

Large deviation principles and evolutionary multiple structure alignment of non-coding RNA

Brandon Legried*

May 27, 2024

Abstract

Non-coding RNA are functional molecules that are not translated into proteins. Their function comes as important regulators of biological function. Because they are not translated, they need not be as stable as other types of RNA. The TKF91 Structure Tree from Holmes 2004 is a probability model that effectively describes correlated substitution, insertion, and deletion of base pairs, and found to have some worth in understanding dynamic folding patterns. In this paper, we provide a new probabilistic analysis of the TKF91 Structure Tree. Large deviation principles on stem lengths, helix lengths, and tree size are proved. Additionally, we give a new alignment procedure that constructs accurate sequence and structural alignments for sequences with low identity for a dense enough phylogeny.

1 Introduction

The prediction of folding patterns of RNA is a key task in molecular biology. Unlike DNA molecules, RNA sequences are single-stranded. This is because RNA molecules according to the well-known Watson-Crick pairings G-C and A-U as well as the intermediary “wobble” pairing G-U. The list of unpaired positions and paired positions is collectively referred as the *secondary structure* of a given RNA sequence. Some prominent elements in predicting secondary structure include thermodynamic models (Schroeder and Turner (2009); Turner and Mathews (2010)), covarion models (Eddy and Durbin (1994); Nawrocki et al. (2009)), and the stochastic context-free grammar (Knudsen and Hein (1999)).

The folding pattern is important for understanding biological function. A natural question is to understand how the structure has evolved over time, given its close relationship to functionality. This problem is particularly interesting in view of expanding understanding of non-coding RNAs like ribozymes and riboswitches, see Serganov and Patel (2007). A related problem to understanding function is to characterize the evolutionary positioning of a related substring of the genome. Changes in DNA imply downstream effects for their transcribed RNA sequences and subsequent fitness and evolutionary trajectory. It is sensible to guess that paired sites evolve together, both in the RNA sequence and in the

*School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA.

generating portion of the genome. The use of dinucleotide RNA models have been shown to be preferable to DNA models, but there are open questions about which RNA-specific models are best, Allen and Whelan (2014). Despite these open questions, there is a parallel question of attempting to infer the correct branching pattern for related RNA sequences, and substitution-only models cannot explain the change in branching pattern.

One underused way to model structural change is through evolution. A notable model incorporating insertion and deletion of sites, Holmes (2004). After defining a model of evolution, there are many methods to reconstruct evolutionary history from molecular data. Established methods include neighbor-joining, maximum parsimony, and maximum likelihood, see e.g. Felsenstein (1981); Rosenberg and Kumar (2001); Savill et al. (2001); though their statistical guarantees are largely limited to models involving only substitution. The RNA-specific models have used single-nucleotide and dinucleotide substitution models, including ones that are cognizant of canonical base pairings.

In the presence of insertion- and deletion-type mutations, evolutionary models can similarly be proposed, but their complexities make them challenging to use in deriving mathematical results or designing practical algorithms, Rivas and Eddy (2008). Most practical algorithms rely on multiple sequence alignment (MSA) prior to performing phylogeny reconstruction, though alignment-free methods using statistics such as blocks and k -mer counts are also being used, see Daskalakis and Roch (2013) and Allman et al. (2017). A potential complication in doing phylogenetic tasks is that RNA sequences evolve slowly so are strongly conserved over time.

Multiple sequence alignment can then be used to express evolutionary history to make ancestral sequence predictions. Both MSA and RNA secondary structure reflect homology, the conservation of important motifs for biological function. Using the framework of Gardner and Giegerich (2004), there are a few ways to find both. The first, mentioned in the previous paragraph and the main focus of this paper, focuses on performing MSA using sequences and auxiliary information, then using the MSA to estimate secondary structure. Alternatively, one can use sequences to predict secondary structure using methods like RNAfold, UNAFold, etc. or predict both MSA and secondary structure jointly using sequences and auxiliary information alone. Models like the TKF91 (Thorne et al. (1991), Holmes (2004)) offer evolutionary information to aid in this effort, and the connection between evolution and secondary structure appears underexplored.

The main results of this paper are statistical properties of the TKF91 Structure Tree model of Holmes (2004), with applications to the sequence alignment and structure prediction problems. While phylogenetic reconstruction from sequences alone remains challenging, it can be shown that sequence alignment and structure prediction are both possible even if the sequences have different lengths and low sequence identity. We consider implications to the Holmes experiments, to offer potential insight into the TKF91 Structure Tree and to secondary structure prediction for arbitrary pairs of sequences.

2 Definitions and main results

The model. The TKF91 Structure is built on a generalization of the model in Thorne et al. (1991) to two different alphabets. The first definition is stated for a general finite alphabet.

Definition 1 (TKF91 general-substitution process). *The **TKF91 INDEL process** is a Markov process $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{I}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the space \mathcal{S} of Ω -valued sequences (Ω is the **alphabet**) together with an **immortal link** “•”, that is,*

$$\mathcal{S} := \text{“•”} \otimes \bigcup_{M \geq 1} \Omega^M, \quad (1)$$

where the notation above indicates that all sequences begin with the immortal link (and can otherwise be empty). We also refer to the positions of a sequence (including mortal links and the immortal link) as **sites** and the labels corresponding to mortal links as **digits**. Let $(\nu, \lambda, \mu) \in (0, \infty)^3$, $\lambda_0 \geq 0$ and $(\pi_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega} \in [0, \infty)^{|\Omega|}$ with $\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \pi_\omega = 1$ be given parameters. The continuous-time Markovian dynamic is described as follows: if the current state is the sequence \vec{x} , then the following events occur independently:

- (Substitution) Each digit is substituted independently at rate $\nu > 0$. When a substitution occurs, the corresponding digit is replaced by ω with probability π_ω .
- (Deletion) Each mortal link (and its digit) is removed independently at rate $\mu > 0$.
- (Insertion) Each mortal link gives birth to a new mortal link and digit independently at rate $\lambda > 0$, and the immortal link gives birth independently at rate $\lambda_0 \geq 0$. When a birth occurs, a digit is added immediately to the right of its parent site. The newborn site has digit ω with probability π_ω .

Throughout the paper, we consider only TKF91 processes for which the immortal link and all mortal links independently give birth at the same rate, i.e. $\lambda = \lambda_0$. In the TKF91 Structure Tree, defined next, there are two separate TKF91 INDEL processes involved, with respective parameters. We let $\mathcal{I}^\Omega = \mathcal{I}^\Omega(m)$ denote the TKF91 process on the alphabet Ω with the respective mutation parameters $\gamma = (\nu, \mu, \lambda, \pi)$.

Each realization of the TKF91 Structure Tree contains multiple objects. The first object is a tree T whose vertices each correspond to a TKF91 sequence from \mathcal{I}^{Ω_1} and whose edges each correspond to another type of TKF91 sequence from \mathcal{I}^{Ω_2} . The following definitions about trees are not standard across the literature, so we collect them here. A **tree** is a graph (V, E) with vertex set V and edge set E that is connected and has no loops. Equivalently, every pair of vertices has a unique path of edges connecting them. The **degree** of any vertex is the number of vertices adjacent to that vertex. Any vertex ρ with degree 1 may be chosen as the **root**, defining a rooted tree $T = (V, E, \rho)$. Every rooted tree has a partial ordering \lesssim on the vertices, where $v_1 \lesssim v_2$ means the path from ρ to v_2 passes through v_1 . Under this partial ordering, the **in-degree** of any vertex is the number of adjacent vertices with shorter distance to the root. The **out-degree** is the number of adjacent vertices with longer distance to the root. A vertex with in-degree 1 and out-degree 0 is called a **leaf**. Supposing the tree T has $N + 1$ vertices (implying N out-degree vertices), for each $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, if we define $\chi_k = \chi_k(T)$ to be the number of vertices of out-degree k , then the vector $(\chi_1, \dots, \chi_{N-1})$ is called the **degree sequence** of T .

Now, we introduce the TKF91 Structure Tree model of Holmes (2004), building on the notation of the previous Definition. It consists of an evolving tree T with a TKF91 sequence for each vertex and edge.

Definition 2 (TKF91 Structure Tree). *The **TKF91 Structure Tree process** is a Markov process $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{J}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the space \mathcal{R} of $(T, (\mathcal{S}^{\Omega_1})^V, (\mathcal{S}^{\Omega_2})^E)$ -valued objects, consisting of the following:*

- *a rooted tree $T = (V, E, \rho, (n_v)_{v \in V}, (w_e)_{e \in E})$ with vertex set V , edge set E , degree-1 root vertex $\rho \in V$, and non-negative integer weights $(n_v)_{v \in V}$ and $(w_e)_{e \in E}$;*
- *a collection $(\mathcal{S}^{\Omega_1})^V$ of independent \mathcal{I}^{Ω_1} -processes with alphabet $\Omega_1 = \{A, C, G, U, S\}$ and mutation parameters $\gamma_1 = (\nu_1, \mu_1, \lambda_1, \mu_{1,S}, \lambda_{1,S}, \pi_1)$. The substitution matrix is reducible in the sense that transitions in and out of $\{S\}$ are not possible;*
- *a collection $(\mathcal{S}^{\Omega_2})^E$ of independent \mathcal{I}^{Ω_2} -processes with alphabet $\Omega_2 = \{A, C, G, U\}^2$ and mutation parameters $\gamma_2 = (\nu_2, \mu_2, \lambda_2, \pi_2)$.*

There are further continuous-time Markovian dynamics, as follows:

- *For any vertex $v \in V$ with weight n_v , if the \mathcal{I}^{Ω_1} -process inserts an S after position $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n_v\}$, a new tree is constructed by adding a new pendant edge e incident to v and a leaf vertex ℓ ;*
- *For any edge $e \in E$, if the corresponding S in the parent vertex process is deleted, then a new tree is constructed by removing the edge e and all of its progeny produced in the previous bullet.*

In most of the paper, we assume that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_{1,S}$ and $\mu_1 = \mu_{1,S}$, but in the alignment section of the paper we will consider the case where λ_1, μ_1 are arbitrary and $\lambda_{1,S} = \mu_{1,S} = 0$. Each element of \mathcal{R} uniquely identifies an RNA sequence together with an RNA secondary structure that lists the numbered sites that are base pairings and unpaired bases. However, it is possible for many elements of \mathcal{R} to specify the same list of base pairings and unpaired bases, as there could be zero digits arising from empty TKF91 sequences or from having no bases between immortal links and S -links in an \mathcal{I}^{Ω_1} sequence. Our results focus on estimating elements of \mathcal{R} , so they are good at estimating elements of secondary structure.

