

VALID PLANE TREES: COMBINATORIAL MODELS FOR RNA SECONDARY STRUCTURES WITH WATSON-CRICK BASE PAIRS

FRANCIS BLACK, ELIZABETH DRELLICH, AND JULIANNA TYMOCZKO

ABSTRACT. The combinatorics of RNA plays a central role in biology. Mathematical biologists have several commonly-used models for RNA: words in a fixed alphabet (representing the primary sequence of nucleotides) and plane trees (representing the secondary structure, or folding of the RNA sequence). This paper considers an augmented version of the standard model of plane trees, one that incorporates some observed constraints on how the folding can occur. In particular we assume the alphabet consists of complementary pairs, for instance the Watson-Crick pairs A-U and C-G of RNA.

Given a word in the alphabet, a valid plane tree is a tree for which, when the word is folded around the tree, each edge matches two complementary letters. Consider the graph whose vertices are valid plane trees for a fixed word and whose edges are given by Condon, Heitsch, and Hoos's local moves. We prove this graph is connected.

We give an explicit algorithm to construct a valid plane tree from a primary sequence, assuming that at least one valid plane tree exists. The tree produced by our algorithm has other useful characterizations, including a uniqueness condition defined by local moves. We also study enumerative properties of valid plane trees, analyzing how the number of valid plane trees depends on the choice of sequence length and alphabet size. Finally we show that words with at least one valid plane tree are unusual, in the sense that the proportion of words with at least one valid plane tree goes to zero as the word size increases. Open questions and conjectures are given throughout the document.

1. INTRODUCTION

DNA has as its core a fundamental combinatorial object: words in a finite sequence, on which permutations act, with biologically significant output. Until fairly recently RNA was considered a mute cousin of DNA, important primarily as a stepping stone. Unlike the famous double helix, it has a single strand. Because this strand has many nucleotides, it tends to fold onto itself like a too-long piece of tape. The base pairs created by this folding define secondary structure. And it turns out that these secondary structures (and the tertiary structures—namely the embedding of the secondary structure into 3-dimensional space) determine many other functional aspects of RNA, for instance whether RNA transcribes and interprets the code in DNA, builds proteins, sends messages, or even even rewrites genetic code.

In this paper we study a combinatorial model for RNA secondary structures consisting of *plane trees*, which are rooted planar trees whose half-edges are ordered counterclockwise from the root, like those shown in Figure 1. The plane tree model is well-established [JS14, Rus13, HSS98] and plane trees are conveniently one of the many sets of objects enumerated by the Catalan numbers [ALW14, McC06]. Though other sets enumerated by Catalan numbers—including non-crossing matchings and balanced parentheses—are also

used by mathematical biologists to model RNA secondary structures, plane trees have the advantage of depicting a simplified shape of the observed RNA secondary structure.

However the standard plane tree model does not incorporate information about base pairs. In this paper we assume an alphabet consisting of pairs of complementary letters and add the constraint that a letter can only pair with its complement. For instance we might take the alphabet to consist of the four nucleotides $\{A, C, G, U\}$ and the complementary pairs to be the Watson-Crick complements A-U and C-G.



FIGURE 1. The two plane trees with two edges

A *primary structure* P is a word in our alphabet. Given a primary structure P , a plane tree S is called *P -valid* if folding P into the shape S leaves every letter in P matched with its complement (see Definition 2.4). Condon, Heitsch, and Hoos defined an operation on the set of plane trees called local moves, which “unzip” two adjacent edges and “rezip” them in another arrangement (see Definition 2.2). We refine this to consider *valid* local moves, which require both initial and final plane tree to be valid plane trees.



FIGURE 2. Only the plane tree on the right is valid for $P = B\overline{B}B\overline{B}$.

We then answer a collection of questions about primary sequences P and their P -valid plane trees. The first set assume we are given a primary structure and ask about the possible secondary structures:

- Can we find a valid plane tree for P if one exists? (Yes, by a greedy algorithm described in Definition 3.1.)
- Given a primary sequence P with at least one valid plane tree, how many orbits does it have under the action of valid local moves? (Just one, by Theorem 3.5.)
- Valid local moves of type 2 are a kind of collapsing operation on valid plane trees. When can we apply valid local moves of type 2? (On all trees except the tree produced by the greedy algorithm; see Corollary 3.7.)

The second set of questions asks about the possible primary sequences that satisfy various constraints:

- How many sequences have exactly k valid plane trees? (See Proposition 4.2, which says none if $k > C_n$, and Proposition 4.5, which says none if $C_{n-1} < k < C_n$, and other results in Section 4.)

- How does the number of valid plane trees depend on the choice of sequence length $2n$ and alphabet size $2m$? (See Section 4 for some results.)
- How many sequences P have a valid plane tree? (Relatively few—Theorem 5.3 shows that the ratio of sequences with a valid plane tree to all sequences approaches zero as the size of the plane tree increases.)


Many open questions are also included throughout the document.

2. VALID PLANE TREES AND VALID LOCAL MOVES

A plane tree is a rooted tree for which the children of each vertex are ordered. For example these two trees are different plane trees:



We label the half-edges of a plane tree 1 through $2n$ starting on the left side of the leftmost edge adjacent to the root, and walking around the tree counter-clockwise. The edges of the tree are called $e(i, j)$ where i and j are the labels on the left and right sides of the edge, respectively. For example this tree contains the edges $e(1, 2)$, $e(3, 6)$ and $e(4, 5)$:



In the classical plane tree model of RNA-folding, the sequence of half-edges corresponds to the primary structure. The plane tree model as presented by Condon, Heitsch, and Hoos assumed that each half-edge corresponded to a string of six G s or six C s, all of which are paired [Hei, see Section 4]. Hairpin loops, bulges, and most other unmatched biological structures are omitted in the graph. (In fact RNA secondary structure always contains unpaired nucleotides since a hairpin loop with at least three unpaired nucleotides is needed for any pairs to bond.)

