

Statistical Phylogenetic Tree Analysis Using Differences of Means

Elissaveta Arnaoudova¹², David Haws¹³, Peter Huggins⁴,
Jerzy W. Jaromczyk², Neil Moore², Chris Schardl⁵, Ruriko Yoshida³⁶

Abstract

We propose a statistical method to test whether two phylogenetic trees with given alignments are significantly incongruent. Our method compares the two distributions of phylogenetic trees given by the input alignments, instead of comparing point estimations of trees. This statistical approach can be applied to gene tree analysis for example, detecting unusual events in genome evolution such as horizontal gene transfer and reshuffling. Our method uses difference of means to compare two distributions of trees, after embedding trees in a vector space. Bootstrapping alignment columns can then be applied to obtain p-values. To compute distances between means, we employ a “kernel trick” which speeds up distance calculations when trees are embedded in a high-dimensional feature space, e.g. splits or quartets feature space. In this pilot study, first we test our statistical method’s ability to distinguish between sets of gene trees generated under coalescence models with species trees of varying dissimilarity. We follow our simulation results with applications to various data sets of gophers and lice, grasses and their endophytes, and different fungal genes from the same genome. A companion toolkit, *Phylotree*, is provided to facilitate computational experiments.

arXiv:1004.2101v1 [q-bio.PE] 13 Apr 2010

1 Introduction

Estimating differences between phylogenetic trees is one of the fundamental questions in computational biology. Conflicting phylogenies arise when, for example, different phylogenetic reconstruction methods are applied to the same data set, or even with one reconstruction method applied to multiple different genes. Gene phylogenies may be codivergent by virtue of congruence (identical trees) or insignificant incongruence. Otherwise, they may be significantly incongruent [16]. All of these outcomes are fundamentally interesting. Congruence of gene trees (or subtrees) is often considered the most desirable outcome of phylogenetic analysis, because such a result indicates that all sequences in the clade are orthologs (homologs derived from the same ancestral sequence without a history of gene duplication or lateral transfer), and that discrete monophyletic clades can be unambiguously identified, perhaps supporting novel or previously described taxa. In contrast, gene trees that are incongruent are often considered problematic because the precise resolution of speciation events seems to be obscured. Thus, it would also be very useful to identify significant incongruencies in gene trees because these represent noncanonical evolutionary processes. (e.g., [4, 14, 15, 17]). In this paper we propose a statistical hypothesis test which tells whether two phylogenetic trees are significantly incongruent to each other by comparing two distributions for phylogenetic trees, instead of comparing two point estimations. More specifically we will compare two distributions of trees using *difference of means*. In this paper we estimate these distribution by Bayesian sampling from the posterior distribution. Our statistical hypotheses are:

H_0 : Phylogenetic trees T_1 and T_2 are congruent.

H_1 : Phylogenetic trees T_1 and T_2 are incongruent.

¹EA and DH contributed equally to this work

²Department of Computer Science, University of Kentucky

³Department of Statistics, University of Kentucky

⁴Lane Center for Computational Biology, Carnegie Mellon

⁵Department of Plant Pathology, University of Kentucky

⁶Ruriko Yoshida, University Of Kentucky, Department of Statistics, 817 PATTERSON OFFICE TOWER, LEXINGTON KY 40506-0027, ruriko.yoshida@uky.edu

Usually a statistical test on the above hypotheses considers point estimates of the trees obtained by a tree reconstruction method, such as maximum likelihood estimates [6, 7] or the neighbor-joining method [20]. See [21] and references within for an overview. Variation of reasonable tree estimates can be assessed, for example, by using the bootstrap or jackknife method.

There are several techniques to test if gene trees are codiverged. For example, the Bayesian estimation methods (e.g., [1, 4, 14]), the Templeton test implemented in `paup*` [24] (e.g., [8]), the partition-homogeneity test (PHT) also implemented with `paup*` (e.g., [27]), Kishino-Hasegawa test (e.g., [18]), and the likelihood ratio test (LRT; e.g., [26]) are statistical methods to see if there is a “significant” level of incongruence between the trees (these methods are also called partition likelihood support (PLS) [13]). However, there is a limitation in many methods for comparing two phylogenetic trees: It is implicitly assumed that the two given trees are actually correctly estimated phylogenies. In reality, trees are estimated from observed data (e.g. fossil record, sequence data), and tree uncertainty is the rule instead of the exception. Thus, to estimate trees, we propose using posterior means instead of maximum likelihood, and we apply the bootstrap method to assess variation in the posterior means. Our method could also be applied with tree estimators like maximum likelihood, instead of the posterior mean.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we state our method. In Section 3, we show simulation studies with data generated by the software `Mesquite` [Maddison Knowles 2006]. In Section 4, we apply our method to well-known gopher-louse data sets from [10] and grass-endophyte data sets from [21]. We end with a discussion.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Preliminaries

Let \mathcal{T}_n be the space of trees on n taxa. When analyzing and comparing phylogenies, often *tree features* are used. The notion of tree features can be expressed formally as a vector space embedding:

Definition 1. *Given a vector space embedding $v : \mathcal{T}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ for some m , the vector $v(T)$ is the feature vector of T .*

The difference between trees T_1, T_2 can be quantified as the distance $\|v(T_1) - v(T_2)\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is any norm. In this paper we will focus on L_2 norms.

A notable example of our framework is the *dissimilarity map distance*.

