

Interspecies correlation for neutrally evolving traits

Serik Sagitov^a, Krzysztof Bartoszek^{a,*}

^a*Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology and the University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden, Tel: +46 (0)31 772 10 00; fax: +46 (0)31-16 19 73*

Abstract

A simple way to model phenotypic evolution is to assume that after splitting, the trait values of the sister species diverge as independent Brownian motions. Relying only on a prior distribution for the underlying species tree (conditioned on the number, n , of extant species) we study the random vector (X_1, \dots, X_n) of the observed trait values. In this paper we derive compact formulae for the variance of the sample mean and the mean of the sample variance for the vector (X_1, \dots, X_n) .

The key ingredient of these formulae is the correlation coefficient between two trait values randomly chosen from (X_1, \dots, X_n) . This interspecies correlation coefficient takes into account not only variation due to the random sampling of two species out of n and the stochastic nature of Brownian motion but also the uncertainty in the phylogenetic tree. The latter is modeled by a (supercritical or critical) conditioned branching process. In the critical case we modify the Aldous–Popovic model by assuming a proper prior for the time of origin.

Keywords: Phylogenetic comparative methods, Birth and death process, Conditioned branching process, Branching Brownian motion, Uncertainty in phylogeny

2010 MSC: 60J70, 60J85, 62P10, 92B99

1. Introduction

A simple way to model phenotypic evolution for n related species is to assume that after splitting, the trait values (e.g. the logarithms of body sizes) of the sister species diverge as independent Brownian motions (see Felsenstein, 1985). The resulting collection (X_1, \dots, X_n) of the tip species' trait values has a dependence structure caused by shared phylogeny. In this paper we derive compact formulae for the variance of the sample mean $\bar{X} = n^{-1}(X_1 + \dots + X_n)$ and the mean of the sample variance $S^2 = (n - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$. These

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: `serik@chalmers.se` (Serik Sagitov), `krzbar@chalmers.se` (Krzysztof Bartoszek)

formulae take into account not only the stochastic nature of Brownian motion but also uncertainty in the phylogenetic tree.

Based on observed tip species data one would like to make statements about the stochastic process of evolution like the ancestral state X_0 at the time of origin T and infinitesimal variance σ^2 of the Brownian motion. These are important questions addressed by phylogenetic comparative methods. Usually this sort of inference attempts to incorporate the knowledge of the phylogenetic tree estimated from independent data (Butler and King, 2004; Hansen et al., 2008; Bartoszek et al., in review). There is however uncertainty attached to the estimated tree which should be somehow reflected in any subsequent analysis.

All currently available methods addressing such statistical issues rely on simulations. Pagel and Lutzoni (2001) and Huelsenbeck and Rannala (2003) propose to use an MCMC approach to generate a sample of plausible phylogenetic trees each one with its posterior probability attached as a weight. Butler and King (2004) do not include phylogeny uncertainty in their OUCH R (R Development Core Team, 2010) package but say that it can be incorporated in their framework, if one can compute likelihood values (e.g. posterior probabilities from a Bayesian estimation procedure) for candidate trees. Then the complete likelihood function is a product of the tree’s likelihood and the likelihood conditional on the tree and comparative data. A Bayesian estimation procedure implemented by Lemey et al. (2010) uses a tree rescaling step, with each branch of the phylogeny being independently rescaled by an appropriately (e.g. gamma or log-normal) distributed random variable.

These methods face a number of common challenges. The first one is computational, as estimating a phylogeny can be computationally extremely demanding. The second is interpretational, whilst the weighing of results is fully justified statistically one could raise biological objections whether the result is actually biologically meaningful for all parameters of the assumed model of trait evolution. An extreme hypothetical example is if we would have two competing phylogenies each with equal likelihood. The first results in a regression slope of 1, the second -1 . The average of them is 0. A regression slope of 0 means that there is no relationship between the two variables while both phylogenies indicate that there is a relationship except that we don’t have strong enough evolutionary data to decide about the direction of this relationship. The third problem is that since we are merely “trying out” different possible phylogenies we always run the risk of not considering the ones close to the true one.