We will utilize common terms to describe RNA secondary structure motifs. A **loop sequence** corresponds to the sequence attached to any vertex in the Structure Tree. Within each loop sequence, the the S -links partition the sequence into **loop segments**. A **stem sequence** or **helix sequence** corresponds to the sequence attached to any edge in the Structure Tree.

The first few results of this paper concern the estimation of the branching pattern in \mathcal{R} , but we need more definitions. A sequence of probability measures $(\mathbf{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ on a separable metric space K is said to satisfy a **large deviation principle (LDP)** with a non-negative lower semi-continuous rate function $I : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, provided

$$\frac{1}{N} \log (\mathbf{P}_N(C)) \leq -I(C)$$

for any closed set $C \subset K$ and

$$\frac{1}{N} \log (\mathbf{P}_N(O)) \geq -I(O)$$

for any open set $O \subset K$. For any subset $B \subset K$, we defined $I(B) = \inf_{p \in B} I(p)$. This framework is adopted from Dembo and Zeitouni (2010).

We consider LDPs on the degree sequence of T , the length of the RNA sequence, the number of unpaired bases, and the number of base pairs, which use different metric spaces for K . For LDPs on random sums of integers M_N , we simply take $K = \mathbb{R}$ and attempt to control the concentration of the event $\{M_N > Nx\}$ for large enough $x > 0$. For each integer $D \geq 0$, the LDPs on the degree sequence utilize the separable set

$$K = \mathcal{M}_D = \left\{ p_0, \dots, p_D \in [0, 1]^D : \sum_{k=0}^D p_k = 1, \sum_{k=1}^D k p_k = 1 \right\}.$$

In this context, D is taken to be the greatest out-degree permitted, depending on the context of the experiment or program. The numbers $\{p_k\}$ refer to the proportions of vertices with out-degree k throughout the tree T .

We make some notes about the exponential rates underlying the process. First, two relevant functions that govern the branching are

$$a = a(\lambda_1, \mu_1, \pi_S) = \frac{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S)} \text{ and } b = b(\lambda_1, \mu_1, \pi_S) = \frac{\lambda_1 \pi_S}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S)}. \quad (2)$$

Each arises as the normalizing constant for the stationary distribution of a relevant TKF91 process, which is geometric.

Later on, we consider the TKF91 Structure Tree as an evolving sequence-structure pair. Single- and double-nucleotide transitions are permitted, so we define the sets corresponding to the nearest neighbors of a given RNA sequence. For any RNA sequence $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, let $\mathcal{S}_{k,i}, \mathcal{S}_{k,d}, \mathcal{S}_{k,s}, k \in \{1, 2\}$ be the sequences that differ from σ by an insertion, deletion, or substitution by exactly k sites. Some dinucleotide substitutions result in only one site being changed; those are contained in $\mathcal{S}_{1,s}$. Let $\mathcal{S}_1(\sigma) = \mathcal{S}_{1,i} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,d} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,s}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2(\sigma) = \mathcal{S}_{2,i} \cup \mathcal{S}_{2,d} \cup \mathcal{S}_{2,s}$. Letting $Q(\sigma, \sigma')$ be the transition kernel between RNA sequences, one can then define

$$\lambda^*(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}_1(\sigma) \cup \mathcal{S}_2(\sigma)} Q(\sigma, \sigma')$$

as the total rate at which the process moves away from σ . The explicit formula for the total rate is not hard to write, and it is used for analysis in the proofs.

The secondary structure of RNA sequences are meant to reflect homology, and constructing a multiple sequence alignment of multiple RNA sequences through evolutionary signal can be used to infer RNA secondary structure. The multiple sequence alignment arises by comparing sequences descending from a most recent common ancestor.

Definition 3. For any $n \geq 1$ and sequences $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_{v_1}, \dots, \sigma_{v_B}) \in \mathcal{S}^m$ at vertices v_1, \dots, v_B in a tree, a **multiple sequence alignment** is a collection of sequences $\mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = (a_1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \dots, a_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))$ whose entries come from $\Omega \cup \{-\}$ ($-$ is called a **gap**) such that:

- the lengths satisfy

$$|a_1(\boldsymbol{\sigma})| = |a_2(\boldsymbol{\sigma})| = \dots = |a_B(\boldsymbol{\sigma})| \geq \max\{|\sigma_{v_1}|, |\sigma_{v_2}|, \dots, |\sigma_{v_B}|\},$$

- no corresponding entries of $a_1(\sigma), \dots, a_B(\sigma)$ all equal $-$, and
- removing $-$ from $a_i(\sigma)$ yields σ_{v_i} for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.

A multiple sequence alignment can use auxiliary information beyond the sequences (such as an evolutionary tree or an RNA secondary structure ensemble), and our intention is to use a tree to align sequences and subsequently to predict an RNA secondary structure for each sequence.

2.1 Main results

In view of the law of large numbers, we consider the convergence of the vector $\frac{1}{N}\chi(T)$. The degree sequence contains information about the branching pattern of a secondary structure. In the biological literature, branching patterns have been used to abstractly represent structure. Identifying unusual substructures can help to understand functional significance of a particular secondary structure. A large deviation principle (LDP) describes the probability of any particular degree sequence for large N . A branching pattern is said to be typical if the distribution of branching degrees follows some probability in the limit. A branching distribution whose degree sequence differs significant from this distribution would be considered unusual or exotic.

One desires a convergence result over the set \mathcal{M}_D , but the law-of-large-numbers limit need not be an element of \mathcal{M}_D . Following Bakhtin and Heitsch (2009), the following LDP result considers a coupling $Q = (Q^{(1)}, Q^{(2)})$ with $Q^{(1)}$ being the probability measure over $[0, 1]^D$ and $Q^{(2)}$ over \mathcal{M}_D . Intuitively, an LDP involving the set $K = \mathcal{M}_D$ cannot be derived for $Q_N^{(1)} = \mathbf{P}_N$, but there is an LDP for $Q_N^{(2)}$ and $Q_N^{(1)}$ is close enough to $Q_N^{(1)}$ under the coupling to be a meaningful result about $Q_N^{(1)}$.

Theorem 1. *There is a sequence of probability measures $(Q_N)_{N \geq 1}$ defined on $[0, 1]^D \times \mathcal{M}_D$ with marginal distributions $Q_N^{(1)}$ and $Q_N^{(2)}$ where*

1. for each N , we have $Q_N^{(1)} = \mathbf{P}_N$ for all N ,
2. for each N , we have

$$Q_N \left\{ (x, y) \in [0, 1]^D \times \mathcal{M}_D : \sum_{k=0}^D |x_k - y_k| > \frac{2}{N} \right\} = 0,$$

3. $Q_N^{(2)}$ satisfies an LDP on \mathcal{M}_D with rate function I given by

$$I(p) = J(p) - \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}_D} J(p)$$

$$J(p) = \log(a^{-1}) + \log(b^{-1}) + \sum_{k=0}^D p_k \log(p_k),$$

with a and b defined in (2).

For the next two results, we assume that the branching pattern T is known, so that the degree sequence is also known. Then there are LDPs for the average loop sequence length and average stem length. The total number of unpaired bases is denoted L_u , while the total number of base pairs is denoted L_p . The number of unpaired bases in a single loop sequence is denoted $L_u^{(1)}$, while the number of base pairs in a single stem sequence is denoted $L_p^{(1)}$.

Theorem 2. *Let a and b be defined as in (2). (i) Define the rate function*

$$I_u(x) = \sup_{t \geq 0} [xt - \Lambda_u(t)]$$

where $\Lambda_u(t) = \log[\mathbf{E}_T[e^{tL_u^{(1)}}]]$. Then

$$\frac{1}{n} \log [\mathbf{P}_T(L_u \geq nx)] \rightarrow -I_u(x), n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$I_u(x) = -x \log \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) \right) + \log \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)} \right),$$

provided $x > \mathbf{E}_T[L_u^{(1)}]$. (ii) Define the rate function

$$I_p(x) = \sup_{t \geq 0} [xt - \Lambda_p(t)]$$

where $\Lambda_p(t) = \log[\mathbf{E}_T[e^{tL_p^{(1)}}]]$. Then

$$\frac{1}{n} \log [\mathbf{P}_T(L_p \geq nx)] \rightarrow -I_p(x), n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$I_p(x) = -x \log \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} \right) - \log \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2/\mu_2}{1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}} \right),$$

provided $x > \mathbf{E}_T[L_p^{(1)}]$.