Definition 2. *For $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$, let $v(T) = (d_{1,2}^T, d_{1,3}^T, \dots, d_{n-1,n}^T) \in \mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{2}}$ be the vector of pairwise distances $d_{i,j}^T$ between leaves i and j in T . The dissimilarity map distance is*

$$d(T_1, T_2) = \|v(T_1) - v(T_2)\| = \sqrt{(d_{1,2}^{T_1} - d_{1,2}^{T_2})^2 + \dots + (d_{n-1,n}^{T_1} - d_{n-1,n}^{T_2})^2}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ represents L_2 norm (Euclidean length).

In our computational experiments, we will use the dissimilarity map distance. Dissimilarity map distance was studied in [2]. One can also consider a variation where all edge lengths are set to 1. The arising dissimilarity distance is called the *path difference* and only depends on tree topologies.

2.2 Testing for congruence of two trees

In our framework, given are D_1, D_2 , each a collection of n aligned homologous sequences. We assume D_1, D_2 were generated by models of sequence evolution on unknown trees T_1, T_2 . After embedding trees into a vector space, our statistical hypotheses are:

$$H_0: \|v(T_1) - v(T_2)\| = 0,$$

$$H_1: \|v(T_1) - v(T_2)\| > 0.$$

For convenience, we describe our approach as comparing two gene trees T_1, T_2 from the same set of species. One can also compare a phylogeny for host species and a phylogeny for corresponding parasites, as we do in section 3.2.

Random fluctuations in sequence evolution can cause reconstructed gene trees for D_1 and D_2 to look at least slightly different, even if the true underlying trees are equal. Thus we need a way to tell if the difference between two estimated trees is "significant."

One classical approach to assess variability in reconstructed trees is the bootstrap [6]. The bootstrap generates new hypothetical sequence alignments, by sampling (with replacement) columns of aligned sequence. Then trees can be re-estimated for each hypothetical alignment. One common application of the bootstrap is to measure support for each clade; clades that appear in most bootstrap replicate trees are regarded as likely clades in the true tree.

Here we propose a bootstrap procedure to assess significance of the distance between two trees. Our method is based on the triangle inequality. Namely, if $v(\hat{T}_1), v(\hat{T}_2)$ are estimators for $v(T_1), v(T_2)$, then the triangle inequality says

$$\|v(T_1) - v(T_2)\| \geq \|v(\hat{T}_1) - v(\hat{T}_2)\| - \|v(T_1) - v(\hat{T}_1)\| - \|v(T_2) - v(\hat{T}_2)\|,$$

which gives a lower bound on the distance between the true trees T_1, T_2 . See Figure 1 for an illustration. We cannot compute the right-hand side of the inequality directly, because T_1, T_2 are unknown. Instead, we use the bootstrap to estimate the distributions of the terms $\|v(T_1) - v(\hat{T}_1)\|$ and $\|v(T_2) - v(\hat{T}_2)\|$. An outline of our bootstrap procedure is in the Supplement.




Figure 1: A diagram showing two cases of the differences of means method. In Subfigure 1(a) the distance d_1 between $v(T_1)$ and $v(T_2)$ is greater than the distance d_2 between $v(T_1)$ and $v(\hat{T}_1)$ plus the distance d_3 between $v(T_2)$ and $v(\hat{T}_2)$, i.e., $d_1 \geq d_2 + d_3$. In Subfigure 1(b) we see $d_1 \leq d_2 + d_3$.

2.3 Difference of means

The bootstrap procedure we have proposed can be applied with any tree estimator, such as neighbor joining or maximum likelihood. Since we are presuming tree uncertainty is high, and Bayes estimator trees are more accurate than neighbor joining or ML [12], we prefer a Bayes estimator approach.

Given an alignment D , generated by sequence evolution on an unknown tree T , Bayesian MCMC sampling methods will approximately sample from the posterior distribution $P(T | D) \sim P(D | T)P(T)$ [29]. For two posterior distributions $P(T_1 | D_1)$ and $P(T_2 | D_2)$, let t_1, \dots, t_{N_1} be a sample from $P(T_1 | D_1)$, and similarly for t'_1, \dots, t'_{N_2} a sample from $P(T_2 | D_2)$. Then we can use $\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} v(t_i)$ as an estimator for $v(T_1)$, and similarly for $v(T_2)$. The *difference of means* is

$$\hat{\Delta} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} v(t_i) - \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_2} v(t'_i) \quad (1)$$

and $\|\hat{\Delta}\|$ is an estimator for $\|v(T_1) - v(T_2)\|$.

2.3.1 The kernel trick for estimating $\|\hat{\Delta}\|$

Some feature space embeddings produce very high-dimensional feature vectors $v(T_1), v(T_2)$, yet the distance $\|v(T_1) - v(T_2)\|$ can be computed quickly without explicitly writing down the feature vectors for T_1 and T_2 . Notable examples include Robinson-Foulds distance and quartet distance. In such cases, it would be desirable if the difference of means $\|\hat{\Delta}\|$ could be estimated, by sampling trees and computing the distances between samples (without writing down any feature vectors). This is indeed possible, using a *kernel trick*:

Proposition 1. *Let $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be four pairwise independent random variables, where x_1 and x_2 are drawn according to distribution P , and y_1, y_2 are drawn according to distribution Q such that $\mathbb{E}(x_1) = \mathbb{E}(x_2) = \mu_x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbb{E}(y_1) = \mathbb{E}(y_2) = \mu_y \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then*

$$\|\mu_x - \mu_y\|^2 = \mathbb{E}(\|x_1 - y_1\|^2) - \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{E}(\|x_1 - x_2\|^2)] - \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{E}(\|y_1 - y_2\|^2)]. \quad (2)$$

A proof of Proposition 1 is provided in the supplement. Using the proposition, and a subroutine which can compute $\|v(t) - v(t')\|$ for two given tree samples t, t' , the length $\|\hat{\Delta}\| = \|\mathbb{E}v(T_1) - \mathbb{E}v(T_2)\|$ can be estimated from the samples $\{t_i\}, \{t'_i\}$.