Plane trees are also important combinatorial objects. We note three classical properties that are useful in proofs.

Proposition 2.1. *Properties of plane trees:*

- (1) (Non-crossing condition) No edges $e(i, j)$ and $e(i', j')$ have $i < i' < j < j'$.
- (2) For each edge $e(i, j)$ the half-edges labeled $\{i + 1, i + 2, \dots, j - 1\}$ form a subtree, as do the half-edges labeled $\{1, 2, \dots, i - 1, j + 1, j + 2, \dots, n\}$.
- (3) For each edge $e(i, j)$, the half-edges i and j are of opposite parity.

Proof. The non-crossing condition follows from the construction of plane trees. The second property follows from the non-crossing condition. The third property follows from the second. \square

Cordon, Heitsch, and Hoos defined local moves to be the following operation on pairs of edges in a plane tree, which corresponds to an unfolding-and-refolding operation on nearby base pairs in a strand of RNA [Hei, Definition 8].

Definition 2.2. *Let $i < j < i' < j'$ and fix a plane tree S . The two local moves are*

- *type 1: if $e(i, j)$ and $e(i', j')$ are adjacent edges in S then $e(i, j)$, $e(i', j')$ are replaced by $e(i, j')$, $e(j, i')$.*
- *type 2: if $e(i, j')$ and $e(j, i')$ are adjacent edges in S then $e(i, j')$, $e(j, i')$ are replaced by $e(i, j)$, $e(i', j')$.*

A local move results in a new plane tree S' .

Figure 3 shows the local moves. Note that local moves can be performed on edges without any successively-labeled half-edges, namely with $i < j - 1$ and $j < i' - 1$ and $i' < j' - 1$. In other words there can be many other edges incident to the vertices in Figure 3, including edges that come between the edges sketched in the schematic.




FIGURE 3. Local moves

We define plane trees for sequences other than Cordon, Heitsch, and Hoos' $(GC)^n$. We are motivated by the example of RNA but an arbitrary alphabet consisting of complementary pairs is more mathematically natural.

Definition 2.3. *A set \mathcal{A} is a complementary alphabet if for every letter $B \in \mathcal{A}$ there is a unique complement $\overline{B} \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Though the collection of nucleotides $\{C, G, A, U\}$ is our foundational example, it is in fact not a complementary alphabet. The so-called Watson-Crick pairs $C - G$ and $A - U$ form the strongest and second-strongest bonds respectively. However $G - U$ pairs, called wobble pairs, also bond in nature, though more weakly than the others.

The next definition introduces one of the key objects in this paper: valid plane trees. Valid plane trees improve upon the plane tree model by considering whether, using only the Watson-Crick pairs, the primary structure of the RNA could actually form the secondary structure of the plane tree.

Definition 2.4 (P -valid plane trees). *Let S be a plane tree in T_n and let $P = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{2n}$ be a word in a complementary alphabet \mathcal{A} . We say S is a P -valid plane tree if for every edge $e(i, j)$ in S the letters p_i and p_j are a complementary pair in \mathcal{A} . We may refer to S as a valid plane tree if P is clear from context.*

Every P -valid plane tree S induces a perfect matching on the letters $p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{2n} = P$ of the word P . If p_i and p_j label the two half-edges of a single edge in S then we refer to p_i and

p_j either as a *match* or as a *pair*. We tend to use the word *pair* in biological contexts and to discuss the alphabet, and *match* to describe the mathematical matching itself (in total or in part).

We only consider local moves that send P -valid plane trees to other P -valid plane trees. More precisely we have the following definition.

Definition 2.5. *Fix a primary sequence and let S be a P -valid plane tree. A valid local move on S is a local move on S such that the resulting plane tree S' is also P -valid.*

The following two claims are immediate since local moves are invertible.

Proposition 2.6. *A local move of type 1 is valid if and only if the inverse local move of type 2 is valid.*

Corollary 2.7. *The following conditions are necessary and sufficient to guarantee the existence of a valid local move:*

- *There is a valid type 1 local move on adjacent edges $e(i, j)$ and $e(i', j')$ if and only if half-edges i and j' are labeled B and j, i' are labeled \overline{B} .*
- *There is a valid type 2 move on adjacent edges $e(i, j)$ and $e(i', j')$ if and only if half-edges i and i' are labeled B and j, j' are labeled \overline{B} .*

The previous results imply that we can use valid plane trees and local moves to create a graph. This graph, defined in the next corollary, is a central object of study in the next sections.

Corollary 2.8. *Fix a primary structure P . Let \mathcal{G}_P be the graph whose vertices are P -valid plane trees and with an edge between two valid plane trees if they are connected by a valid local move. Then \mathcal{G}_P is a well-defined undirected graph.*




FIGURE 4. The graph \mathcal{G}_P for $P = A\overline{A}A\overline{A}B\overline{B}B\overline{B}B$

3. GRAPH OF VALID PLANE TREES: GLOBAL STRUCTURE

Given a primary structure P this section considers the overall structure of the graph \mathcal{G}_P of P -valid plane trees. We give an algorithm that produces a P -valid plane tree from P exactly when the graph \mathcal{G}_P is nonempty. The algorithm is greedy in the sense that it matches letters in P opportunistically as it reads through the word. Theorem 3.5 shows that the graph \mathcal{G}_P is connected. Define a graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ by directing each edge in \mathcal{G}_P consistently with its type 2 move. Corollary 3.7 proves that \mathcal{G}_P^+ has a unique sink. This 2-sink is characterized in a number of different combinatorial ways in Corollary 3.10, including as the tree produced by the greedy algorithm.