Note the coefficients of x in the definitions of I_u and I_p are positive, as

$$1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) < 1 \text{ and } 1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} < 1.$$

This makes it so that $\mathbf{P}_T(L_u \geq nx)$ and $\mathbf{P}_T(L_p \geq nx)$ decay to 0 exponentially in x . Similarly, we prove another Theorem about the average stem length when the branching pattern T is not known.

Theorem 3. *Let a and b be defined as in (2). Define the rate function*

$$I_p(x) = \sup_{t \geq 0} [xt - \Lambda_p(t)]$$

where $\Lambda_p(t) = \log[\mathbf{E}[e^{tL_p^{(1)}}]]$. Then

$$\frac{1}{n} \log[\mathbf{P}(L_p \geq nx)] \rightarrow -I_p(x), n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$I_p(x) = -x \log \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} \right) - \log \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2/\mu_2}{1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}} \right) - \log \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ab}}{2b} \right),$$

with a and b defined in (2), provided $x > \mathbf{E}[L_p^{(1)}]$.

The analogous result is not available for loop sequence lengths because the unconditional mean and variance formulas for L_u are comparatively less tractable.

The LDPs provide a delicate characterization of the distribution of vertex and edge weights in the Structure Tree. Using these, we can derive statistical guarantees for the alignment of RNA sequences and structures. To start, we generalize the main Theorem of Legried and Roch (2023) to sequences that evolve according to the TKF91 Structure Tree. In this context, we condition on the branching pattern T . The steps in the procedure are similar to those already used; the specifics are outlined in the Appendix.

Theorem 4. *Fix $\nu_i, \mu_i, \lambda_i \in (0, \infty), i \in \{1, 2\}$, the substitution, deletion, and insertion rates under the TKF91 Structure Tree. Conditioned on the branching pattern T , there is a polynomial-time alignment procedure A such that for any tree depth $h > 0$ and any failure probability $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a maximum branch length $t_{\max} > 0$ such that the following property holds. For any rooted binary tree with edge weights with leaves $\{\ell_j\}_{j=1}^n$ ordered from left to right in a planar realization of the tree, the alignment procedure applied to the sequences $\sigma_{\ell_1}, \dots, \sigma_{\ell_n}$ outputs a true pairwise alignment of σ_{ℓ_1} and σ_{ℓ_n} with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, provided that all edge weights are bounded above by t_{\max} .*

Our primary contribution about alignment and prediction is an enhancement to the previous algorithm that permits one to predict secondary structure with high probability. In principle, equipped with a statistical or alignment-free method of phylogenetic reconstruction that provides a dense enough tree and sequences at the leaves, the implied multiple sequence alignment can be used to predict the secondary structures.

Theorem 5. *Fix $\nu_i, \mu_i, \lambda_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$ to be the substitution, deletion, and insertion rates under the TKF91 Structure Tree. Conditioned on the branching pattern T and success of the alignment procedure A in Theorem 4, there is a prediction procedure A' where for any failure probability $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a minimum number of leaves n such that the procedure applied to the sequences $\sigma_{\ell_1}, \dots, \sigma_{\ell_n}$ outputs the true secondary structures of σ_{ℓ_1} and σ_{ℓ_n} with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$.*

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 3, the stationary distributions are explicitly derived for relevant portions of the TKF91 Structure Tree process. In Section 4, the large deviation principles are proven and analyzed. In Section 5, the correctness of our secondary structure prediction is proven. In Section 6, we provide a short discussion and conclusion.

3 The stationary distribution and statistics

In this section, we give consideration only to the number of base pairs, number of unpaired bases, and the rooted tree induced by the placement of S -links within \mathcal{I}^{Ω_1} sequences. We consider whether the Markov process \mathcal{J} follows a stationary distribution. Provided the insertion rate of the immortal link is positive, there are no absorbing states of the process. So the stationary distribution exists provided the process does not explode. The next Theorem characterizes the stationary probability of any branching pattern, with the possibility of recording vertex and integer weights, if desired. These results are then used to verify that stationarity is attainable without further restriction on the growth of single sequences, i.e. $\lambda_1 < \mu_1$ and $\lambda_2 < \mu_2$.

Let $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the stationary distribution of the sequence length of the \mathcal{I} -process. If the insertion and deletion parameters are λ and μ , respectively, then it is well-known that $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}$ follows a geometric probability mass function, i.e.

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}(n) = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right)^n, n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}.$$

Derivations are provided in many places, such as Chapter 9 of Steel (2016). For any vertex $v \in V$, we let $c(v)$ be the child vertices of v . Because each child vertex corresponds to an S in the parenting loop sequence, it follows that $n_v \geq |c(v)|$ for every v .

Theorem 6. *Let \mathcal{J} be a TKF91 Structure Tree process.*

(i) *For any rooted topology T with vertex weights (n_v) and edge weights (w_e) , the stationary probability is*

$$\Pi(T, (n_v), (w_e)) = \prod_{v \in V} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^{\Omega_1}}(n_v) \binom{n_v}{|c(v)|} \pi_S^{|c(v)|} (1 - \pi_S)^{n_v - |c(v)|} \prod_{e \in c(v)} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^{\Omega_2}}(w_e).$$

(ii) *For any rooted topology with vertex weights but not edge weights, the stationary probability is*

$$\Pi(T, (n_v)) = \prod_{v \in V} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^{\Omega_1}}(n_v) \binom{n_v}{|c(v)|} \pi_S^{|c(v)|} (1 - \pi_S)^{n_v - |c(v)|}.$$

(iii) *For any rooted topology without vertex weights but with edge weights, the stationary probability is*

$$\Pi(T, (w_e)) = \prod_{v \in V} \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \left[\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} \pi_S \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}\right)\right]^{|c(v)|}}{1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)} \prod_{e \in c(v)} \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}\right)^{w_e}.$$

(iv) *For any rooted topology without vertex weights nor edge weights, the stationary probability is*

$$\Pi(T) = \prod_{v \in V} \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} \pi_S\right)^{|c(v)|}}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^{|c(v)|+1}} = \left(\frac{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1 (1 - \pi_S)}\right)^{|V|} \left(\frac{\lambda_1 \pi_S}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1 (1 - \pi_S)}\right)^{|V|-1}.$$

From (iv), the probability of any T is given by $\Pi(T) = a^{|V|}b^{|V|-1}$. It can be checked that the probability of observing a tree T with N vertices is well-defined for any choice of parameters with $\mu_1 < \lambda_1$ and $0 \leq \pi_S \leq 1$. The statement and proof make rudimentary observations about the Catalan numbers and plane trees, so the original content of the following Proposition is that no further restrictions on the parameters are required.

Proposition 7. *Let $\mu_1 < \lambda_1$ and $0 \leq \pi_S \leq 1$. Then the probability that the observed plane tree has N vertices under Π is*

$$p_N = \frac{1}{N} \binom{2N-2}{N-1} a^N b^{N-1},$$

and $\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} p_N = 1$.

Proof. The number of plane trees with N vertices is equal to the $(N-1)$ th Catalan number, given by

$$C_{N-1} = \frac{1}{N} \binom{2N-2}{N-1}.$$

Then

$$p_N = \sum_{i=1}^{C_{N-1}} a^N b^{N-1} = \frac{1}{N} \binom{2N-2}{N-1} a^N b^{N-1}.$$

For the second part, recall the generating function for the Catalan numbers is (see, e.g. Stanley and Fomin (2010))

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n x^n = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4x}}{2x}.$$

For the p_N to sum to 1, we require that

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} C_{N-1} a^N b^{N-1} = 1.$$

Using the generating function, this is equivalent to

$$\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ab}}{b} = 1.$$

We see that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - 2b)^2 &= \left(\frac{\mu_1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_1 \pi_S}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_1 \pi_S} \right)^2 \\ &= 1 - \frac{4(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)\lambda_1 \pi_S}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_1 \pi_S)^2} \\ &= 1 - 4ab, \end{aligned}$$

so the equality indeed holds.

It must also be checked that $ab \leq 1/4$ for $\mu_1 < \lambda_1$ and $0 \leq \pi_S \leq 1$. For this we optimize the function

$$h(\pi) = \frac{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)\lambda_1\pi}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi))^2}.$$

The derivative is

$$h'(\pi) = \frac{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)\lambda(\mu_1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_1\pi)}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi))^3}.$$

The denominator is positive for all choices of π , so the only critical point is $\pi = (\mu_1 - \lambda_1)/\lambda_1$. Plugging this critical point into h yields

$$h\left(\frac{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}{\lambda_1}\right) = \frac{1}{4}.$$

The endpoints 0 and 1 evaluate to $h(0) = 0$ and $h(1) = (\mu_1 - \lambda_1)\lambda_1/\mu_1^2$. It turns out that $h(1) \leq 1/4$, as it simplifies to $x(1 - x)$ with $x = \lambda_1/\mu_1$. As $0 \leq x \leq 1$, we find that $x(1 - x)$ has a maximal value of $1/4$, obtained at $x = 1/2$. Putting it together, the maximal value of ab is $1/4$, completing the proof. \square

Now, we prove Theorem 6. In the proof, we use the Fubini-Tonelli Theorem and the sum of the geometric series.