Here we propose a different approach making use of explicit analytical calculations. We model the unknown phylogenetic tree for n extant species using a conditioned birth–death process with speciation rate λ and extinction rate μ as described by Gernhard (2008). The corresponding distribution of random trees with n tips is a posterior distribution resulting from the improper uniform prior on the time of origin T . The appropriate range of the rates $0 \leq \mu \leq \lambda$ has an important region $\mu = \lambda$ representing the critical case (Aldous and Popovic, 2005) with the speciation and extinction events being equally likely. In the supercritical case $\mu < \lambda$ the height of the tree is expected to be lower due to the expansive speciation regime. A key test example of the supercritical birth–death




Figure 1: A branching Brownian motion simulated on a random tree with $n = 5$ tips using the TreeSim and mvSLOUCH software. Panel A: the trait evolution for five species is modeled by a Brownian motion with $\sigma = 1$. Panel B: the species tree disregarding the trait values. Panel C: a convenient presentation of speciation times.

model is the classical Yule model (Yule, 1924) of pure birth process when $\mu = 0$.

2. Summary of main results

In our setting both the variance of the sample mean

$$\text{Var} [\bar{X}_n] = \sigma^2 n^{-1} (1 + (n-1)\rho_n) \text{E}[T] \quad (1)$$

and the mean of the sample variance

$$\text{E} [S_n^2] = \sigma^2 (1 - \rho_n) \text{E}[T], \quad (2)$$

are compactly expressed (see Appendix A) in terms of the correlation coefficient

$$\rho_n = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2} \text{Var} [X]} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \text{Cov} [X_i, X_j] \quad (3)$$

and the mean time to the origin $\text{E}[T]$.

Sections 3, 4, 5 present analytical formulae for ρ_n and $\text{E}[T]$ in the Yule, supercritical and critical cases. These formulae are summarized in Tab. 1 in terms of three principal cases for the species tree model. Observe that we incur no loss of generality by specifying one of the two parameters (μ, λ) . For example, in a seemingly more general case with $0 < \mu < \lambda$ the same formula, Eq. (12) holds with λ replaced by the ratio λ/μ .

What we call the interspecies correlation coefficient ρ_n is the correlation between two trait values randomly chosen among n observed. Next, to clarify the exact meaning of ρ_n we describe an algorithm producing a pair of random variables having ρ_n as the correlation coefficient for a given set of parameters (n, λ) .

Species tree model	Extinction rate	Speciation rate	Exact ρ_n	Approximate ρ_n	E[T]
Yule	$\mu = 0$	$\lambda = 1$	(10)	(11)	(6)
supercritical	$\mu = 1$	$\lambda > 1$	(12)	(13)	(16)
near-critical	$\mu = 1$	$\lambda > 1, \lambda \approx 1$	(12)	(14), (15)	(16)
PP-critical	$\mu = 1$	$\lambda = 1$	(18)	(19), (20)	(17)

Table 1: Summary of formulae for ρ_n and E[T].

Algorithm 1 Generate two random variables with a correlation of ρ_n

- 1: generate a species tree with n tips using TreeSim (Stadler, 2009, 2011),
 - 2: generate n trait values by running a branching Brownian motion over the species tree simulated in step 1 using mvSLOUCH (Bartoszek et al., in review),
 - 3: choose at random two out of n trait values generated in step 2.
-

The steps 1–3 of Algorithm 1 (implemented by us in R) were repeated many times to collect enough data for estimating the correlation coefficient between the underlying pair of random variables, see Fig. 2. The simulation results presented in Tab. 2 compare the correlation coefficient estimated from the simulated trees $\hat{\rho}_n$ to the true value of ρ_n and the value given by an appropriate approximate formula. Notice that we did not simulate the critical case with a proper prior as suitable software is currently lacking. Simulations of the critical case with improper prior are time consuming. Therefore the critical case is represented with a smaller number of dots on the graph.

In the critical case the correlation coefficient ρ_n is undefined as both the covariance between two sampled species and the species’ variances take infinite values. We overcome this difficulty by modifying the Aldous–Popovic approach, we replace the improper prior distribution for T by the uniform prior on a finite interval $(0, N)$. We believe that considering a proper prior in the critical case makes the model biologically more relevant. A realistic value of N gives an upper bound on the number of speciation events for a group of related species as traced back to their common ancestor. This number depends on the particular kind of organisms in consideration and in many cases cannot be larger than several thousands.

Model	n	Trees	$\hat{\rho}_n$	ρ_n	Approximation
$\mu = 0, \lambda = 1$	30	1000	0.430	0.449	0.503 using (11)
$\mu = 1, \lambda = 2$	30	1000	0.506	0.502	0.609 using (13)
$\mu = 1, \lambda = 1.01$	30	1000	0.784	0.794	0.689 using (14)
$\mu = 1, \lambda = 1$	10	100	0.870	NA	NA

Table 2: Summary of simulations.