We begin with the algorithm.

Definition 3.1 (The greedy algorithm). *Given a primary structure $P = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_n$ the greedy algorithm matches letters together as follows. Start at p_1 . At each letter p_i consider the most recent unmatched letter p_{j_i} . (More precisely j_i is the maximal integer $1 \leq j_i < i$ such that p_{j_i} is unmatched.) If p_i and p_{j_i} are complements then match them by forming edge $e(i, j_i)$; otherwise leave them unmatched and proceed to the next letter p_{i+1} . The algorithm terminates when each letter in the word P has been considered and either matched or left unmatched.*

If the greedy algorithm produces a valid tree, we call the tree $T_0(P)$ or T_0 when P is clear.




FIGURE 5. T_0 for the sequence $BB\overline{B}\overline{B}\overline{B}\overline{B}B$

RNA molecules do not wait patiently to be fully formed before starting to fold. As they grow longer RNA molecules begin to refold into shapes that minimize free energy [FH08]. The greedy algorithm models the first folds, before the effects of energy-minimization dominate.

The output of the greedy algorithm satisfies several properties that are reminiscent of Proposition 2.1.

Lemma 3.2. *The output of the greedy algorithm satisfies the following properties:*

- (Noncrossing property) No edges $e(i, j)$ and $e(i', j')$ produced by the greedy algorithm have $i < i' < j < j'$.
- If the greedy algorithm produces an edge $e(i, j)$ then every half-edge $i+1, i+2, \dots, j-1$ is matched in the output of the greedy algorithm.
- If the greedy algorithm produces an edge $e(i, j)$ then the half edges $i+1, i+2, \dots, j-1$ form a subtree in the output of the greedy algorithm.
- Suppose the greedy algorithm on the sequence P produces output O that contains a subtree indexed by half-edges $i+1, i+2, \dots, j-1$. Let P' be the sequence obtained by erasing the letters indexed by $i+1, i+2, \dots, j-1$ in P and define O' by erasing

half-edges $i+1, i+2, \dots, j-1$ from O . Then O' is the output of the greedy algorithm performed on P' .

Proof. Suppose that i and i' are unmatched after the i'^{th} step in the greedy algorithm. Then by definition the i'^{th} is a more-recent unmatched edge than the i^{th} so the half-edge j will form an edge $e(i', j)$ rather than $e(i, j)$. Moreover if $e(i, j)$ is an edge produced by the greedy algorithm then none of $i+1, i+2, \dots, j-1$ can be unmatched, else there was a more-recent unmatched edge with which j could match. Combining the first two claims shows that the half-edges $\{i+1, \dots, j-1\}$ form a perfect matching; the resulting collection of edges is connected and acyclic by construction of the greedy algorithm, and so induces a tree.

The greedy algorithm can only match a half-edge labeled $j, j+1, \dots$ in P with something labeled k where $k \geq j$ or $k \leq i$ since the half-edges $\{i+1, i+2, \dots, j-1\}$ are all matched with each other. In both cases, the greedy algorithm on P' will match the corresponding half-edges. If the greedy algorithm on P cannot match a half-edge labeled with one of $j, j+1, \dots$ then the corresponding statement is true for P' . \square

In fact if a primary structure has any valid plane tree, then the greedy algorithm will produce a valid plane tree. The next theorem proves this claim using induction on the length of the primary structure.

Theorem 3.3. *Given a primary structure P , the greedy algorithm produces a valid plane tree if a valid plane tree exists.*

Proof. We induct on the length of P . If P has length two and has a valid plane tree, then $P = B\bar{B}$ and the greedy algorithm produces a valid plane tree with one edge. Assume that if P is a sequence of length at most $2n-2$ that has a valid plane tree, then the greedy algorithm produces a P -valid plane tree.

Let P be a sequence of length $2n$ with at least one valid plane tree. Let O be the output of the greedy algorithm (not necessarily a plane tree) and let T be a P -valid plane tree. We will find a subtree with at least one edge that is shared by both T and O , say T'' . Once we have T'' let P' be the sequence obtained by removing the letters corresponding to T'' from P and denote by T' and O' the result when T'' is removed from T and O respectively. Note that T' is a P' -valid plane tree and O' is the output of the greedy algorithm performed on P' by Lemma 3.2. By induction O' is a P' -valid plane tree so O is a P -valid tree as well.

Thus it suffices to show that O and T share a common subtree. Assume that i labels the first half-edge at which the two disagree. We show by contradiction that i must be a left-half of an edge $e(i, k)$ in T . If not then i is a right-half of an edge $e(j, i)$ in T . Both T and O agree before i so j is also an unmatched left half-edge at the i^{th} step of the greedy algorithm. Since $e(j, i)$ is not an edge in O we know there is another more recent unmatched half-edge j' with $j < j' < i$. Since T and O agree for the first $i-1$ half-edges we know that $e(j', k)$ is an edge in T for some $k > i$. But then T has edges $e(j, i)$ and $e(j', k)$ for $j < j' < i < k$ which violates the noncrossing condition.

Since O and T differ at the i^{th} half-edge we conclude that i is a right-half-edge in O . Say i forms the edge $e(j, i)$ in O . We will find a subtree within the first i half-edges of both O and another P -valid plane tree.

Consider the half-edges $j + 1, j + 2, \dots, i - 1$ in both O and T . If there are no such edges then $e(j, i) = e(i - 1, i)$ is a leaf in O while $e(i - 1, k'), e(i, k)$ are edges in T . The valid local move on edges $e(i - 1, k'), e(i, k)$ in T produces a P -valid plane tree T' with leaf $e(i - 1, i)$. The tree T' also agrees with T in half-edges $1, 2, \dots, i$ since $k, k' > i$. The leaf $e(i - 1, i)$ in T' is the desired common subtree with O .