Proof of Theorem 6. Part (i) is obtained by using the Markov property. To start, for the root vertex v_0 , the joint stationary probability of the loop sequence length and the number of S links is

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{I}\Omega_1}(n_{v_0}) \binom{n_{v_0}}{|c(v_0)|} \pi_S^{|c(v_0)|} (1 - \pi_S)^{n_{v_0} - |c(v_0)|}.$$

Each S link corresponds to a new stem process for each edge $e \in c(v_0)$ and a new loop process for the vertex descending from e . Both processes are initialized at stationarity. Inductively, the calculation is repeated for all descending vertices until the leaves are reached. All leaf vertices have no child edges, so there are no probabilities involving descending edges to multiply. I.e. the notation

$$\prod_{e \in c(v)} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}\Omega_2}(w_e)$$

is simply replaced with 1 if $|c(v)| = 0$. Part (ii) is immediate from (i), as $\sum_{w_e \geq 0} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}\Omega_2}(w_e) = 1$ for all edges.

For part (iii), we use the stationary distribution of length of a TKF91 process. For each vertex, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_{\mathcal{I}\Omega_1}(n_v) \binom{n_v}{|c(v)|} \pi_S^{|c(v)|} (1 - \pi_S)^{n_v - |c(v)|} \prod_{e \in c(v)} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}\Omega_2}(w_e) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right)^{|c(v)|} \binom{n_v}{|c(v)|} \pi_S^{|c(v)|} (1 - \pi_S)^{n_v - |c(v)|} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}\right)^{|c(v)|} \prod_{e \in c(v)} \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}\right)^{w_e}. \end{aligned}$$

The product over $c(v)$ independently factors out of a summation over $n_v \geq |c(v)|$, so

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n_v=|c(v)|}^{\infty} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^{\Omega_1}}(n_v) \pi_S^{|c(v)|} (1 - \pi_S)^{n_v - |c(v)|} \prod_{e \in c(v)} \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} \right)^{w_e} \\ &= \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \left[\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} \pi_S \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \right]^{|c(v)|}}{1 - \frac{\lambda}{\mu} (1 - \pi_S)} \prod_{e \in c(v)} \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} \right)^{w_e}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (iii).

For (iv), we need only compute the sum of $(\lambda_2/\mu_2)^{w_e}$ over $w_e \geq 0$, and multiply $|c(v)|$ copies of this number together. This provides the first equality. For the second equality, there are $|V|$ copies of $(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)/(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))$. Every vertex except the root is a child vertex, so $\sum_{v \in V} c(v) = |V| - 1$. This provides $|V| - 1$ copies of $\lambda_1 \pi_S / (\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))$. This completes the proof of the second equality. \square

3.1 Length statistics

Next, we consider the distribution of the sequence length L . For a sequence with a determined RNA secondary structure, each unpaired base contributes one unit and each base pair contributes two units. So

$$L = n_\rho - |c(\rho)| + \sum_{n > \rho} (n_v - |c(v)| + 2w_{p(v)}),$$

where $p(v)$ denotes the parent edge to any non-root vertex v . The number of unpaired bases is denoted L_u , and the number of base pairs is denoted L_p . In the next Proposition, we condition on observing a particular branching pattern and compute means and variances of loop and stem sequences, intending to build to a result without the conditioning. Because $L = L_u + 2L_p$, the expectation and variance of the RNA sequence follow from this Proposition.

Proposition 8. *Let T be a given tree consisting of N vertices, child vertex counts $c(v_i)$, vertex weights (n_v) , and edge weights (w_e) . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[L_u|T] &= (2N - 1)\alpha. \\ \mathbf{E}[L_p|T] &= (N - 1) \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \\ \text{Var}[L_u|T] &= (2N - 1)\alpha(\alpha - 1) \\ \text{Var}[L_p|T] &= (N - 1) \frac{\beta}{(1 - \beta)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) \right) \\ \beta &= \lambda_2 / \mu_2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Given a tree T with N vertices, there are N independent TKF91 processes with a specified list of out-degrees $|c(v)|$ for each $v \in V$. Then

$$L_u = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i,$$

where X_i is the (base) length of a TKF91 process for loop i . The joint pmf of X_i and $|c(v_i)|$ is

$$\mathbf{P}(X_i = n, |c(v_i)| = c_i) = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right)^{n+c_i} \binom{n+c_i}{c_i} \pi_S^{c_i} (1 - \pi_S)^n, n \geq 0.$$

It is the joint probability of observing n bases and c_i S -links in the loop sequence. Because the X_i are independent, we integrate out the realizations of X_j over $j \neq i$. The probability of observing c_i S -links is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(X_i = n, T) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right)^{n+c_i} \binom{n+c_i}{c_i} \pi_S^{c_i} (1 - \pi_S)^n \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \left(\pi_S \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right)^{c_i} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+c_i}{c_i} \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^n \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right) \left(\pi_S \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}\right)^{c_i} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^{-c_i-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The conditional probability of $X_i = n$ given c_i links of type S is then

$$\mathbf{P}(X_i = n | |c(v_i)| = c_i) = \binom{n+c_i}{c_i} \frac{\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^n}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^{c_i+1}}, n \geq 0.$$

The other observed $|c(v)|$ are independent of X_i , so the probability of $X_i = n$ is equivalent when conditioned on T . The expectation is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_T[X_i] &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \binom{n+c_i}{c_i} \frac{\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^n}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^{c_i+1}} \\ &= (c_i + 1) \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right) \\ &\quad \times \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \binom{n-1+c_i+1}{c_i+1} \frac{\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^{n-1}}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^{(c_i+1)+1}} \\ &= (c_i + 1) \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_T[L_u] &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}_T[X_i] \\ &= (2N-1) \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) \right).\end{aligned}$$

For the variance of L_u we compute the expectation of $X_i(X_i - 1)$. Similarly to the first part, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_T[X_i(X_i - 1)] &= \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n(n-1) \binom{n+c_i}{c_i} \frac{\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1-\pi_S)\right)^n}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1-\pi_S)\right)^{c_i+1}} \\ &= (c_i+1)(c_i+2) \left[\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1-\pi_S) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1-\pi_S) \right) \right]^2.\end{aligned}$$

The variance is then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}_T[X_i] &= \mathbf{E}_T[X_i(X_i - 1)] + \mathbf{E}_T[X_i] - (\mathbf{E}_T[X_i])^2 \\ &= (c_i+1)\alpha(\alpha+1),\end{aligned}$$

with α defined as in the Theorem statement. Using conditional independence of the X_i , conditioned on T , we conclude

$$\text{Var}_T[L_u] = (2N-1)\alpha(\alpha+1).$$

On the other hand, each copy of L_p is a dinucleotide TKF91 process with no conditioning on existing links. So L_p is a geometric random variable with parameter λ_2/μ_2 , with

$$\mathbf{E}[L_p|T] = (N-1) \frac{\lambda_2/\mu_2}{1 - \lambda_2/\mu_2}$$

and

$$\text{Var}[L_p|T] = (N-1) \frac{\lambda_2/\mu_2}{(1 - \lambda_2/\mu_2)^2}.$$

□

Separately, we provide a Proposition giving the moment generating function of L_u and L_p given T . Note that these subsume the case where a sequence consists of either a single loop or single stem.

Proposition 9. *We have*

$$\mathbf{E}[e^{tL_u}|T] = \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^{2N-1} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)e^t\right)^{2N-1}}$$

if $\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)e^t < 1$, and

$$\mathbf{E}[e^{tL_p}|T] = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}e^t\right)^{N-1},$$

if $(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2})e^t < 1$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_T[e^{tX_i}] &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{tn} \binom{n+c_i}{c_i} \frac{\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^n}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^{c_i+1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^{c_i+1} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)e^t\right)^{c_i+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_T[e^{tL_u}] &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}_T[e^{tX_i}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^{2N-1} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)e^t\right)^{2N-1}} \end{aligned}$$

The method for $\mathbf{E}_T[e^{tL_p}]$ is similar. □

In the Propositions 8 and 9, we observe that the means, variances, and moment generating functions depend on n and on the parameters, but not on the specific branching pattern of T . These results imply the mean and variance of L_u and L_p , unconditionally. Before that, we need a result on the generating functions of L_u , L_p , and the underlying summands.

Proposition 10. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{L_u}(t) &= \mathbf{E}[e^{tL_u}] = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ab[w(t)]^{-2}}}{2b[w(t)]^3} \\ \phi_{L_p}(t) &= \mathbf{E}[e^{tL_p}] = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4abv(t)}}{2bv(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

with a and b defined in (2) and where

$$\begin{aligned} w(t) &= \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)e^t\right) \\ v(t) &= ab \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}e^t\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We use the law of total probability on the moment generating function. This is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[e^{tL_u}] &= \sum_T \mathbf{E}_T[e^{tL_u}] \Pi(T) \\
&= \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_T[e^{tL_u}] \mathcal{C}_{N-1} a^N b^{N-1} \\
&= a \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) e^t\right) \\
&\quad \times \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{N-1} \left(\frac{ab}{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S)\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1} (1 - \pi_S) e^t\right)^2} \right)^{N-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side uses the generating function for the Catalan numbers. Computing this limit and simplifying yields the moment generating function $\phi_{L_u}(t)$ for L_u . One can then compute two partial derivatives to obtain the mean and variance of L_u .

The method for L_p is similar. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[e^{tL_p}] &= \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_T[e^{tL_p}] \mathcal{C}_{N-1} a^N b^{N-1} \\
&= a \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \left(ab \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} e^t\right) \right)^{N-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, using the generating function of the Catalan numbers gives the result. □

Given the generating functions for L_u and L_p , one can compute the mean and variance of each. The full formulas are given in the Appendix.

Proposition 11. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[L_u] &= \phi'_{L_u}(0) \\
\mathbf{E}[L_p] &= \phi'_{L_p}(0) \\
\text{Var}[L_u] &= \phi''_{L_u}(0) - [\phi'_{L_u}(0)]^2 \\
\text{Var}[L_p] &= \phi''_{L_p}(0) - [\phi'_{L_p}(0)]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

4 Large deviations of the vertex number and lengths

In this section, we prove the large deviation principles outlined in Section 2. Though the joint probabilities are simple to write down, one must take care when writing conditional probabilities. We first consider the problem when the number of vertices N is known.