Figure 2: Regression line fitted to the simulated data (thick line) compared to the line $y = \rho_n x$ (dotted line) with ρ_n given by the exact formula. Upper-left panel: the Yule case. Upper-right: the supercritical case with $\lambda = 2$. Lower-left: the near-critical case with $\lambda = 1.01$. Lower-right: the critical case with improper prior (here the dotted line is $y = x$).

In Section 6 the obtained formulae for ρ_n and $E[T]$ are combined with Eqs. (1) and (2) to produce compact expressions for $\text{Var}[\bar{X}_n]$ and $E[S_n^2]$ in the three main cases. These analytic expressions can be used, for example, to construct phylogenetic confidence intervals for the ancestral trait value X_0 , which would take into account tree uncertainty. This issue is one of the subjects of our forthcoming paper where among other things some of the results of this paper for the Brownian motion model are extended to the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck model.

Section 7 presents a connection to a new measure of how balanced are phylogenetic trees recently introduced by Mir et al. (2012). Appendix A and Appendix B contain intermediate results. Appendix B is mainly dealing with the properties of an important for this paper expression,

$$e_{n,m} = m^n \left(\ln \frac{m}{m-1} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{im^i} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+i)m^i}, \quad (4)$$

which satisfies $0 < e_{n,m} < \frac{1}{n(m-1)}$ for $1 < m < \infty$.

3. Correlation coefficient for the Yule model

Assume that the trait values evolve according to Brownian motions with variance σ^2 . At the time of origin the ancestral trait is believed to have a fixed value X_0 . Due to the formula for the total variance, the variance of a sampled trait value equals,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[X_i] &= E[\text{Var}[X_i|T]] + \text{Var}[E[X_i|T]] \\ &= E[\sigma^2 T] + \text{Var}[0] = \sigma^2 E[T]. \end{aligned}$$

If X_{ij} is the ancestral trait value at the time τ_{ij} of the most recent common ancestor for two sampled species, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[X_i, X_j] &= E[\text{Cov}[X_i, X_j|T, \tau_{ij}, X_{ij}]] + \text{Cov}[E[X_i|T, \tau_{ij}, X_{ij}], E[X_j|T, \tau_{ij}, X_{ij}]] \\ &= E[0] + \text{Var}[X_{ij}] = \sigma^2 E[T - \tau_{ij}]. \end{aligned}$$

Putting this into (3) we get

$$\rho_n = \frac{E[T - \tau]}{E[T]}, \quad (5)$$

where τ is the time to the most recent common ancestor for a pair of randomly chosen extant species.

The denominator in Eq. (5) is computed as

$$E[T] = \int_0^{\infty} tq_n(t)dt,$$

where $q_n(t)$ is the distribution density for the time to origin T . Assuming the Yule model with rate $\lambda = 1$ for the unknown species tree it is easy to see that

$$E[T] = a_n. \quad (6)$$

Indeed, using the formula (see Gernhard, 2008)

$$q_n(t) = n(1 - e^{-t})^{n-1}e^{-t}, \quad (7)$$

and applying a change of variables

$$v = 1 - e^{-t}, \quad t = -\ln(1 - v), \quad dv = (1 - v)dt,$$

we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T] &= -n \int_0^1 \ln(1 - v)v^{n-1}dv = -\int_0^1 \ln(1 - v)d(v^n - 1) \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{1-v^n}{1-v}dv = a_n. \end{aligned}$$

In the framework of the conditioned reconstructed process model (see Gernhard, 2008) the random species tree (extinct species removed) is conveniently described in terms of speciation times s_1, \dots, s_{n-1} , see panel C in Fig. 1. Conditioned on the time of origin $T = t$ the random variables s_1, \dots, s_{n-1} are independent and identically distributed according to a cumulative distribution function to be denoted by $F_t(s)$. Due to this observation the numerator Eq. (5) can be found from the formula

$$\mathbb{E}[T - \tau] = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{2(n-k)}{n(n-1)} \int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^t F_t^k(s)ds \right) q_n(t)dt, \quad (8)$$

derived in Appendix A.

