 \cdot \text{cost}^2(u,v)) + 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(C) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \text{SQ}(u) \cdot \text{TC}(u) - \text{CB}(\mathcal{T}) + 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(C) . \tag{21}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining our analyses from (16) up to (21) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{TRS}(G) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{TC}(\mathcal{T}) \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}^2(u) - \sum_{e \in E} w_e (\text{TC}(e) + \text{Mult}(e)) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in S} \text{TC}(u) \cdot (5 \cdot \text{SQ}(u) - \text{SM}(u) - \text{TC}^2(u)) - 2 \cdot \text{CB}(T) + 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(C) .
\end{aligned}$$

We can express $\text{TRS}(H)$ using the values of the other isomorphism classes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{TRS}(H) &= \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \Delta(S)} \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \Delta(S)} \sum_{\{c,d\} \in \Delta(S)} \text{cost}(u,v) \cdot \text{cost}(x,y) \cdot \text{cost}(c,d) \\
&\quad - \text{TRS}(A) - 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(B) - 6 \cdot \text{TRS}(C) - 6 \cdot \text{TRS}(D) \\
&\quad - 3 \cdot \text{TRS}(E) - 6 \cdot \text{TRS}(F) - 6 \cdot \text{TRS}(G) \\
&= \frac{1}{6} \cdot \text{TC}^3(\mathcal{T}) - \frac{1}{6} \cdot \text{TRS}(A) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{TRS}(B) - \text{TRS}(C) - \text{TRS}(D) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{TRS}(E) - \text{TRS}(F) - \text{TRS}(G) .
\end{aligned}$$

We get the value of $E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)]$ by plugging into (5) the values that we got for all eight isomorphism classes of triples. For any isomorphism class X we showed that the value $\text{TRS}(X)$ can be computed by using the quantities in Table 1. The lemma follows from the fact that each quantity that appears in this table is used a constant number of times for computing value $\text{TRS}(X)$ for any class X , and since we showed that we can precompute all these quantities in $\Theta(n)$ time in total. \square

Theorem 1. *Let \mathcal{T} be a phylogenetic tree that contains s tips, and let r be a natural number with $r \leq s$. The skewness of the mean pairwise distance on \mathcal{T} among all subsets of exactly r tips of \mathcal{T} can be computed in $\Theta(n)$ time.*

Proof. According to the definition of skewness, as it is also presented in (1), we need to prove that we can compute in $\Theta(n)$ time the expectation and the variance of the MPD, and the value of the expression $E_{R \in \text{Sub}(S,r)}[\text{MPD}^3(\mathcal{T}, R)]$. In a previous paper we showed that the expectation and the variance of the MPD can be computed in $\Theta(n)$ time. By combining this with Lemma 2 we get the proof of the theorem. \square

References

1. Cooper,N., Rodríguez,J., Purvis,A.: A Common Tendency for Phylogenetic Overdispersion in Mammalian Assemblages. In: Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, vol. 275, pp. 2031–2037 (2008)
2. Harmon-Threatt,A.N., AckerlyD.D.: Filtering Across Spatial Scales: Phylogeny, Biogeography and Community Structure in Bumble Bees. PLoS ONE 8:e60446, (2013)
3. PontarpM., Canbäck,B., Tunlid,A., Lundberg,P.: Phylogenetic Analysis Suggests that Habitat Filtering Is Structuring Marine Bacterial Communities Across the Globe. Microbial Ecology 64, 8–17 (2012)
4. Swenson,N.G.: Phylogenetic Beta Diversity Metrics. Trait Evolution and Inferring the Functional Beta Diversity of Communities. PLoS ONE 6(6):e21264, (2011)
5. Tsirogiannis,C., Sandel,B. Cheliotis,D.: Efficient Computation of Popular Phylogenetic Tree Measures. In: Proc. Workshop on Algorithms in Bioinformatics (WABI), pp. 30–43 (2012)
6. Vamosi,J.C., VamosiS.M.: Body Size, Rarity, and Phylogenetic Community Structure: Insights from Diving Beetle Assemblages of Alberta. Diversity and Distributions 13, 1–10 (2007)
7. Webb,C.O., Ackerly,D.D., McPeck,M.A., Donoghue,M.J.: Phylogenies and Community Ecology. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 33, 475–505 (2002)