Throughout, we fix a positive integer D and let it represent the maximum out-degree across vertices. Recall $\chi(T) = (\chi_k(T))_{k=0}^D$ is the degree sequence of T .

Using the formulas in Proposition 7, the conditional probability of any particular tree with N vertices is

$$\frac{a^N b^{N-1}}{p_N} = \left[\frac{1}{N} \binom{2(N-1)}{N-1} \right]^{-1}.$$

The number of trees with $\chi_k(T) = n_k$ for $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, D\}$ and compatible n_k is

$$\frac{1}{N} \binom{N}{n_0, n_1, \dots, n_k}.$$

By compatible, we mean that $\sum_{k=0}^D n_k = N$ and $\sum_{k=1}^D k n_k = N - 1$. The first requirement ensures only vertices up to out-degree N appear, and the second enforces the fact that the total number of non-root vertices is $N - 1$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}(\chi_k(T) = n_k : 0 \leq k \leq D | N) = \frac{1}{N} \binom{N}{n_0, n_1, \dots, n_k} \left[\frac{1}{N} \binom{2(N-1)}{N-1} \right]^{-1}.$$

Following Bakhtin and Heitsch (2009), there is a large deviation principle in the case where each tree with N vertices is equally likely. We do this without making reference to any energy model. So, asymptotically we find

$$\mathbf{P}_N(\chi_k(T) = n_k) = \frac{e^{N \log(a) + (N-1) \log(b)}}{Z_N} \exp \left\{ -N \sum_{k=0}^D \frac{n_k}{N} \log(n_k/N) + O(\log(N)) \right\},$$

with a and b defined as in (2). Inside the exponential, we have

$$-N[J(p_0, \dots, p_N)] + O(\log(N)),$$

where we set

$$J(p_0, \dots, p_D) = \log(a^{-1}) + \log(b^{-1}) + \sum_{k=0}^D p_k \log(p_k).$$

The function J is strictly convex over the set

$$\mathcal{M}_D = \{(p_0, \dots, p_D) \in [0, 1]^D : \sum_{k=0}^D p_k = 1, \sum_{k=1}^D k p_k = 1\},$$

so it obtains a unique minimum on \mathcal{M}_D . We now minimize this over the constraints $\sum_{k=0}^D p_k = 1$ and $\sum_{k=1}^D k p_k = 1$. The function J is simple enough that we (nearly) have a closed form solution for the minimum value. Importantly, we find for finite M that p_k^* decays exponentially for $k \geq 2$. This is in contrast to the conclusion when the only constraint is $\sum_{k=0}^D p_k = 1$, where the unique minimum occurs for the uniform distribution. In the limit as $D \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain another typical optimal distribution (p_0, \dots, p_D) . The following Proposition states that the minimizer satisfies a geometric-like distribution.

Proposition 12. *Let the maximum degree D be fixed. Then*

$$p_k^* = \frac{1-x}{1-x^{D+1}}x^k, k \in \{0, 1, \dots, D\},$$

where x is a solution to the polynomial equation

$$(D-1)x^{D+2} - Dx^{D+1} + 2x - 1 = 0.$$

Moreover, there exists an D sufficiently large that $x < 1$. In the limit as $D \rightarrow +\infty$, the value p_k^* follows a geometric probability mass function with parameter $1/2$.

Proof. We use the method of Lagrange multipliers to optimize J subject to the two constraint set in \mathcal{M}_D . The optimal solution $p^* = (p_0^*, \dots, p_D^*)$ satisfies the $D+2$ equations given by $\nabla J(p_k^*) = \nu_1(1, \dots, 1) + \nu_2(0, 1, \dots, D)$. More directly, these are equivalent to $\log(p_k^*) + 1 = \nu_1 + k\nu_2$. Because the probabilities must sum to 1, we find

$$1 = \sum_{k=0}^D p_k^* = \sum_{k=0}^D e^{\nu_1-1} (e^{\nu_2})^k = e^{\nu_1-1} \frac{1 - e^{\nu_2(D+1)}}{1 - e^{\nu_2}}.$$

From the second constraint, we find

$$1 = \sum_{k=1}^D kp_k^* = \sum_{k=1}^D e^{\nu_1-1} k (e^{\nu_2})^k = e^{\nu_1-1} \frac{e^{\nu_2}(De^{\nu_2(D+1)} - (D+1)e^{\nu_2D} + 1)}{(1 - e^{\nu_2})^2}.$$

Solving for e^{ν_1-1} and making the substitution implies

$$(D-1)x^{D+2} - Dx^{D+1} + 2x - 1 = 0$$

where $x = e^{\nu_2}$. Once ν_2 and e^{ν_2} are determined, one then has

$$e^{\nu_1-1} = \frac{1 - e^{\nu_2}}{1 - e^{\nu_2(D+1)}}.$$

Then

$$p_k^* = \frac{1 - e^{\nu_2}}{1 - e^{\nu_2(D+1)}} e^{\nu_2 k}.$$

For the second part of the claim, we observe that

$$e^{\nu_2} = (p_D^* e^{1-\nu_1})^{1/D} \leq e^{(1-\nu_1)/D} = (p_0^*)^{-1/D}.$$

Taking D sufficiently large ensures that e^{ν_2} is less than 1. □

In the next result, we prove the large deviation principle for the average length of loops and stems. It assumes a branching pattern T with N vertices is given.

Proof of Theorem 2. For the number of unpaired bases, we have

$$\Lambda_u(t) = -\log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right) - \log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)e^t\right).$$

We then want to maximize the function $xt - \Lambda_u(t)$ over

$$t \in [0, -\log(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S))].$$

The derivative is

$$x - \Lambda'_u(t) = x + \frac{\frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)e^t}{1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)e^t},$$

which is always non-negative. So the maximal value of $xt - \Lambda_u(t)$ occurs at the boundary point

$$t^* = -\log(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)).$$

Then

$$\Lambda_u^*(x) = -x \log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right) + \log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)}\right).$$

The large deviation principle for base pairs is similar, but

$$\Lambda_p(t) = -\log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}e^t\right)$$

defined for $t < -\log(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2})$, the derivative of $xt - \Lambda_p(t)$ is

$$x + \frac{\frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}e^t}{1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}e^t}.$$

Because this is non-negative, the function $xt - \Lambda_p(t)$ is maximized at the right boundary, implying

$$\Lambda_p^*(x) = -x \log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}\right) - \log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2/\mu_2}{1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}}\right).$$

□

We now proceed to the large deviation principle for the average stem length, without conditioning on T . The proof uses Theorem 2 and the law of total probability, conditioning on the tree T .

Proof of Theorem 3. We first need the moment generating function of $L_p^{(1)}$. Using the law of total probability, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[e^{tL_p^{(1)}}] &= \sum_T \mathbf{E}_T[e^{tL_p^{(1)}}] \Pi(T) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} e^t\right) \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{N-1} a^N b^{N-1} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} e^t\right) \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ab}}{2b}. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\Lambda_p(t) = -\log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} e^t\right) + \log\left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ab}}{2b}\right)$$

for $t < -\log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}\right)$. As with the previous Theorem, the function $xt - \Lambda_p(t)$ is maximized at the right boundary, implying

$$\Lambda_p^*(x) = -x \log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}\right) - \log\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda_2/\mu_2}{1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\mu_2}}\right) - \log\left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ab}}{2b}\right).$$

□

5 Alignment and support for base pairs

For RNA sequences with a great amount of structural stability, indels should be much less common than substitution mutations. The TKF91 model and its progeny evolve according to Markov processes, so sequence alignments express where indels are most likely to have occurred. The explicit steps in the alignment are written in the Appendix, and many steps are taken directly from Legried and Roch (2023). However, as with the LDP results, we need to be aware of the underlying tree structure. The results of that paper do not contemplate long indels, and we do not develop new methods for that here. Instead, we assume the number of vertices in the tree is fixed and align the many independently evolving loop and stem sequences. This is implemented by giving individual rates λ_S and μ_S to S -links and assume that they both equal 0.

Through a careful reading of the stepwise alignment procedure, it is clear the following Proposition is true and applicable to the sequences we would consider.