In the Yule case we have

$$F_t(s) = \frac{1 - e^{-s}}{1 - e^{-t}} 1_{\{0 < s \leq t\}} + 1_{\{s > t\}} \quad (9)$$

which together with Eq. (8) after applying a change of variables $u = 1 - e^{-s}$, $v = 1 - e^{-t}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T - \tau] &= \frac{2}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (n-k) \int_0^1 \int_0^v \frac{u^k v^{n-k-1}}{1-u} dudv \\ &= \frac{2}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_0^1 \int_u^1 \frac{u^k}{1-u} dv^{n-k} du. \end{aligned}$$

Switching the integration order we find,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T - \tau] &= \frac{2}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_0^1 \frac{(1-u^{n-k})u^k}{1-u} du \\ &= \frac{2}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (a_n - a_k) = \frac{2(n-a_n)}{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with Eqs. (5) and (6) we arrive at

$$\rho_n = \frac{2}{n-1} \left(\frac{n}{a_n} - 1 \right), \quad (10)$$




Figure 3: Exact (black line) and approximate (gray line) formulae for ρ_n in the Yule case (left), supercritical case $\lambda = 2$ (centre) and critical case with proper prior $N = 10000$ (right).

where $a_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i}$ is the n -th harmonic number. Notice that Eq. (10) implies,

$$\rho_n = \frac{2}{\ln n + \gamma + o(1)}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (11)$$

where $\gamma = 0.577\dots$ is the Euler constant, in other words, $\frac{2}{\rho_n} - \ln n - \gamma \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The exact formula Eq. (10) and the approximate formula Eq. (11), with the term $o(1)$ being disregarded, are illustrated in Fig. 3, left panel.

4. Supercritical case

In the supercritical case the correlation coefficient has a more complicated but still surprisingly compact form in terms of the function from Eq. (4),

$$\rho_n = \frac{2}{n-1} \left(\frac{n(1+e_{n,\lambda})}{a_n + e_{n,\lambda} - \ln \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1}} - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} \right). \quad (12)$$

Observe that Eq. (10) can be recovered from Eq. (12) by letting $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, Eq. (12) implies a close counterpart of Eq. (11),

$$\rho_n = \frac{2}{\ln n + \gamma - \ln \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} + o(1)}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty \quad (13)$$

uniformly in $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ for any $\lambda_0 > 1$.

Specializing on the nearly critical case, when $\lambda = 1 + 1/N$ for some large N , we derive the following asymptotic result,

$$\rho_n = 1 - \frac{1}{2(\ln N - a_n + 1) + o(1)}, \quad N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (14)$$

The fact that $\rho_n \rightarrow 1$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ is a consequence of the improper prior distribution assumption for the time of origin T . Besides this approximation, it can be shown that for any fixed positive α ,

$$\rho_n \rightarrow 2 \left(\frac{1 + I_\alpha}{\ln \alpha + \gamma + I_\alpha} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right), \quad N \rightarrow \infty, \quad n/N \rightarrow \alpha, \quad (15)$$




Figure 4: Approximated correlation coefficient as a function of model parameters. Left, the supercritical case, Eq. (13): black $\lambda = 1.5$, gray $\lambda = 2$, light gray $\lambda = 5$. Center, the critical case with a proper prior, Eq. (19): black $n = 50$, gray $n = 100$, light gray $n = 500$, lightest gray $n = 1000$. Right: the critical case with a proper prior, Eq. (20).

where $I_\alpha = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-x} dx}{\alpha+x}$, so that $e^{-\alpha} I_\alpha = \int_\alpha^\infty \frac{e^{-x} dx}{x}$ is the exponential integral. The exact formula Eq. (12) and the approximate formula Eq. (13) are illustrated in Fig. 3, central panel. Another illustration of Eq. (13) is given on Fig. 4, left panel.

We derive Eq. (12) using,

$$\begin{aligned} q_n(t) &= n\lambda^n(\lambda-1)^2 \frac{x_t^{n-1}(1-x_t)}{(\lambda-1+x_t)^{n+1}}, \\ F_t(s) &= \frac{x_s}{\lambda-1+x_s} \frac{\lambda-1+x_t}{x_t}, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_t = 1 - e^{-(\lambda-1)t}$. These expressions are obtained from more general relations due to Gernhard (2008) after specifying the parameter values as $\mu = 1$ and $\lambda > 1$. Denoting $\delta = \lambda^{-1}$ we can write,

$$E[T] = n\delta(\lambda-1)^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{x_t^{n-1}(1-x_t)}{(1-\delta(1-x_t))^{n+1}} t dt.$$