3 Results

3.1 Simulations

In this section we estimate posterior distributions of phylogenetic trees via MCMC-based software `MrBayes` [11] and apply the difference of means method to test if two phylogenetic trees are incongruent. Note other softwares such as `BEAST` [3] could also be used. Simulated data sets were generating using the software `Mesquite` [17] with parameters chosen similar to [17], to emulate real data and test the effectiveness of our method. `Mesquite` takes two parameters; the species depth in terms of number of generations and the population size in terms of number of individuals. Three simulation sets were generated, determined by the species depths of 100000, 600000, and 1000000. The effective population size was fixed to 100000 for all data sets. For each simulation set, two species trees, species tree one and two, with eight species were generated using the pure birth yule process in `Mesquite`. Sequence alignments were generated by `Mesquite` under HKY85 model

with transition-transversion ratio of 3.0, a discrete gamma distribution with four categories and shape parameters 0.8. In all our simulations, we set the stationary probability distribution $\pi = (0.3, 0.2, 0.2, 0.3)$ for A, C, G, T respectively, the 3:2 AT:GC ratio was maintained through all trees, and our sequences were generated with 1000 base pairs. The coalescence gene trees generated had branch lengths in terms of the coalescence model and therefore a scaling factor of 10^{-8} was used to yield sequences with sequence divergence similar to real data. Table 1 shows sequence divergences. The sequence divergence was calculated in two ways: (1) the average percent pairwise difference between all sequences [17], and (2) the minimum of the pairwise percent differences among sequences [9].

Species Depth						Species Depth					
	Min	Q1	Median	Q3	Max		Min	Q1	Median	Q3	Max
1000K	0.000	0.002	0.005	0.008	0.017	1000K SD	0.032	0.04	0.043	0.045	0.054
600K	0.000	0.003	0.006	0.01	0.022	600K SD	0.025	0.03	0.032	0.035	0.046
100K	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.006	100K SD	0.004	0.007	0.008	0.012	0.016

(a) Pairwise Minimum (b) Pairwise Average

Table 1: Q1 means the first quantile and Q3 means the third quantile. By “min” we mean the smallest number and “max” means the largest number among a sample. Sequence divergences were calculated in two ways: 1) the pairwise minimum percentage of sequence divergence and 2) the average pairwise percentage of sequence divergence.






Figure 2: The three pairs of species trees used in our simulations. The dissimilarity maps normalized by $\sqrt{\binom{n}{2}}$ between the two species trees used to generate gene trees for our simulations are 0.4333 for 1, 000, 000 species depth, 0.2672 for 600, 000 species depth and 0.046 for 100, 000 species depth.

In order to estimate posterior distributions we used the MCMC-based software `MrBayes` with the following parameters: (1) for the model: HKY85 + Gamma, shape parameter: 0.8, transition-transversion ratio: 3.0; and (2) for MCMC runs: number of runs: 1, number of chains: 2, chain length: 100, 000, sample frequency: 1, 000, burn-in: 25%. For bootstrap sampling we sampled 100 bootstrap samples with sample size of 1, 000 columns since the simulated sequences are generated with 1, 000 base pairs.

We generated simulated data sets in three different ways; (1) two separate sequence data sets generated from the same gene tree, (2) sequence data sets generated from two different gene trees under the same species tree, (3) sequence data sets generated by two sequence data sets generated from two different gene trees whose species trees are also different. We tested ten gene trees for each species depth (i.e. 30 different gene trees in total) generated under the same species tree. One can find the species trees we used in Figure 2. We used two sets of sequences generated under the HKY model with the same tree for each test. We have the three species depths of 1000,000, 600,000 and 100,000, with fixed population size of 100,000. Notice that we do not observe



(a) Box plots of p-values for simulated data. We generated ten gene trees for each species depth (i.e. 30 different gene trees in total) for each species tree. Sequences for each gene tree were generated using the HKY model. Species depths of 1,000,000, 600,000 and 100,000 were used, with fixed population size of 100,000. White box plots are for testing Type I error by comparing identical gene trees generated by *Mesquite* (we used the species tree on the right in Figure 2), light grey box plots represent the p-values with two different gene trees generated from the same species tree under the coalescence model (we used the species tree on right in Figure 2), and dark grey box plots summarize the p-values with gene trees generated from two different species trees. Some boxes of p-values are identically zero. Box plots were computed in R [25] using `boxplot`



(b) These plots represent correlation between distances among true trees and p-values, and correlation between difference of means and p-values. These are computed with the same data sets in Figure 3(a). The sample size here is 94 (i.e., there are 94 pairs of sequence data sets we tested in total). For more details see supplement. We fitted the data in R [25] using `loess` to perform local regression. The dotted lines are for 95% confidence intervals of the fitted lines. The vertical solid line is the line $x = 0.05$ which represents the α -level, p value = 0.05.