Otherwise the edges $j + 1, j + 2, \dots, i - 1$ in O form a subtree by Lemma 3.2. Both O and T agree on the first $i - 1$ half-edges so the half-edges $\{j + 1, j + 2, \dots, i - 1\}$ form a subtree in T as desired. This proves the claim. \square

In fact we can say more about the valid plane tree that the greedy algorithm produces: it cannot have any valid local moves of type 2.

Corollary 3.4. *The greedy algorithm produces a valid plane tree with no valid local moves of type 2.*

Proof. Consider the first valid local move of type 2 if you start at the root of T_0 and work clockwise through the half-edges. The first valid local move of type 2 involves two adjacent edges $e(i, j)$ and $e(i', j')$ such that $i < i' < j' < j$. If the half-edge i has label B then the half-edges j and i' must both be labeled by \overline{B} while half-edge j' is labeled B . When the greedy algorithm reaches half-edge j then the half-edge i' is unmatched more recently than the half-edge i . Since half-edges i and i' can bond, the greedy algorithm should have bonded them. Therefore T_0 has no valid local moves of type 2. \square


We now conclude that in fact the graph whose vertices are valid plane trees and whose edges are local moves is connected.

Theorem 3.5. *Fix a primary structure P . The graph \mathcal{G}_P is connected.*

Proof. We induct on the size of the sequence P . The claim is trivial when P has 2 letters since in that case there is a unique valid plane tree. Suppose that for every primary structure with at most $2(n - 1)$ letters, the graph whose vertices are valid plane trees and whose edges are local moves is connected. Fix a primary structure P with n letters and consider two distinct P -valid plane trees S and T . Either one edge $e(i, j)$ is in both S and T or they share no common edges.

If any edge $e(i, j)$ appears in both, then delete that edge. The edges closer to the root than $e(i, j)$ (namely those indexed $e(i', j')$ for $i' < i$ and $j' > j$) form a tree S' while the edges farther from the root than $e(i, j)$ (namely those indexed $e(i', j')$ for $i < i', j' < j$) form a tree S'' . Similarly we obtain trees T' and T'' from T . By construction the half-edges in S' and T' have the same labels, as do the half-edges in S'' and T'' . Thus S' and T' are P' -valid plane trees, where P' is the subsequence of P consisting of the letters in positions i' for $i' < i$ or $i' > j$. Similarly S'' and T'' are P'' -valid plane trees, where P'' is the subsequence of P consisting of the letters in positions i' for $i < i' < j$. By induction there are valid local moves taking S' to T' and S'' to T'' . Implement the same local moves on S to get valid local moves that take S to T .

Now suppose S and T have no common edges. Consider a leaf of S say $e(i, i + 1)$. Since it is not a leaf in T the half-edges labeled i and $i + 1$ have one of the following configurations in T :



Since $e(i, i + 1)$ is an edge of a valid plane tree, edges i and $i + 1$ are labeled B and \overline{B} respectively. Thus the half-edge j must be labeled \overline{B} and the half-edge k must be B regardless of the configuration. Each configuration has a valid local move that results in tree T' with leaf $e(i, i + 1)$. By the previous case there is a sequence of valid local moves between S and T' and so there is a sequence of valid local moves between S and T as well. This proves the claim. \square

In fact more is true: the tree T_0 produced by the greedy algorithm is the only P -valid plane tree with no valid local moves of type 2. The proof walks through the definitions, particularly using the non-crossing condition of half-edges in plane trees.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose T is a P -valid plane tree that is not T_0 . Then T has a valid local move of type 2.*


Proof. Since T is not T_0 we know that there is a first half-edge i that did not match with the most-recent unmatched edge j when it could have. In other words we can show

- i and j are both left half-edges in T
- that have complementary labels, say B and \overline{B} respectively, and
- all of the half-edges corresponding to letters $p_{j+1}, p_{j+2}, \dots, p_{i-1}$ in P are matched in T .

The second claim follows from the fact that the i^{th} and j^{th} half-edges could match.

We prove the third claim next: that half-edges indexed $j + 1, \dots, i - 1$ are matched with each other and with no other half-edges. Every left half-edge labeled with one of p_{j+1}, \dots, p_{i-1} is matched with a right half-edge labeled by one of p_{j+1}, \dots, p_{i-1} else j could not be the most-recent unmatched edge for i . This accounts for all of the right half-edges labeled by p_{j+1}, \dots, p_{i-1} since otherwise some $j'' \in \{j + 1, j + 2, \dots, i - 1\}$ matched with a half-edge j' with $j' < j$. Then T contains edges $e(j', j'')$ and $e(j, k)$ where $k > i$ is the half-edge matched with j in T . This violates the noncrossing condition of plane trees.

Thus all of the half-edges labeled with p_{j+1}, \dots, p_{i-1} are matched amongst each other in T . We claim that these edges form a rooted subtree whose root is incident to both the i^{th} and j^{th} half-edges as shown in Figure 6.

FIGURE 6. If T differs from T_0 then T has a type-2 local move.