Proposition 13. *Let T be output of the pre-processing step and let x_1, \dots, x_B be the resulting vertices on the backbone (path between x_1 and x_B). Then the alignment algorithm A produces a true pairwise alignment of the sequences σ_{x_1} and σ_{x_B} provided (1) the ancestral sequence $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ for $k = 2, \dots, B-1$ are correct, and (2) successive pairs of backbone sequences $\{\sigma_{x_k}, \sigma_{x_{k+1}}\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, B-1$ are at most one mutation away.*

Proof. The only change between the TKF91 sequences in Legried and Roch (2023) and the TKF91 Structure Tree without stem indel is that the TKF91 Structure Tree permits dinucleotide mutations. Since these mutations occur independently in exponential time, properties (1) and (2) follow in the same way as in Legried and Roch (2023). □

Suppose there are N vertices in the TKF91 Structure Tree. Then there are N loop sequences and $N - 1$ stem sequences, all of which are independent. We let σ denote the sequence determining the state of the process. The sequence σ partitions into loop sequences $\{\sigma_{u_i}\}_{i=1}^N$ and stem sequences $\{\sigma_{p_i}\}_{i=1}^{N-1}$. Assuming $|\sigma| \leq \bar{L}$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^N |\sigma_{u_i}| \leq \bar{L}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |\sigma_{p_i}| \leq \bar{L}/2$ for each i . Letting Y_σ be the sequences that are at most one mutation away, the transition from σ to Y_σ requires no more than one of the partitioned sequences undergo a single mutation. Also, let $P_t(\sigma, \cdot)$ be the probability measure for the sequence at time t given that the sequence is σ at time 0. We then have

$$P_t(\sigma, Y_\sigma) \geq 1 - [t(\bar{L} + 2)\max(\mu_1 + \lambda_1 + \nu_1, \mu_2 + \lambda_2 + \nu_2)]^2.$$

We also want to control for the length of a stationary structure tree. Conditioned on the number of vertices N , the probability that the length exceeds a given number \bar{L} is

$$\exp\left(N \log\left(\frac{\lambda_1/\mu_1}{1 - (1 - \lambda_1/\mu_1)e^s}\right) + (N - 1) \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2/\mu_2}{1 - (1 - \lambda_2/\mu_2)e^{2s}}\right) - s\bar{L}\right)$$

for any $s > 0$. There is a single s involving λ_1/μ_1 and λ_2/μ_2 that minimizes this probability, and it ensures that the probability decays exponentially in \bar{L} .

With these bounds, the steps in Legried and Roch (2023) can be re-traced to prove Theorem 4. Through a careful reading of the stepwise alignment procedure, the generalization to evolving RNA sequences holds as a small extension.

Proof of Theorem 4. The proof amounts to generalizing Proposition 1 of Legried and Roch (2023) to the TKF91 Structure Tree sequences in absence of stem indels. Supposing T is the output tree of the pre-processing step and x_1, \dots, x_B are the resulting vertices on the backbone path between x_1 and x_B . Then the alignment algorithm A produces a true pairwise alignment of the sequences σ_{x_1} and σ_{x_B} provided (1) the ancestral sequence $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ for $k = 2, \dots, B - 1$ are correct, and (2) successive pairs of backbone sequences $\{\sigma_{x_k}, \sigma_{x_{k+1}}\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, B - 1$ are at most one mutation away. The only change between the TKF91 sequences in Legried and Roch (2023) and the TKF91 Structure Tree without stem indel is that the TKF91 Structure Tree permits dinucleotide mutations. Since these mutations occur independently in exponential time, properties (1) and (2) follow in the same way as in Legried and Roch (2023). \square

Next, we introduce the enhancement to the alignment procedure to assist in predicting RNA secondary structure. Every pair of sequences in the alignment satisfies one of the criteria (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E). The enhancement procedure is as follows:

1. Given $\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}$, let $\Sigma_s^2(\hat{\sigma}_{1:2})$ be the sequence of length $|\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}|$ whose entries all equal $*$.
2. For $k = 3, \dots, B$:
 - (a) We are given a partial multiple structure alignment

$$\Sigma_1^{k-1}(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k-1}), \dots, \Sigma_{k-1}^{k-1}(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k-1})$$

of the sequences $\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$, and a new sequence $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ that is at most one mutation away from $\hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$.

- (b) The sequences satisfy one of the five cases (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) by assumption, so their alignment $a_{k-1}^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ and $a_k^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ (within the larger multiple sequence alignment) will differ by at most two entries. If the change is due to (C), (D), or (E) and the affected columns in the structure alignment are still $*$, then $*$ is changed to \cdot to indicate that site is unpaired or to $($ or $)$ to indicate that site is part of a base pair. If the change is due to (B), then it is impossible (when “wobble” pairings are permitted) to tell whether a dinucleotide substitution has occurred, so no structure symbols are changed.
3. Output the pairwise structure alignment $(\Sigma_1^B(\hat{\sigma}_{1:B}, \hat{\eta}_{1:B}), \Sigma_B^B(\hat{\sigma}_{1:B}, \hat{\eta}_{1:B}))$ after replacing all remaining $*$ symbols with \cdot and removing all columns with only gaps.

The remainder of this section is used to show that step (2b) in the enhancement procedure is superfluous in the limit as the edge lengths in the phylogenetic tree tend to 0. This means the secondary structures of σ_{x_1} and σ_{x_B} are predicted with high probability, proving the Theorem.

To start, we consider the 6-by-6 dinucleotide transition kernel Q , with the state space consisting of canonical base pairs, including the “wobble” pairing. It takes the form

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} AU & GU & GC & UA & UG & CG \\ * & Q_{12} & Q_{13} & Q_{14} & Q_{15} & Q_{16} \\ Q_{21} & * & Q_{23} & Q_{24} & Q_{25} & Q_{26} \\ Q_{31} & Q_{32} & * & Q_{34} & Q_{35} & Q_{36} \\ Q_{41} & Q_{42} & Q_{43} & * & Q_{45} & Q_{46} \\ Q_{51} & Q_{52} & Q_{53} & Q_{54} & * & Q_{56} \\ Q_{61} & Q_{62} & Q_{63} & Q_{64} & Q_{65} & * \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} AU \\ GU \\ GC \\ UA \\ UG \\ CG \end{matrix}.$$

The main idea is the dinucleotide base pair eventually makes a transition that can be annotated. These transitions include most dinucleotide substitutions as well as deletion. To consider the waiting time for any transition of these types, we add an “empty” state 0 to the transition kernel. Accounting for only deletion gives

$$Q' = \begin{pmatrix} AU & GU & GC & UA & UG & CG & 0 \\ * & \nu_2 Q_{12} & \nu_2 Q_{13} & \nu_2 Q_{14} & \nu_2 Q_{15} & \nu_2 Q_{16} & \mu_2 \\ \nu_2 Q_{21} & * & \nu_2 Q_{23} & \nu_2 Q_{24} & \nu_2 Q_{25} & \nu_2 Q_{26} & \mu_2 \\ \nu_2 Q_{31} & \nu_2 Q_{32} & * & \nu_2 Q_{34} & \nu_2 Q_{35} & \nu_2 Q_{36} & \mu_2 \\ \nu_2 Q_{41} & \nu_2 Q_{42} & \nu_2 Q_{43} & * & \nu_2 Q_{45} & \nu_2 Q_{46} & \mu_2 \\ \nu_2 Q_{51} & \nu_2 Q_{52} & \nu_2 Q_{53} & \nu_2 Q_{54} & * & \nu_2 Q_{56} & \mu_2 \\ \nu_2 Q_{61} & \nu_2 Q_{62} & \nu_2 Q_{63} & \nu_2 Q_{64} & \nu_2 Q_{65} & * & \mu_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} AU \\ GU \\ GC \\ UA \\ UG \\ CG \\ 0 \end{matrix}.$$

Accounting additionally for the informative substitutions gives Q'' which equals

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & \nu_2 Q_{12} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \nu_2(Q_{13} + Q_{14} + Q_{15} + Q_{16}) + \mu_2 \\ \nu_2 Q_{21} & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \nu_2(Q_{23} + Q_{24} + Q_{25} + Q_{26}) + \mu_2 \\ 0 & \nu_2 Q_{32} & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & \nu_2(Q_{31} + Q_{34} + Q_{35} + Q_{36}) + \mu_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * & \nu_2 Q_{45} & 0 & \nu_2(Q_{41} + Q_{42} + Q_{43} + Q_{46}) + \mu_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \nu_2 Q_{54} & * & 0 & \nu_2(Q_{51} + Q_{52} + Q_{53} + Q_{56}) + \mu_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \nu_2 Q_{65} & * & \nu_2(Q_{61} + Q_{62} + Q_{63} + Q_{64}) + \mu_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, we are interested in the outcomes of discrete transitions as they occur. So, we define the discrete transition matrix P'' obtained by setting

$$P''_{ij} = \frac{Q''_{ij}}{Q''_{ii}}, \quad \text{if } i \neq j$$

$$P''_{ii} = 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} P''_{ij}.$$

This matrix then takes the block form

$$P'' = \begin{pmatrix} P''_r & P''_0 \\ \mathbf{O} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where P''_0 is the 6-by-1 column corresponding to transitions to the 0 state, P''_r is the 6-by-6 matrix corresponding to prior transitions, and \mathbf{O} is a 1-by-6 row of zeros. The survival function of the first transition K to state 0 is then

$$\mathbf{P}_T(K > k) = \mathbf{s}_0 [P''_r]^k \mathbf{1}, \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{s}_0 is a 1-by-6 row indicating the initial probability distribution of the original six states. Because σ_{x_1} is known, this vector is always a standard basis vector; we let \mathbf{B} denote the set of standard basis vectors. The distribution of K is often called a **(discrete) phase-type distribution**, and results like (3) can be found in Asmussen and Albrecher (2010).

Proof of Theorem 5. It remains to bound the probability that the procedure A' correctly predicts the secondary structures of σ_{x_1} and σ_{x_B} . From the Perron-Frobenius Theorem (again, see Asmussen and Albrecher (2010)), the leading eigenvalue of P''_r is equal to 1. Because $\mu_2 > 0$, the non-leading eigenvalues of P''_r have magnitude strictly less than 1. This implies $\mathbf{P}_T(K > k)$ decays to 0 exponentially in k for all choices of basis vectors \mathbf{s}_0 .