Figure 3:

any Type I errors with our testing method, however, in within-species comparisons at species depth of 1,000,000 the p-values were high in general (Figure 3(a)). Also notice that with pairs of gene trees where each pair of gene trees are generated from different species trees under the coalescence model, the p-values were 0.000 for all pairs of genes from 1,000,000 and 600,000 species depth. However, in the case of species depth 100,000 we see that only one pair (Species1_Genetree0 / Species2_Genetree7) has a p-value less than 0.05 (see Table 5 in the supplement). We appear to have Type II errors, probably because species trees with 100,000 species depth are very close to each other.

p-values and distance between true trees appear strongly correlated. We fitted correlations between p-values and distance between true trees as well as correlation between p-values and the difference of means for the posterior distributions given the original sequence data sets, using a function called *loess* (Figure 3(b)). The fitted lines show negative correlation between the p-values and the distance between true trees and also negative correlation between the p-values and the difference of means. Note that the fitted lines for distances between true trees and for differences of means in Figure 3(b) any p-values below the α -level (0.05 in our case) are within their confidence intervals. Actually they are within their confidence intervals up to the p-value equals to 0.3. This means the differences of means with posterior distributions given the original sequence data sets are good measurements for distance between true trees for our statistical tests. This is particularly important since we usually do not know the true trees with biological data sets. For complete results of our simulations see Table 4 and Table 5 in the supplement.

3.2 Experiments with real data sets

We tested our method with a well-known gopher-louse data set [10], see Table 2(a). This data set contains 17 taxa of lice and 15 taxa of gophers. In order to satisfy the requirement for an equal number of leaves for tree comparison we constructed 4 individual data sets reflecting all possible pairings of the two gopher species involved in the possible host jumps with their apparent parasitic louse species: (dataset 1) *Thomomys talpoides*-*Thomomydoecus barbara*e, *Thomomys bottae*-*Thomomydoecus minor*; (dataset 2) *Thomomys talpoides*-*Geomydoecus thomomyus*, *Thomomys bottae*-*Thomomydoecus minor*; (dataset 3) *Thomomys talpoides*-*Thomomydoecus barbara*e, *Thomomys bottae*-*Geomydoecus actuosi*; (dataset 4) *Thomomys talpoides*-*Geomydoecus thomomyus*, *Thomomys bottae*-*Geomydoecus actuosi*.

The posterior distributions were estimated using MrBayes with the following parameters: (1) for the model: GTR + Gamma + Invariant sites; (2) for MCMC: number of runs: 1, number of chains: 2, chain length: 100,000, sample frequency: 1,000, burn-in: 25%; and (3) for bootstrap sampling: 100 bootstrap samples with sample size of 379 columns which is the length of sequence alignments in the data sets.

We also tested our Method with the data sets from [21]. After removing cases of apparent host jumps, the data sets contain sequences from 20 taxa of grasses and 20 taxa of endophytes. Sequences were aligned with the aid of PILEUP implemented in SEQWeb Version 1.1 with Wisconsin Package Version 10 (Genetics Computer Group, Madison, Wisconsin). PILEUP parameters were adjusted empirically; a gap penalty of two and a gap extension penalty of zero resulted in reasonable alignment of intron-exon junctions and intron regions of endophyte sequences, and of intergenic spacer and intron regions of cpDNA sequences. Alignments were scrutinized and adjusted by eye, using tRNA or protein coding regions as anchor points. For phylogenetic analysis of the symbionts, sequences from *tubB* (encoding β -tubulin) and *tefA* (encoding translation elongation factor 1- α) were concatenated to create a single, contiguous sequence of approximately 1400 bp for each endophyte, of which 357 bp was exon sequence and the remainder was intron sequence. For phylogenetic analysis of the hosts, sequences for both cpDNA intergenic regions (*trnT-trnL* and *trnL-trnF*) and the *trnL* intron were aligned individually then concatenated to give a combined alignment of approximately 2200 bp. Analysis was also performed using the sequences from *tubB* and *tefA* separately.

Data set	p-value
Gopher-louse (dataset 1)	0.640
Gopher-louse (dataset 2)	0.400
Gopher-louse (dataset 3)	0.840
Gopher-louse (dataset 4)	0.590

(a) p-values for subsets of the well-known gopher-louse data set in [10]. All p-values are high, so no significant incongruence is found.

Data set	p-value
Grass-endophyte <i>tefA</i>	0.040
Grass-endophyte <i>tubB</i>	0.080
Grass-endophyte <i>tubB</i> plus <i>tefA</i>	0.000

(b) p-values for grass-endophyte data sets from [21]. After removing cases of apparent host jumps, the data comprises 20 taxa of grasses and 20 taxa of endophytes. The first two rows compare grass phylogeny to gene trees for *tefA* and *tubB* in endophytes; the last row uses the concatenation of *tefA* and *tubB*.

Table 2:




Figure 4: Trees with maximum likelihood identified by MCMC search on aligned intron sequences from the *lolC*, *tefA*, and *tubB* genes of *Epichloe* and *Neotyphodium* species. Some *Neotyphodium* species are interspecific hybrids that have multiple genomes from different ancestors. The genes from the different genomes are distinguished, for example, as *lolC1* and *lolC2*. The same number labeling leaves on the three trees indicates genes from the same genome from the same fungal isolate.

The posterior distributions were estimated using MrBayes with the following parameters: (1) for the model: GTR + Gamma + Invariant sites; (2) for MCMC: number of runs: 1, number of chains: 2, chain length: 100,000, sample frequency: 1,000, burn-in: 25%; and (3) for bootstrap sampling: 100 bootstrap samples, number of bootstrap columns equals length of original alignment.