The proof is by induction on the cardinality $|\{j+1, \dots, i-1\}|$, which we saw is even. If the cardinality is zero, the claim is trivial. Now consider the edges $e(j', j'')$ with $j', j'' \in \{j+1, \dots, i-1\}$. The difference $j'' - j'$ is an odd number by properties of plane trees. If $j'' - j'$ is not one then by the noncrossing condition of plane trees there must be at least one edge $e(i', i'')$ with $j' < i' < i'' < j''$. Thus the difference $i'' - i'$ is less than $j'' - j'$. Since there are only a finite number of edges $e(j', j'')$ with $j', j'' \in \{j+1, \dots, i-1\}$ we conclude that there is at least one edge $e(j', j'')$ with $j'' - j' = 1$. In other words there is at least one leaf $e(j', j'' = j' + 1)$ within the set of half-edges $\{j+1, \dots, i-1\}$. Removing the leaf $e(j', j'')$ preserves the property that the edges labeled $\{j+1, \dots, i-1\}$ form a rooted subtree whose root is a vertex incident to both the i^{th} and j^{th} half-edges. By induction the claim is proven.

We conclude that the i^{th} and j^{th} half-edges are left edges with complementary labels B and \overline{B} that are incident to the same vertex in T . If the edges containing i and j in T are $e(i, k_i)$ and $e(j, k_j)$ then by definition we may perform a valid local move of type 2 on $e(i, k_i)$ and $e(j, k_j)$ as desired. \square

In other words consider the graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ in which each edge is directed consistently with local moves of type 2. Then \mathcal{G}_P^+ has a unique sink, and that sink corresponds to the valid plane tree T_0 .

Corollary 3.7. *Fix a primary sequence P with a valid plane tree and let T_0 be the valid plane tree for P produced by the greedy algorithm. Let \mathcal{G}_P^+ denote the graph whose vertices are valid plane trees for P and with a directed edge $T \rightarrow T'$ if there is a local move of type 2 from T to T' .*

The valid plane tree T_0 is the unique sink in the directed graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ .

Proof. Corollary 3.4 proved that T_0 has no edges directed out so T_0 is a sink in \mathcal{G}_P^+ . Theorem 3.6 proved that every other tree has at least one edge directed out so there are no other sinks in the graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ . \square

Remark 3.8. The graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ may have several sources. For instance the graph on the sequence $A\bar{A}B\bar{B}A\bar{A}B\bar{B}$ has two sources and one sink.




FIGURE 7. The graph of valid plane trees for $A\bar{A}B\bar{B}A\bar{A}B\bar{B}$ with type 2 edges.

Corollary 3.9. The graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ has no directed cycles. There is a path consisting only of type-2 valid local moves from every valid plane tree T in \mathcal{G}_P^+ to T_0 .

Proof. Consider the total distance from the root in a valid plane tree, defined as

$$d_T = \sum_{v \in T} \text{dist}(v, v_0)$$

where v_0 is the root. Figure 8 shows that d_T drops by at least one with each valid local move of type 2 (and more if the subtree labeled C in Figure 8 is non-empty).




FIGURE 8. A generic move of type 2

Since the total distance d_T can only decrease there are no directed cycles in the graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ .

Moreover Theorem 3.5 proved that the undirected graph \mathcal{G}_P is connected and hence \mathcal{G}_P^+ has only one connected component. Consider the following process: given a tree T in the graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ follow any edge out of T . Repeat until you reach a tree with no edges directed out within the graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ . Since \mathcal{G}_P^+ has no directed cycles and only finite number of trees, we know this process terminates. Since T_0 is the unique tree with no edges directed out of it in \mathcal{G}_P^+ we know the process terminates at T_0 . Thus there is a path consisting only of type 2 valid local moves from every valid plane tree T to T_0 as desired. \square

We can collect all of this information concisely as follows.

Corollary 3.10. Let P be a primary sequence with at least one P -valid plane tree. The following are equivalent.

- T_0 is the unique sink in the graph \mathcal{G}_P^+ .
- T_0 is the plane tree produced by the greedy algorithm on P .
- For each plane tree T with root v_0 define the total distance $d_T = \sum_{v \in T} \text{dist}(v, v_0)$. Among the P -valid plane trees T_0 has minimum total distance.

4. NUMBER OF VALID PLANE TREES: THE SIZE OF \mathcal{G}_P

A generic unfolded primary sequence P has two main parameters: the length of the sequence P and the size of the alphabet from which the letters of P are drawn. The vast majority of primary sequences have no valid plane trees at all, as we discuss in the next section. This section gives results showing how the size of \mathcal{G}_P depends on n and m . It also includes many conjectures drawn from experimental data.

Some notation makes the discussion in this and following sections easier. Denote the length of the sequence by $2n$. If the alphabet has $2m$ letters we say it has m complementary matches.

Notation 4.1. *Given sequences of length $2n$ in complementary alphabets with m matches:*

- $\mathcal{P}(n, m)$ is the set of valid sequences of length $2n$ in a complementary alphabet with m pairs, namely sequences P with at least one P -valid plane tree.
- $V(P)$ is the set of P -valid plane trees for a fixed primary sequence P . These are the vertices of the graph \mathcal{G}_P .
- $N(n, m, k)$ is the set of valid sequences $P \in \mathcal{P}(n, m)$ such that $|V(P)| = k$.
- $R(n, m)$ is the set of $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $N(n, m, k)$ is non-empty.

We computed the size of the sets $N(n, m, k)$ for small values of n and m . Figure 9 marks with an X each (n, k) such that $N(n, 1, k)$ is non-empty for $n \leq 7$.

4.1. Describing $N(n, m, k)$. We can bound the k for which $N(n, m, k)$ is nonzero and can describe $N(n, m, k)$ in the boundary cases.

Proposition 4.2. *Fix a length $2n$ and a complementary alphabet \mathcal{A} with m complementary matches. Let C_n be the n^{th} Catalan number. Then for any primary sequence P in \mathcal{A}*


$$0 \leq |V(P)| \leq C_n$$

Proof. For a primary sequence P , each P -valid plane tree has n edges and there are C_n plane trees with exactly n edges. Thus the maximum size $|V(P)|$ for any $P \in \mathcal{P}(n, m)$ is C_n . The minimum size of $|V(P)|$ is zero so the claim follows. \square

Note that $\mathcal{P}(n, m)$ is defined to be *only* the set of primary sequences with at least one valid plane tree so for $P \in \mathcal{P}(n, m)$ we have $|V(P)| > 0$.