For provable correctness of the secondary structures, it is sufficient to obtain correctness for every pair of sites in the shorter sequence. Letting $M' = \min(|\sigma_{x_1}|, |\sigma_{x_B}|)$, we consider all $\mathcal{P}' = \binom{M'}{2}$ pairs. Letting \mathcal{E} be the event of error, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_T(\mathcal{E}^c) &= 1 - \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}) \\ &\geq 1 - \mathbf{P}_T\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\mathcal{P}'} \{\text{pair } i \text{ is predicted incorrectly}\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying subadditivity of measure a union-bound, where the right-hand side is at least

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{P}'} \mathbf{P}_T(\text{pair } i \text{ is predicted incorrectly}) \\
&= 1 - \mathcal{P}' \mathbf{P}_T(\text{pair 1 is predicted incorrectly}) \\
&\geq 1 - \mathcal{P}' \max_{\mathbf{s}_0 \in \mathbf{B}} \mathbf{P}_T(K > k).
\end{aligned}$$

Then given $\epsilon > 0$, by choosing T dense enough, the survival probabilities are small enough that the right-hand side is at least $1 - \epsilon$. \square

6 Discussion

The large deviation principles derived in Section 4 show that empirical estimates for the degree sequence, average loop length, and average stem length have exponentially small error when the number of leaves N gets larger. Having most concentration of the stationary distribution near the mean means the ancestral sequence estimation is highly accurate between any pair of closely related sequences, no matter how ancient. The pairwise sequence alignment and secondary structure predictions of two arbitrarily distant extant sequences can then be made with high probability. Because the alignment results are stated for those with a fixed number of vertices, we consider the implications for well-conserved transfer RNA as well as the the purine riboswitch and nanos translational control element (TCE) examples discussed in Holmes (2004).

The transfer RNA coding for arginine in *S. cerevisiae* and six related yeasts are studied in Domingo et al. (2018). The seven closely related yeast species have the same cloverleaf branching pattern and have only ten segregating sites for sequences that are all length 72. The authors provide a particular target cloverleaf, see Figure 1. Yet, some of the species have mismatched base pairs, so the target secondary structures should be slightly different from the target. An evolutionary indel model could help explain which sequence of mutations is most likely to be compatible with the change in bases with the least radical change in secondary structure. However, identical sequence lengths suggest very low base indels and stem indels, so any particular sequence of mutations of order as low as 2 may give rise to an identifiability problem. If we desire transfer RNA evolution to have low stem indel, then it might be valuable to allow the indel model to permit the faster establishment of bulges and interior loops. A new alignment procedure in the presense of a dense phylogenetic tree would need to be developed for this.

The purine riboswitches in *B. halodurans* and *S. pneumoniae* found in Rfam and studied in Holmes (2004) have the same sequence length and same target secondary structure. Although the sequences have low identity, the sequence alignment has few gaps. In view of our alignment and prediction results, very low base indel implies relatively fast alignment.

The nanos TCE RNA in *D. melanogaster* and *D. virilis* are considered in Cruscs et al. (2001). Despite having a large difference in sequence length, the two RNA sequences have the same branching pattern and have strong conservation in some of the stems and are established to provide the same functionality. Because of the strong conservation, the alignment method of Holmes (2004) is successful at coming up with a reasonable alignment




Figure 1: The target secondary structures for the nanos TCE RNA in *D. melanogaster* (Left) and in *D. virilis* but without site labels (Right), as in Cruce et al. (2001). It is possible to assign compatible labels in the right secondary structure while having a near-zero sequence identity.

that correctly infers the secondary structure in the important stem regions. It may be countered that this success of the TKF91 Structure Tree is possible because the two RNA sequences have low total branching and the sequences have borderline high sequence identity. Our results suggest that the number of vertices in the branching pattern may be important – it is much harder to align sequence and perform secondary structure prediction in the presence of a complicated branching pattern. On the other hand, the high sequence identity is not a driving factor of the Holmes result. In the presence of enough phylogenetic information, the correct secondary structures can be found with high probability, even with very different sequences with compatible sites. See Figure 1.

Importantly, we do not consider the alignment and prediction problems when stem indels occur with reasonable probability. This is because the ancestral sequence estimation problem in Legried and Roch (2023) is not known to generalize to so-called “Long Indels” in Miklos et al. (2004) where a large number of sites may be inserted or deleted in linear time. While it would not be difficult to align two sequences that are a single large indel away from each other, one would need a new large deviation principle and controls on concentration that we are not prepared to present here. A generalization to long indels would likely not need much more work to generalize to the TKF91 Structure Tree. This generalization should be pursued in future work.

References

- James Allen and Simon Whelan. Assessing the state of substitution models describing noncoding rna evolution. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 6:65–75, 2014. doi: 10.1093/gbe/evt206.
- Elizabeth Allman, John Rhodes, and Seth Sullivant. Statistically consistent k-mer methods for phylogenetic tree reconstruction. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 24:153–171, 2017. doi: 10.1089/cmb.2015.0216.
- Soren Asmussen and Hansjorg Albrecher. Ruin probabilities. *Advanced Series on Statistical Science and Applied Probability*, 14, 2010. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1142/7431>.
- Yuri Bakhtin and Christine Heitsch. Large deviations for random trees and the branching of rna secondary structures. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 71:84–106, 2009. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11538-008-9353-y>.
- Susan Cruce, Seema Chatterjee, and Elizabeth Gavis. Overlapping but distinct rna elements control repression and activation of nanos translation. *Molecular Cell*, 5:457–467, 2001. doi: 10.1016/s1097-2765(00)80440-2.
- Constantinos Daskalakis and Sebastien Roch. Alignment-free phylogenetic reconstruction: Sample complexity via a branching process analysis. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 23:693–721, 2013. doi: 10.1214/12-AAP852.
- Amir Dembo and Ofer Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. 2010.
- Julia Domingo, Guillaume Diss, and Ben Lehner. Pairwise and higher-order genetic interactions during the evolution of a trna. *Nature*, 558:117–121, 2018. doi: 10.1038/s41586-018-0170-7.
- Sean R. Eddy and Richard Durbin. RNA sequence analysis using covariance models. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 22(11):2079–2088, 06 1994. ISSN 0305-1048. doi: 10.1093/nar/22.11.2079. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/22.11.2079>.
- Joseph Felsenstein. Evolutionary trees from dna sequences: A maximum likelihood approach. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 17:368–376, 1981. doi: 10.1007/BF01734359.
- Paul Gardner and Robert Giegerich. A comprehensive comparison of comparative rna structure prediction approaches. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 5, 2004. doi: 10.1186/1471-2105-5-140.
- Ian Holmes. A probabilistic model for the evolution of rna structure. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 5, 2004. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-5-166>.
- B Knudsen and J Hein. RNA secondary structure prediction using stochastic context-free grammars and evolutionary history. *Bioinformatics*, 15(6):446–454, 06 1999. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/15.6.446. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/15.6.446>.

- Brandon Legried and Sebastien Roch. Pairwise alignment at arbitrarily large evolutionary distance. *The Annals of Applied Probability, to appear*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2207.12543.
- Istvan Miklos, Gerton Lunter, and Ian Holmes. A “long indel” model for evolutionary sequence alignment. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 21, 2004. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msh043.
- Eric Nawrocki, Diana Kolbe, and Sean Eddy. Infernal 1.0: inference of rna alignments. *Bioinformatics*, 25, 2009. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btp157.
- Elena Rivas and Sean Eddy. Probabilistic phylogenetic inference with insertions and deletions. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 2008. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000172.
- Michael Rosenberg and Sudhir Kumar. Traditional phylogenetic reconstruction methods reconstruct shallow and deep evolutionary relationships equally well. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 18:1823–1827, 2001. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a03969.
- Nicholas J Savill, David C Hoyle, and Paul G Higgs. RNA Sequence Evolution With Secondary Structure Constraints: Comparison of Substitution Rate Models Using Maximum-Likelihood Methods. *Genetics*, 157(1):399–411, 01 2001. ISSN 1943-2631. doi: 10.1093/genetics/157.1.399. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/157.1.399>.
- Susan Schroeder and Douglas Turner. Optical melting measurements of nucleic acid thermodynamics. *Methods in Enzymology*, 468, 2009. doi: 10.1016/S0076-6879(09)68017-4.
- Alexander Serganov and Dinshaw Patel. Ribozymes, riboswitches and beyond: regulation of gene expression without proteins. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 8, 2007. doi: 10.1038/nrg2172.
- Richard Stanley and Sergey Fomin. Enumerative combinatorics. *Cambridge University Press*, 2010. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511609589.
- Mike Steel. *Phylogeny: Discrete and Random Processes in Evolution*. SIAM-Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2016. ISBN 161197447X.
- Jeffrey L. Thorne, Hirohisa Kishino, and Joseph Felsenstein. An evolutionary model for maximum likelihood alignment of dna sequences. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 33(2): 114–124, Aug 1991. ISSN 1432-1432. doi: 10.1007/BF02193625. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02193625>.
- Douglas Turner and David Mathews. Nndb: the nearest neighbor parameter database for predicting stability of nucleic acid secondary structure. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 38, 2010. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkp892.