These results are interesting in comparison with the prior finding of significant relationship between the phylogenies of the grasses and their endophytes [21]. The previous analysis indicated a significant relationship between ages of corresponding nodes in endophyte and grass phylogenies, addressing whether divergences of grass and endophyte clades tended to occur at approximately the same time. In contrast, results of the analysis above suggest that the grass and endophyte phylogenies are significantly different (Table 2(b)). We conclude that such a relationship of node ages does not necessarily imply similar phylogenetic histories. This is reasonable because the relationships of grasses and their endophytes is expected to be one of diffuse cospeciation at best. Individual species of endophyte may be associated with genera or tribes of grasses, but rarely with individual species. This contrasts with the gopher-gopher louse situation, where evidence suggests a much stricter coevolutionary relationship (Table 2(a)).

We chose an additional biological data set to compare phylogenies of genes that occur together in endophyte genomes. Whereas *tefA* and *tubB* are housekeeping genes present in all isolates, *lolC* is a secondary metabolism gene sporadically present in endophyte isolates [22]. It has been suggested that such sporadically occurring secondary metabolism genes may be distributed in fungi largely by horizontal gene transfer [28]. To investigate this possibility in the case of *lolC*, we used our approach to test whether the phylogenies of these three genes were significantly different. The most likely trees obtained by MCMC showed related but nonidentical topologies (Figure 4; note placement of genes from *Epichloe festucae* and *Epichloe brachyelytri*). Our test found no significant difference between the phylogenies, although the p-values appear stochastically smaller than the p-values observed for simulated data under the null. This perhaps reflects the conservative nature of our test. Removing either *Epichloe festucae* or *Epichloe brachyelytri* altered the results only slightly (Table 3(b)). These results indicate that *lolC* evolution was largely or exclusively by decent, and disfavored horizontal transfer as an explanation for the sporadic distribution of this gene.

Data set	p-value	Data set	p-value
<i>lolC</i> vs. <i>tefA</i>	0.390	<i>lolC</i> vs. <i>tefA</i>	0.230
<i>lolC</i> vs. <i>tubB</i>	0.560	<i>lolC</i> vs. <i>tubB</i>	0.340
<i>tefA</i> vs. <i>tubB</i>	0.940	<i>tefA</i> vs. <i>tubB</i>	0.870

(a) The results with our statistical method with the endophyte data sets from *lolC*, *tubB*, *tefA* genes. There are 17 taxa in each data set.

(b) The results with our statistical method with the endophyte data sets from *lolC*, *tubB*, *tefA* genes after removing E2368. There are 16 taxa in each data set.

Table 3:

3.3 Toolkit for Computational Experiments

To facilitate computations for our experiments, we developed a set of programs, collectively called `Phylotree`. `Phylotree` is organized as a collection of scripts for running a complete computational experiment starting from sequence alignments, then sampling phylogenetic trees and computing distances between phylogenetic trees and their distributions (see Section 2). Supported distance measures include path-difference, dissimilarity

map distance, Robinson-Foulds distance. Available scripts allow for selecting the number of columns and the number of bootstrap samples, linking taxa in the alignments and provide flexibility for using different sampling methods (e.g., MrBayes or BEAST) and distance measures. This is free software, and will be distributed under the terms of the GNU General Public License. One can download the software at <http://csurs7.csr.uky.edu/phylo/tree/>. The website is password protected and login information can be obtained at <http://cophylogeny.net/research.php>.

4 Discussion

In this paper we presented a method to determine if two phylogenetic trees with given alignments are significantly incongruent. Our method computes the difference of means of posterior distributions of trees, which has the advantage of using entire tree distributions, as opposed to single tree estimators.

In this paper we used the triangle inequality ($d_1 < d_2 + d_3$ in Figure 1) to derive a bootstrap procedure to compute p-values. However, our bootstrap procedure appears to be very conservative, producing p-values whose null distribution is stochastically much larger than uniform $U(0, 1)$. Thus in order to increase the power we might want to consider different criteria for computing p-values. One approach may be to define $v(\hat{T}_1), v(\hat{T}_2)$ to be the average of bootstraps $\{v(T_1^*)\}, \{v(T_2^*)\}$, rather than the initial tree estimates. Another possibility is to replace the triangle inequality with a max condition (e.g. in Figure 1 use the condition $d_1 < \max(d_2, d_3)$). We explored this in the supplementary material, and it seems that the max condition provides much more power, but is somewhat anti-conservative.

In this paper we used the dissimilarity map as feature space. However, there other common tree features which can be used to define different feature spaces. Examples of distances derived from tree features include (normalized) Robinson-Foulds distance [19]; quartet distance [5]; and the path difference metric [23]. Of course, in all the above examples, we could choose any vector space norm, such as L_p for any p . The important point is that there are many different useful *features* (i.e., choices of vector space embeddings) which can be used to analyze trees, and many such as splits and quartets have already been used for quite some time. Moreover, with the kernel trick presented above we can efficiently calculate distances between distributions of trees using the Robinson-Foulds and quartet distance. Thus it is interesting to use different feature spaces for our statistical method, and we leave this for future work.

5 Acknowledgments

D. Haws, E. Arnaudova, J. Jaromczyk, C. Schardl, R. Yoshida are supported by NIH R01 grant 5R01GM086888. E. Arnaudova, J. Jaromczyk, and N. Moore developed the software *PhyloTree*. P. Huggins is supported by the Lane Fellowship in Computational Biology at Carnegie Mellon University.

6 Supplement Materials

Supplement materials can be downloaded at <http://cophylogeny.net/research.php>.

References

- [1] Ane, C., Larget, B., Baum, D. A., Smith, S. D., Rokas, A., 2007. Bayesian estimation of concordance among gene trees. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 24, 412–426.