In fact the upper bound is always attained, as the next proposition demonstrates.

Proposition 4.3. *Every plane tree is a valid plane tree for the primary structure $B\overline{B}B\overline{B}\dots B\overline{B}$. In particular if C_n is the n^{th} Catalan number then $C_n \in R(n, m)$ for all n, m .*

FIGURE 9. k in $R(n, 1)$.

Proof. Each edge $e(i, j)$ consists of two half-edges i, j of opposite parity. The letters in positions of opposite parity in the primary sequence $B\overline{B}B\overline{B}\dots B\overline{B}$ are always complements so every plane tree is valid for this sequence. Thus $N(n, m, C_n)$ is nonempty as desired. \square

Figure 9 connects the Xs that mark $C_n \in R(n, 1)$ with a dotted line.

We can compute $|N(n, m, C_n)|$ as follows.

Proposition 4.4. *Let C_n be the n^{th} Catalan number. The set $N(n, m, C_n)$ has size $2m$.*

Proof. If $P \in \mathcal{P}(n, m)$ does not have structure $B\overline{B}B\overline{B}\dots B\overline{B}$ then there is an edge $e(i, j)$ such that i and j have different parity and but the letters p_i and p_j are not complements. Thus no plane trees with the edge $e(i, j)$ are P -valid. It follows that there are fewer than C_n valid plane trees for P . Since there are $2m$ possibilities for the letter B , there are exactly $2m$ sequences P with C_n valid plane trees. \square

The Catalan number C_{n-1} is also in $R(n, m)$ for all m . Indeed consider the primary sequence $P = (B\overline{B})^{n-1}\overline{B}B$ in $\mathcal{P}(n, m)$. The last two letters must match because P has exactly one \overline{B} in an odd position and exactly one B in an even position. By Proposition 4.3 the rest of the word can form any possible valid plane tree on $2n - 2$ half-edges and so $|V(P)| = C_{n-1}$.

In fact if a sequence in $\mathcal{P}(n, m)$ has more than C_{n-1} valid plane trees, then all C_n possible plane trees must be valid. In other words $R(n, m)$ has a large gap between its largest element C_n and its second largest C_{n-1} .

Proposition 4.5. *If k is an integer satisfying $C_{n-1} < k < C_n$ then $k \notin R(n, m)$.*

Proof. We show that if $P \in \mathcal{P}(n, m)$ has fewer than C_n valid plane trees then it has at most C_{n-1} valid plane trees. Let $P = p_1 p_2 \dots p_{2n}$ be a valid sequence and suppose that there is some plane tree that is *not* P -valid. Define the following function on valid sequences:

$$n_{\text{odd}}(P) = \max_{B \in \mathcal{A}} |\{p_i \in P : i \text{ is odd and } p_i = B\}|$$

The maximum n_{odd} must be strictly less than n because at least one plane tree is not P -valid.

Since a P -valid plane tree exists, there must also be n_{odd} even-indexed letters \overline{B} in P . This $2n_{\text{odd}}$ -length subword in the letters $\{B, \overline{B}\}$ can form at most $C_{n_{\text{odd}}}$ subtrees (and quite possibly fewer). The remaining $2n - 2n_{\text{odd}}$ half-edges can form a maximum of $C_{n-n_{\text{odd}}}$ plane trees so

$$|V(P)| \leq C_{n_{\text{odd}}} \cdot C_{n-n_{\text{odd}}}.$$

The product $C_{n_{\text{odd}}} \cdot C_{n-n_{\text{odd}}}$ is maximized when $n_{\text{odd}} = n - 1$ or 1. A primary sequence with $n_{\text{odd}} = 1$ only has one valid plane tree. Thus $n_{\text{odd}} = n - 1$ and the claim follows. \square


We can also characterize the sequences P that have exactly C_{n-1} valid plane trees.

Proposition 4.6. *There are exactly $4m(2m-1)n$ sequences $P \in \mathcal{P}(n, m)$ with exactly C_{n-1} valid plane trees, i.e.*

$$|N(n, m, C_{n-1})| = 4m(2m-1)n.$$

Proof. Following the previous proof, if $|V(P)| = C_{n-1}$ then $n_{\text{odd}}(P) = n - 1$. Exactly one odd position does not contribute to n_{odd} and exactly one even position matches it. Denote these two positions $i < j$. There are $2m$ ways to choose a letter $B \in \mathcal{A}$ for the $n - 1$ odd positions not in $\{i, j\}$. Since P is valid the even positions not in $\{i, j\}$ must be \overline{B} . The letters p_i and p_j must also be complementary. The letter in the odd position can be any of the $2m - 1$ letters $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{B\}$. This choice determines the other letter.

We determine the constraints on i and j by identifying where in the P -valid tree the edge $e(i, j)$ can go. Removing the edge $e(i, j)$ divides the remaining edges into two parts, each forming its own valid plane tree:



This gives $C_{\frac{j-i-1}{2}} \cdot C_{n-\frac{j-i+1}{2}}$ P -valid plane trees. We assumed that $|V(P)| = C_{n-1}$ which implies either

- $j = i + 1$ and $e(i, j)$ is a leaf, or
- $i = 1$ and $j = 2n$ so $e(i, j)$ is the unique edge adjacent to the root.

This leaves $2n$ possibilities for the edge $e(i, j)$. Thus there are $(2m)(2m-1)(2n)$ sequences in $N(n, m, k)$. \square

We can characterize the set $N(n, 1, 1)$ using a similar argument.