7 Appendix

7.1 Mean and variance formulas

The expectation of L_u (first derivative of the moment generating function evaluated at 0) is

$$\frac{1}{\left[2\mu_1(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S)) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^{11}\right]} \times (1 - \pi_S) \\ \times \left[-\frac{4\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \mu_1)}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \mu_1)\mu_1^4\pi_S}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^6}}} - \frac{3(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^6}{\mu_1^4\pi_S} \left(-1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{4\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \mu_1)\mu_1^4\pi_S}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^6}}\right) \right].$$

The expectation of L_u^2 (second derivative of the moment generating function evaluated at 0) is

$$\frac{(8\lambda_1^3(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)^2(1 - \pi_S)^2\pi_S)}{\mu_1^2(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^3 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^{16} \left(1 - \frac{4\lambda_1(-\lambda_1 + \mu_1\pi_S)}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^2 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^4}\right)^{3/2}} \\ + \frac{2\lambda_1(-\lambda_1 + \mu_1)(1 - \pi_S)}{\left(\mu_1(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S)) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^{11} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_1(-\lambda_1 + \mu_1\pi_S)}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^2 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^4}}\right)} \\ + \frac{18\lambda_1^2(-\lambda_1 + \mu_1)(1 - \pi_S)^2}{\left(\mu_1^2(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S)) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^{12} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_1(-\lambda_1 + \mu_1\pi_S)}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^2 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^4}}\right)} \\ + \frac{3(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))(1 - \pi_S) \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_1(-\lambda_1 + \mu_1\pi_S)}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^2 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^4}}\right)}{2\mu_1 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right) \pi_S} \\ + \frac{6\lambda_1(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))(1 - \pi_S)^2 \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_1(-\lambda_1 + \mu_1\pi_S)}{(\mu_1 - \lambda_1(1 - \pi_S))^2 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^4}}\right)}{\left(\mu_1^2 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}(1 - \pi_S)\right)^8 \pi_S\right)}.$$

The variance is then $\text{Var}[L_u] = \mathbf{E}[L_u^2] - [\mathbf{E}[L_u]]^2$.

7.2 Stepwise alignment

In this section, we describe the stepwise alignment subroutine. It is based on the assumption that along the backbone (of the pruned tree):

- (i) the sequences have been correctly inferred; and

- (ii) consecutive sequences differ by at most one mutation action. Double substitutions, insertions, and deletions are permitted.

These facts can be established easily from previous theoretical work for sequence alignments only. In these circumstances, we show that homologous sites can be traced (up to the conventions used to handle indistinguishability). We will construct a sequence of alignments \mathbf{a}^2 , \mathbf{a}^3 , etc. We first describe the alignment of two structures, then the alignment of alignments, and so on.

Given two sequences $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ satisfying the assumptions (i) and (ii) above, we construct an alignment $\mathbf{a}^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta})$. We let $a_\ell^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta})$ denote the ℓ th sequence (ℓ th row) of the alignment constructed from the sequences $\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}$. Assuming that $\pi_S = 0$, there are five possible cases:

- (A) If $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\eta}$, then a true alignment is obtained by setting $a_1^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}) = \hat{\sigma}$, $a_2^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}) = \hat{\eta}$, corresponding to no mutation.
- (B) If $|\hat{\sigma}| = |\hat{\eta}|$ but $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ agree on all sites except one, then a true alignment is obtained by setting $a_1^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}) = \hat{\sigma}$, $a_2^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}) = \hat{\eta}$, corresponding to either: (i) exactly one substitution between the sequences at an unpaired base, or (ii) exactly one dinucleotide substitution between the sequences at a base pair but one site stays the same.
- (C) If $|\hat{\sigma}| = |\hat{\eta}|$ but $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ agree on all sites except two, then a true alignment is obtained by setting $a_1^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}) = \hat{\sigma}$, $a_2^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}) = \hat{\eta}$, corresponding to exactly one dinucleotide substitution between the sequences at a base pair and both sites change.
- (D) If $|\hat{\eta}| = |\hat{\sigma}| + 1$ and there exists $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, |\hat{\sigma}|\}$ and $\hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}} \in \{A, C, G, U\}$ such that

$$\hat{\eta}_i = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_i & i < j \\ \hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}} & i = j \\ \hat{\sigma}_{i-1} & i > j, \end{cases}$$

then an indel has occurred. The location of the indel cannot be determined from the sequences alone. For example, if $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ are separated by an indel so that they are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma} &= (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0) \\ \hat{\eta} &= (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0), \end{aligned}$$

we cannot tell which site gave birth to the new 0 to obtain $\hat{\eta}$ (assuming that the evolutionary process transformed $\hat{\sigma}$ into $\hat{\eta}$). Secondary structure information could provide additional restrictions, but ambiguity is still possible. In any case, we assume by convention that j is the minimal choice possible. Then a true alignment is obtained by setting $a_2^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}) = \hat{\eta}$ and for $i = 1, \dots, |\hat{\sigma}| + 1$

$$a_1^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta})_i = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_i & i < j \\ - & i = j \\ \hat{\sigma}_{i-1} & i > j \end{cases}$$

corresponding to a single site $\hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}}$ being inserted into the sequence $\hat{\eta}$ to the left of the j th site to obtain $\hat{\sigma}$. The inserted site is unpaired. Similarly, if instead $|\hat{\sigma}| = |\hat{\eta}| + 1$ (in which case a deletion has occurred), we interchange the roles of $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ and use the same convention. The deleted site is unpaired.

- (E) If $|\hat{\eta}| = |\hat{\sigma}| + 2$ and there exist $j, j' \in \{1, 2, \dots, |\hat{\sigma}|\}$ with $j < j'$ and $\hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}}, \hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}'} \in \{A, C, G, U\}$ such that

$$\hat{\eta}_i = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_i & i < j \\ \hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}} & i = j \\ \hat{\sigma}_{i-1} & j < i < j' \\ \hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}'} & i = j' \\ \hat{\sigma}_{i-2} & i > j', \end{cases}$$

then a dinucleotide indel has occurred. As with single indels, the location of the indel cannot always be determined, so we assume by convention that j, j' are the minimal choices possible. Then a true alignment is obtained by setting $a_2^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta})$ and for $i = 1, \dots, |\hat{\sigma}| + 2$

$$a_1^2(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\eta})_i = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_i & i < j \\ - & i = j \\ \hat{\sigma}_{i-1} & j < i < j' \\ - & i = j' \\ \hat{\sigma}_{i-2} & i > j' \end{cases}$$

corresponding to the base pair $(\hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}}, \hat{\eta}_{\text{ins}'})$ being inserted into the sequence $\hat{\eta}$, displacing the sites j and j' to obtain $\hat{\sigma}$. The two sites comprise a base pair. Similarly, if instead $|\hat{\sigma}| = |\hat{\eta}| + 2$ (in which case a base pair deletion has occurred), we interchange the roles of $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ and use the same convention. The deleted sites comprise a base pair.

As with the standard algorithm, we will need to align alignments along the backbone. Doing this step for B vertices yields a multiple structure alignment of the form $a_\ell^B(\hat{\sigma}_{1:B}, \hat{\eta}_{1:B})$. Suppose we have sequences $\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}, \hat{\sigma}_{x_2}, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{x_B}$ and successive pairs $\{\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}, \hat{\sigma}_{x_2}\}, \{\hat{\sigma}_{x_2}, \hat{\sigma}_{x_3}\}, \dots, \{\hat{\sigma}_{x_{B-1}}, \hat{\sigma}_{x_B}\}$ each satisfy exactly one of the cases (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) (We terminate without output if the assumptions do not hold.) Then we recursively construct a multiple sequence alignment as follows. To simplify the notation, we let $\hat{\sigma}_{1:k} = (\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{x_k})$. For any $\ell \leq k$, we let $a_\ell^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ denote the ℓ th sequence (or ℓ th row) of the alignment constructed from the given sequences $\hat{\sigma}_{1:k}$.

1. Given $\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{x_2}$, let $a_1^2(\hat{\sigma}_{1:2})$ and $a_2^2(\hat{\sigma}_{1:2})$ be the pairwise alignment constructed above.
2. For $k = 3, \dots, B$:
 - (a) We are given a multiple alignment $a_1^{k-1}(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k-1}), \dots, a_{k-1}^{k-1}(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k-1})$ of the sequences $\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$, and a new sequence $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ that is at most one mutation away from $\hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$.

- (b) The sequences $\hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ satisfy one of the five cases (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) by assumption, so their alignment $a_{k-1}^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ and $a_k^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ (within the larger multiple sequence alignment) will differ by at most one entry similarly to the sequence case above. To describe the alignment, it will be convenient to imagine that the tree is rooted at x_1 , and that the evolutionary process transforms $\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}$ into $\hat{\sigma}_{x_2}$, and so on up to $\hat{\sigma}_{x_B}$. Indeed, observe that the direction of time simply turns insertions into deletions and vice versa, and that it plays no role in the alignment procedure. The full alignment is defined as follows:
- If $\hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}} = \hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$, then set $a_k^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ to be equal to $a_{k-1}^{k-1}(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k-1})$ and $a_i^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ to be equal to $a_i^{k-1}(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k-1})$ for all $i < k$.
 - If $\hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ have equal length and disagree at a single segregating site, set $a_i^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ to $a_i^{k-1}(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ for all $i \leq k-1$. Each entry of $a_k^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$ is set to the corresponding entry of $a_{k-1}^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$, except for the segregating site. If the latter occurs at position i within $a_{k-1}^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})$, then we set $a_k^k(\hat{\sigma}_{1:k})_i$ to the appropriate letter.
 - If $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ has one or two more sites than $\hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$, then an insertion has occurred and the inserted sites in $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ cannot be ancestral to any sites in $\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$. This creates new columns for the sequence alignment and the inserted sites in $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ correspond to gaps in all previous sequences.
 - The case where $\hat{\sigma}_{x_k}$ has one or two fewer sites than $\hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1}}$ is handled similarly. This time we include gaps in the k th sequence of the alignment, while all other rows remain unchanged from the previous multiple alignment.
3. Output the pairwise alignment $(a_1^B(\hat{\sigma}_{1:B}, \hat{\eta}_{1:B}), a_B^B(\hat{\sigma}_{1:B}, \hat{\eta}_{1:B}))$ after removing all columns with only gaps.