- [2] Buneman, P., 1971. The recovery of trees from measures of similarity. In: Hodson, F., Kendall, D., Tautu, P. (Eds.), *Mathematics of the Archaeological and Historical Sciences*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, pp. 387–395.
- [3] Drummond, A. J., Rambaut, A., 2007. Beast: Bayesian evolutionary analysis by sampling trees. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 7 (214).
- [4] Edwards, S., Liu, L., Pearl, D., 2007. High-resolution species trees without concatenation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 104, 5936–5941.
- [5] Estabrook, G., McMorris, F., Meacham, C., 1985. Comparison of undirected phylogenetic trees based on subtrees of four evolutionary units. *Syst. Zool.* 34 (2), 193–200.
- [6] Felsenstein, J., 1981. Evolutionary trees from dna sequences. *J. Mol. Evol.* 17, 368–376.
- [7] Galtier, N., Gascuel, O., Jean-Marie, A., 2005. Markov models in molecular evolution. *Statistical Methods in Molecular Evolution*, 3–24.
- [8] Ge, S., Sang, T., Lu, B., Hong, D., December 7, 1999. Phylogeny of rice genomes with emphasis on origins of allotetraploid species. *PNAS* 96 (25), 14400–14405.
- [9] Guindon, S., Gascuel, O., 2003. A simple, fast, and accurate algorithm to estimate large phylogenies by maximum likelihood. *Systematic Biology* 52 (5), 696–704.
- [10] Hafner, M. S., Nadler, S. A., 1990. Cospeciation in host parasite assemblages: comparative analysis of rates of evolution and timing of cospeciation events. *Systematic Zoology* 39, 192–204.
- [11] Huelsenbeck, J., Ronquist, F., 2001. Mrbayes: Bayesian inference in phylogenetic trees. *Bioinformatics* 17, 754–755.
- [12] Huggins, P., Li, W., Haws, D., Friedrich, T., Liu, J., Yoshida, R., 2010. Bayes estimators for phylogenetic reconstruction. *Systematic Biology*.
- [13] Lee, M. S. Y., Hugall, A. F., Feb., 2003. Partitioned likelihood support and the evaluation of data set conflict. *Systematic Biology* 52 (1), 15–22.
- [14] Liu, L., Pearl, D., 2007. Species trees from gene trees: reconstructing bayesian posterior distributions of a species phylogeny using estimated gene tree distributions. *Syst Biol* 56, 504–514.
- [15] Liu, L., Pearl, D., Brumfield, R., Edwards, S., 2008. Estimating species trees using multiple-allele dna sequence data. *Evolution* 62, 2080–2091.
- [16] Maddison, W., 1997. Gene trees in species trees. *Systematic Biology* 46 (3), 523–536.
- [17] Maddison, W., Knowles, L., 2006. Inferring phylogeny despite incomplete lineage sorting. *Syst Biol* 55, 21–30.
- [18] O’Donnell, K., Cigelnik, E., Benny, G. L., Jul. - Aug., 1998. Phylogenetic relationships among the Harpelales and Kickxellales. *Mycologia* 90 (4), 624–639.
- [19] Robinson, D. F., Foulds, L. R., 1981. Comparison of phylogenetic trees. *Mathematical Biosciences* 53, 131–147.

- [20] Saitou, N., Nei, M., 1987. The neighbor joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 4 (4), 406–425.
- [21] Schardl, C. L., Craven, K. D., Speakman, S., Lindstrom, A., Stromberg, A., Yoshida, R., 2008. A novel test for host-symbiont codivergence indicates ancient origin of fungal endophytes in grasses. *Systematic Biology* 57 (3), 483 – 498.
- [22] Spiering, M., Wilkinson, H., Blankenship, J., Schardl, C., 2002. Expressed sequence tags and genes associated with loline alkaloid expression by the fungal endophyte *neotyphodium uncinatum*. *Fungal Genetics and Biology* 36, 242–254.
- [23] Steel, M., Penny, D., 1993. Distributions of tree comparison metrics-some new results. *Syst. Biol.* 42 (2), 126–141.
- [24] Swofford, D. L., 1998. PAUP*. Phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (* and other methods). Sunderland Mass.
- [25] Team, R. D. C., 2004. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. [Http://www.R-project.org](http://www.R-project.org).
- [26] Vilaa, M., Vidal-Romani, J. R., Björklund, M., August 2005. The importance of time scale and multiple refugia: Incipient speciation and admixture of lineages in the butterfly *Erebia triaria* (Nymphalidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 36 (2), 249–260.
- [27] Voigt, K., Cicelnik, E., O'Donnel, K., Dec. 1999. Phylogeny and PCR identification of clinically important zygomycetes based on nuclear ribosomal-DNA sequence data. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 37 (12), 3957–3964.
- [28] Walton, J., 2000. Horizontal gene transfer and the evolution of secondary metabolite gene clusters in fungi: an hypothesis. *Fungal Genetics and Biology* 30, 167–171.
- [29] Yang, Z., Rannala, B., 1997. Bayesian phylogenetic inference using dna sequences: A markov chain monte carlo method. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 14, 717–724.

7 Supplement Materials

7.1 Bootstrap procedure

Here is the outline of our bootstrap procedure we have used in the main manuscript.