Proposition 4.7. *The set $N(n, 1, 1)$ has size $2n$.*

Proof. We show that unless the primary sequence P on the alphabet $\{B, \overline{B}\}$ has a very special form, then we can find a P -valid plane tree with a valid local move. Hence P has at least two P -valid plane trees and so $P \notin N(n, 1, 1)$.

Suppose v is a vertex in a P -valid plane tree on the alphabet $\{B, \overline{B}\}$ that is incident to three edges. Then two of the left-edges incident to v have the same label by the pigeonhole principle. Thus there is a valid local move at the vertex v . It follows that if P has only one P -valid plane tree then that tree is a path. Moreover each pair of adjacent edges in that path must share the same left half-edge label otherwise there is a P -valid local move. So if P has only one P -valid plane tree then B is the only letter on one side of the path and \overline{B} is the only letter on the other side. There are two choices for the side that has B and n choices for the location of the root. Thus there are $2n$ primary sequences P with a unique P -valid plane tree as claimed. \square

The arguments in the previous proof lead us in two directions.

Question 4.8. Consider $N(n, m, 1)$ for $m > 1$.

- If the alphabet is larger then the previous argument can be modified to show that any plane tree with a vertex of degree at least $2m+1$ cannot represent a primary sequence for $P \in N(n, m, 1)$. Can we characterize the primary sequences $P \in N(n, m, 1)$?
- A path can be labeled so that there are no valid local moves. What conditions on plane trees and alphabet size ensure that a plane tree has a special primary structure preventing any valid local moves?

4.2. Comparing $R(n, m)$ for different n and m . In this section we further analyze the sets $R(n, m)$. For instance Propositions 4.2 and 4.5 showed that $|R(n, m)| \leq C_{n-1} + 1$. Our data and the following preliminary results suggest two things:

- $R(n, m)$ depends surprisingly little on the size of the underlying alphabet.
- The set $\bigcup_{n, m} R(n, m)$ contains surprisingly many integers—conjecturally all of the integers.

We begin by observing that increasing the alphabet size strictly increases the set $R(n, m)$.

Proposition 4.9. $R(n, m) \subsetneq R(n, m+1)$

Proof. Every primary sequence on the alphabet $\{B_1, \overline{B_1}, \dots, B_m, \overline{B_m}\}$ is also a primary sequence on the alphabet $\{B_1, \overline{B_1}, \dots, B_{m+1}, \overline{B_{m+1}}\}$. \square

In fact our data suggests something stronger.

Conjecture 4.10. The set $R(n, m)$ depends only on n .

We calculated $R(n, 2)$ for $n \leq 6$, $R(n, 3)$ and $R(n, 4)$ for $n \leq 5$, and for $n \leq 4$ we computed $R(n, m)$ for $m \leq 10$. In all of these cases $R(n, m)$ matches $R(n, 1)$.

We can also exploit prime factorization to construct sets $R(n, m)$ that contain desired elements.

Proposition 4.11. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ factor into a product of primes $k = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_\ell^{\alpha_\ell}$ such that for each i , there exists a pair (n_i, m_i) with $p_i \in R(n_i, m_i)$. Then

$$k \in R\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i n_i, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i m_i\right)$$

Proof. Fix a complementary alphabet with $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i m_i$ pairs. For each i with $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ let P_i be a primary sequence with n_i edges and m_i complementary letters that has exactly k distance P_i -valid plane trees. (This is possible because $k \in R(n_i, m_i)$.) For each i make α_i copies of P_i and denote them $P_{i,1}, P_{i,2}, \dots, P_{i,\alpha_i}$. Now change the complementary letters as needed so that no two primary sequences $P_{i,j}, P_{i',j'}$ share a letter.

Consider the sequence $P = P_{1,1}P_{1,2}P_{1,3} \cdots P_{\ell,\alpha_\ell}$ obtained by writing all of these primary sequences in one word. No half-edge from $P_{i,j}$ can match with a half-edge from $P_{i',j'}$ unless $i = i'$ and $j = j'$ since the alphabets on the subwords $P_{i,j}$ and $P_{i',j'}$ are otherwise distinct. Thus every P -valid plane tree consists of $P_{i,j}$ -valid plane subtrees joined at a common root and the only P -valid local moves are $P_{i,j}$ -valid local moves on the subtrees. Since there are p_i of the $P_{i,j}$ -valid plane trees and since the $P_{i,j}$ -valid local moves are independent, there are $k = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_\ell^{\alpha_\ell}$ P -valid plane trees as desired. \square

This leads us to the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.12. *For all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ there exists n, m such that $k \in R(n, m)$.*

By the previous proposition it suffices to prove this conjecture for prime numbers. Computational data showed that the prime numbers 7, 19, and 43 appeared in $R(n, 1)$ for $n = 5, 6$, and 7 respectively.

5. HOW MANY SEQUENCES ARE VALID?

This last section enumerates the total number of primary sequences that have any valid plane trees at all and proves that they are extremely unusual, in the sense that the ratio of the number of these primary sequences to all words in $2n$ letters over the alphabet approaches zero as n increases.

Our main tool comes from Corollary 3.10: every primary sequence P corresponds to exactly one labeled tree with no valid local moves of type 2, namely the tree produced by the greedy algorithm. Thus we may count the number of valid primary sequences by counting the number of labeled plane trees with no type-2 local moves.

Lemma 5.1. *Every plane tree T is the output $T_0(P)$ of the greedy algorithm for some valid sequence P .*

Proof. Given a plane tree T , label the edges adjacent to the root with any complementary pair from the alphabet. Each edge not adjacent to the root has a parent edge. Starting from the edges adjacent to the root, label each edge so that it has no local move with its parent edge. Then the labeled tree T has no local moves of type 2 and thus is the output $T_0(P)$ of the greedy algorithm for the sequence P obtained by reading the labels on the half-edges. \square

Note that a labeled tree generated by this procedure does not produce a tree with *no* local moves, only with none of type 2. For example if a plane tree has a vertex of degree $2m + 1$ or more, there is always a local move; the process in the previous lemma ensures that it is a local move of type 1.

We now enumerate valid sequences by counting labeled trees with no local moves of type 2.

Theorem 5.2. *The number of valid primary sequences is*

$$(1) \quad |\mathcal{P}(n, m)| = \sum_{\substack{\lambda=(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \\ \text{a composition of } n}} (2m)^k \cdot (2m-1)^{n-k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k C_{\lambda_i-1}$$

where C_{λ_i-1} is the $(\lambda_i - 1)^{th}$ Catalan number.

Proof. By the previous lemma, we can count the number of valid sequences by counting the number of plane trees with no local moves of type 2. We partition the set of plane trees based on the number of edges adjacent to the root and the size of the subtrees coming off of those edges.

Suppose there are k edges adjacent to the root. The k subtrees descending from those k edges divide the n edges of the tree into k parts, say with the i^{th} of size λ_i . This gives a composition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$ of n . Moreover the i^{th} subtree can be any of C_{λ_i-1} possible plane trees.

Label the edges in order of their distance to the root. Each of the k edges adjacent to the root has no parent edge and thus has $2m$ possible labels. Every other edge in the tree has a parent so there are $2m-1$ other ways to label that edge without creating a local move of type 2. Thus there are $2m \cdot (2m-1)^{\lambda_i-1} \cdot C_{\lambda_i-1}$ possibilities for the i^{th} branch.

Taking the product over all k branches, there are $(2m)^k \cdot (2m-1)^{n-k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k C_{\lambda_i-1}$ labeled plane trees with no valid local moves of type 2 corresponding to the composition λ . Summing over all compositions λ of n gives the desired result. \square

The other main result of this section is that the ratio of valid primary sequences to all primary sequences approaches zero as n increases.

Theorem 5.3. *Fix m and let $S(n, m)$ denote all possible words of length $2n$ over a complementary alphabet with m complementary pairs. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{P}(n, m)|}{|S(n, m)|} = 0.$$

Proof. When $m = 1$ the number of valid plane sequences $|\mathcal{P}(n, 1)|$ is at most $\binom{2n}{n}$ since each valid plane sequence must have the same number of letters B as \overline{B} . (In fact $|\mathcal{P}(n, 1)| = \binom{2n}{n}$.) There are a total of 2^{2n} words in $\{B, \overline{B}\}$ of length $2n$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\binom{2n}{n}}{2^{2n}} &= \frac{(2n)(2n-2)(2n-4)\cdots 4 \cdot 2}{2^n n!} \cdot \frac{(2n-1)(2n-3)(2n-5)\cdots 5 \cdot 3 \cdot 1}{2^n n!} \\ &= \frac{2n-1}{2n} \frac{2n-3}{2(n-1)} \frac{2n-5}{2(n-2)} \cdots \frac{3}{2 \cdot 2} \frac{1}{2 \cdot 1} \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2(n-i)}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{2i}\right) \end{aligned}$$

which approaches zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

When $m > 1$ the number of valid plane sequences $|\mathcal{P}(n, m)|$ is at most the number of valid plane trees, since each valid plane sequence P may have several P -valid plane trees. There are $(2m)^n C_n$ valid plane trees since there are C_n plane trees on n edges, $2m$ ways to pick

the letter labeling each left-half-edge, and 1 way to pick the complementary letters on the right-half-edges. There are a total of $(2m)^{2n}$ words in the alphabet of length $2n$. Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{P}(n, m)|}{|S(n, m)|} < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(2m)^n C_n}{(2m)^{2n}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \frac{\binom{2n}{n}}{(2m)^n} < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \frac{\binom{2n}{n}}{2^{2n}}$$

using the definition of Catalan numbers and the fact that $m \geq 2$. The binomial coefficient $\binom{2n}{n}$ counts the number of ways to pick a subset of exactly n elements from a set of $2n$ while 2^{2n} counts all possible subsets of a set with $2n$ elements. The ratio $\frac{\binom{2n}{n}}{2^{2n}}$ is thus less than one. So as n grows we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{P}(n, m)|}{|S(n, m)|} < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \frac{\binom{2n}{n}}{2^{2n}} < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} = 0$$

which proves the claim. \square

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge useful conversations with Christine Heitsch as well as the support of the Smith College Center for Women in Mathematics.

REFERENCES

- [ALW14] Drew Armstrong, Nicholas A. Loehr, and Gregory W. Warrington. Rational parking functions and catalan numbers. *arxiv:1403.1845*, 2014.
- [FH08] Christoph Flamm and Ivo L. Hofacker. Beyond energy minimization: approaches to the kinetic folding of RNA. *Monatsheft für Chemie Chemical Monthly*, 139:447–457, 2008.
- [Hei] Christine E. Heitsch. Combinatorics on plane trees, motivated by RNA secondary structure configurations. *preprint*.
- [HSS98] Ivo L. Hofacker, Peter Schuster, and Peter F. Stadler. Combinatorics of RNA secondary structures. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 88:207–237, 1998.
- [JS14] Natasa Jonoska and Masahico Saito, editors. *Discrete and Topological Models in Molecular Biology*. Natural Computing Series. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2014.
- [McC06] Jon McCammond. Noncrossing partitions in surprising locations. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 113:598, 610 2006.
- [Rus13] Rick Russel, editor. *Biophysics of RNA Folding*. Springer, New York, 2013.