Algorithm 1. Input: Alignments D_1 and D_2

Output: An estimated p -value, under the null $H_0 : \|v(T_1) - v(T_2)\| = 0$

1. Compute tree estimates $v(\hat{T}_1), v(\hat{T}_2)$ from the data D_1, D_2 .
2. Compute $d = \|v(\hat{T}_1) - v(\hat{T}_2)\|$.
3. Let $p = 0$ and for $i = 1$ to N do
 - Take a bootstrap sample D_1^* from the columns of alignment D_1 and a bootstrap sample D_2^* from the columns of D' .
 - Compute tree estimates $v(T_1^*), v(T_2^*)$ from the data D_1^*, D_2^* .
 - Test the condition: if $d \leq \|v(\hat{T}_1) - v(T_1^*)\| + \|v(\hat{T}_2) - v(T_2^*)\|$ then set $p = p + 1$.
4. Set $p = \frac{p}{N}$ and return p as the p -value of the hypothesis test.

During the ‘‘Test the condition’’ step, one could alternatively use the less conservative condition $d \leq \max(\|v(\hat{T}_1) - v(T_1^*)\|, \|v(\hat{T}_2) - v(T_2^*)\|)$

7.2 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$, let a^T be the transpose of a . Since $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are mutually independent, the bilinearity of dot-product gives $\mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_2) = \mathbb{E}(x_1)^T \mathbb{E}(x_2)$ and similarly $\mathbb{E}(y_1^T y_2) = \mathbb{E}(y_1)^T \mathbb{E}(y_2)$ and $\mathbb{E}(x_1^T y_1) = \mathbb{E}(x_1)^T \mathbb{E}(y_1)$. Also for any vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we have the identity $a^T b = b^T a$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}(\|x_1 - y_1\|^2) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}((x_1 - y_1)^T (x_1 - y_1)) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1 + y_1^T y_1 - x_1^T y_1 - y_1^T x_1) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1) + \mathbb{E}(y_1^T y_1) - \mathbb{E}(x_1^T y_1) - \mathbb{E}(y_1^T x_1) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1) + \mathbb{E}(y_1^T y_1) - \mathbb{E}(x_1)^T \mathbb{E}(y_1) - \mathbb{E}(y_1)^T \mathbb{E}(x_1) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1) + \mathbb{E}(y_1^T y_1) - 2\mu_x^T \mu_y.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

But

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2 + x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2 + x_2)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2) + x_2^T (x_1 - x_2) \\
&\quad + (x_1 - x_2)^T x_2 + x_2^T x_2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + \mathbb{E}[x_2^T (x_1 - x_2)] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T x_2] + \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_1) - \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_2) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_2) - \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_2) + \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_1) - \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_2) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + \mu_x^T \mu_x - \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_2) \\
&\quad + \mu_x^T \mu_x \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + 2\mu_x^T \mu_x - \mathbb{E}(x_2^T x_2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + 2\mu_x^T \mu_x - \mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$2\mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1) = \mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + 2\mu_x^T \mu_x. \quad (4)$$

By dividing the both sides of the equation in (4) by 2 we have:

$$\mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + \mu_x^T \mu_x. \quad (5)$$

Similarly we have

$$\mathbb{E}(y_1^T y_1) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(y_1 - y_2)^T (y_1 - y_2)] + \mu_y^T \mu_y. \quad (6)$$

Then we substitute $\mathbb{E}(x_1^T x_1)$ and $\mathbb{E}(y_1^T y_1)$ in equations (5) and (6) into the equation in (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(\|x_1 - y_1\|^2) \\
&= \left[\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + \mu_x^T \mu_x \right] \\
&\quad + \left[\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(y_1 - y_2)^T (y_1 - y_2)] + \mu_y^T \mu_y \right] \\
&\quad - 2\mu_x^T \mu_y \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(y_1 - y_2)^T (y_1 - y_2)] \\
&\quad + [\mu_x^T \mu_x + \mu_y^T \mu_y - 2\mu_x^T \mu_y] \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(x_1 - x_2)^T (x_1 - x_2)] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(y_1 - y_2)^T (y_1 - y_2)] \\
&\quad + \|\mu_x + \mu_y\|^2.
\end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

□

7.3 Supplement for simulation studies

Throughout the remaining subsections, Condition (i) refers to the condition tested in Algorithm 1: $d \leq \|v(\hat{T}_1) - v(T_1^*)\| + \|v(\hat{T}_2) - v(T_2^*)\|$. Condition (ii) refers to the alternative condition $d \leq \max(\|v(\hat{T}_1) - v(T_1^*)\|, \|v(\hat{T}_2) - v(T_2^*)\|)$.

7.4 Results with biological data sets

Data set	1000K SD			600K SD			100K SD		
	i	ii	dist	i	ii	dist	i	ii	dist
Sp1_Gene0_rep1 / Sp1_Gene0_rep2	1.000	0.790	0.046	0.980	0.140	0.071	0.870	0.100	0.142
Sp1_Gene1_rep1 / Sp1_Gene1_rep2	0.990	0.430	0.066	0.990	0.800	0.051	0.870	0.180	0.116
Sp1_Gene2_rep1 / Sp1_Gene2_rep2	0.330	0.000	0.105	1.000	0.440	0.061	1.000	0.700	0.081
Sp1_Gene3_rep1 / Sp1_Gene3_rep2	0.980	0.340	0.063	0.760	0.000	0.092	0.700	0.040	0.136
Sp1_Gene4_rep1 / Sp1_Gene4_rep2	0.940	0.110	0.072	0.990	0.370	0.063	1.000	0.410	0.103
Sp1_Gene5_rep1 / Sp1_Gene5_rep2	0.550	0.050	0.090	0.750	0.040	0.087	0.810	0.030	0.134
Sp1_Gene6_rep1 / Sp1_Gene6_rep2	0.710	0.020	0.091	0.990	0.730	0.055	1.000	0.800	0.090
Sp1_Gene7_rep1 / Sp1_Gene7_rep2	0.940	0.150	0.077	1.000	0.600	0.057	0.570	0.010	0.159
Sp1_Gene8_rep1 / Sp1_Gene8_rep2	0.980	0.340	0.061	0.970	0.110	0.067	0.950	0.570	0.083
Sp1_Gene9_rep1 / Sp1_Gene9_rep2	1.000	0.580	0.058	0.780	0.040	0.090	0.920	0.160	0.112

Table 4: Testing Type I error by comparing the identical gene trees generated by `Mesquite`. We tested ten gene trees for each species depth (i.e. 30 different gene trees in total) generated under the same species tree. We used two sets of sequences generated under the HKY model with the same tree for each test. The numbers in the table are p-values for our hypothesis testing. We give p-values for the three species depths of 1000,000, 600,000 and 100,000, with fixed population size of 100,000. We used the species tree on right with each species depth in Figure 2. `dist` represents the average of the normalized difference of means with posterior distributions given the original sequence data sets.

Data set	1000K SD			600K SD			100K SD		
	p	dist	true dist	p	dist	true dist	p	dist	true dist
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre1	0.910	0.070	0.079	0.044	0.047	0.044	0.000	0.284	0.290
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre2	0.640	0.010	0.093	0.060	0.067	0.039	0.120	0.205	0.182
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre3	0.230	0.000	0.114	0.074	0.088	0.056	0.950	0.118	0.172
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre4	0.310	0.010	0.105	0.083	0.055	0.051	0.290	0.204	0.164
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre5	0.320	0.000	0.111	0.082	0.107	0.088	0.310	0.192	0.229
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre6	0.370	0.000	0.101	0.055	0.078	0.039	0.980	0.107	0.096
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre7	0.000	0.000	0.208	0.159	0.076	0.049	0.190	0.207	0.136
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre8	0.640	0.020	0.087	0.078	0.116	0.128	0.050	0.240	0.269
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp1_Genetre9	0.640	0.020	0.093	0.079	0.101	0.054	0.070	0.236	0.270
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre1	0.000	0.000	0.192	0.202	0.194	0.176	0.160	0.218	0.248
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre2	0.000	0.000	0.207	0.245	0.253	0.252	0.480	0.181	0.156
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre3	0.000	0.000	0.180	0.209	0.193	0.188	0.120	0.234	0.256
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre4	0.000	0.000	0.237	0.269	0.199	0.232	0.050	0.244	0.237
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre5	0.000	0.000	0.213	0.233	0.281	0.283	0.290	0.202	0.205
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre6	0.000	0.000	0.192	0.245	0.259	0.236	0.080	0.234	0.276
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre7	0.000	0.000	0.218	0.253	0.225	0.231	0.000	0.308	0.283
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre8	0.000	0.000	0.177	0.213	0.225	0.232	0.150	0.222	0.218
Sp1_Genetre0 / Sp2_Genetre9	0.000	0.000	0.209	0.235	0.225	0.213	0.460	0.188	0.259

Table 5: Shown are the p-values calculated using our method on eighteen pairs of gene trees. The first nine lines compare different genes derived from the same species tree (the species tree on left in each species depth in Figure 2), the second nine lines compare two genes from different species trees. We give p-values for the three species depths of 1,000,000, 600,000 and 100,000, with fixed population size of 100,000. dist represents the average of the normalized difference of means with posterior distributions given the original sequence data sets and true dist represents the normalized distance between true trees.

Data set	i	ii	dist
Gopher-louse (dataset 1)	0.640	0.020	0.120
Gopher-louse (dataset 2)	0.400	0.020	0.128
Gopher-louse (dataset 3)	0.840	0.070	0.117
Gopher-louse (dataset 4)	0.590	0.030	0.122
Grass-endophyte (<i>tefA</i> gene)	0.040	0.000	0.073
Grass-endophyte (<i>tubB</i> gene)	0.080	0.010	0.088
Grass-endophyte (<i>tefA</i> <i>tubB</i> genes)	0.000	0.000	0.073

Table 6: The numbers in this table are p-values for our statistical hypothesis testing estimated by our method with the grass-endophyte data sets from [21]. dist represents the average of the normalized difference of means with posterior distributions given the original sequence data sets.

Data set	i	ii	Permuted	dist
(- E2368)				
endophyte 16-taxa (<i>lolC</i> vs <i>tubB</i>)	0.340	0.000	0.000	0.100
endophyte 16-taxa (<i>lolC</i> vs <i>tefA</i>)	0.230	0.000	0.000	0.105
endophyte 16-taxa (<i>tefA</i> vs <i>tubB</i>)	0.870	0.050	0.000	0.080
(- E1125)				
endophyte 16-taxa (<i>lolC</i> vs <i>tubB</i>)	0.670	0.010		0.093
endophyte 16-taxa (<i>lolC</i> vs <i>tefA</i>)	0.870	0.040		0.073
endophyte 16-taxa (<i>tefA</i> vs <i>tubB</i>)	0.950	0.160		0.069

Table 7: The numbers in this table are p-values for our statistical hypothesis testing estimated by our method with the endophyte data sets from *tefA*, *tubB*, and *lolC* genes. dist represents the average of the normalized difference of means with posterior distributions given the original sequence data sets. (- E2368) means that they are with the data sets after removing E2368 and (- E1125) means that these are the results with the data sets after removing E1125.