A change of variables,

$$\begin{aligned} v &= \frac{x_t}{1-\delta(1-x_t)}, & 1-x_t &= \frac{1-v}{1-\delta v}, \\ (\lambda-1)t &= \ln \frac{1-\delta v}{1-v}, & dv &= \lambda(1-\delta v)(1-v) dt, \end{aligned}$$

results in,

$$\begin{aligned} E[T] &= n(\lambda-1)^{-1} \int_0^1 \left(\ln \frac{1-\delta v}{1-v} \right) v^{n-1} dv \\ &= (\lambda-1)^{-1} \int_0^1 (\ln(1-\delta v) - \ln(1-v)) d(v^n - 1) \\ &= \delta \int_0^1 \frac{1-v^n}{(1-\delta v)(1-v)} dv = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_0^1 \frac{v^k}{\lambda-v} dv. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Eqs. (B.1) and (B.2) from Appendix B, leads to,

$$\mathbb{E}[T] = \frac{1}{\lambda - 1} \left(a_n + e_{n,\lambda} - \ln \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1} \right). \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, with $u = \frac{x_s}{1 - \delta(1 - x_s)}$ and $du = \lambda(1 - \delta u)(1 - u)ds$ Eq. (8) entails,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T - \tau] &= \frac{2}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (n-k) \int_0^1 \int_0^v \frac{u^k v^{n-k-1}}{(\lambda-u)(1-u)} du dv \\ &= \frac{2}{\lambda(n-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_0^1 \int_u^1 \frac{u^k}{(1-\delta u)(1-u)} dv^{n-k} du. \end{aligned}$$

Due to,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_0^1 \int_u^1 \frac{u^k}{(1-\delta u)(1-u)} dv^{n-k} du = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-k-1} \int_0^1 \frac{u^{k+i} du}{1-\delta u} = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \int_0^1 \frac{j u^j du}{1-\delta u}$$

we arrive at,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T - \tau] &\stackrel{(B.1)}{=} \frac{2}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} k e_{k,\lambda} \\ &\stackrel{(B.3)}{=} \frac{2}{(n-1)(\lambda-1)} \left(n + n e_{n,\lambda} - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} \left(a_n + e_{n,\lambda} - \ln \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

which together with Eqs. (16) and (5) gives Eq. (12).

5. Critical case with a proper prior

Under the improper uniform prior on $(0, \infty)$ for T one has (see Aldous and Popovic, 2005),

$$q_n(t) = \frac{nt^{n-1}}{(1+t)^{n+1}}, \quad t \in (0, \infty)$$

implying the infinite mean $\mathbb{E}[T]$. To remedy this inconvenience we use a proper uniform prior on $(0, N)$ and put $m = \frac{N+1}{N}$. The corresponding posterior distribution of T has density,

$$q_n(t) = \frac{nt^{n-1}m^n}{(1+t)^{n+1}}, \quad t \in (0, N)$$

with finite mean,

$$\mathbb{E}[T] = n e_{n,m}, \quad (17)$$

obtained as

$$\mathbb{E}[T] = nm^n \int_0^N \frac{t^n dt}{(1+t)^{n+1}} = nm^n \int_0^{1/m} \frac{x^n dx}{1-x} \stackrel{(B.1)}{=} n e_{n,m}.$$

For the critical case with a proper prior we establish

$$\rho_n = 2 - \frac{2N}{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{e_{n,m}}\right) + \frac{2N(N+1)}{n(n-1)} \left(1 + \frac{a_n - \ln(N+1)}{e_{n,m}}\right), \quad (18)$$

where $m = 1 + 1/N$. Interestingly, the following approximate version of Eq. (18),

$$\rho_n = 1 - \frac{1}{2(\ln N - a_n) + o(1)}, \quad N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (19)$$

is almost the same as Eq. (14). The counterpart of Eq. (15) is given by,

$$\rho_n \rightarrow 2 - \frac{2}{\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{1}{I_\alpha}\right) + \frac{2}{\alpha^2} \left(1 + \frac{\ln \alpha + \gamma}{I_\alpha}\right), \quad N \rightarrow \infty, \quad n/N \rightarrow \alpha. \quad (20)$$

Eq. (18) is illustrated on the right panel of Fig. 3, while Eqs. (19) and (20) are illustrated on the central and right panels of Fig. 4.

Next we derive Eq. (18) using the formula $F_t(s) = \frac{s(1+t)}{(1+s)t}$ obtained by Aldous and Popovic (2005). Entering this into Eq. (8) gives,

$$\mathbb{E}[T - \tau] = \frac{2m^n}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (n-k) \int_0^N \int_0^t \left(\frac{s}{1+s}\right)^k \left(\frac{1+t}{t}\right)^{k-n+1} \frac{1}{(1+t)^2} ds dt.$$

Replacing the variables s and t with $y = \frac{s}{1+s}$ and $x = \frac{t}{1+t}$ we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T - \tau] &= \frac{2m^n}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_0^{1/m} \int_0^x y^k (1-y)^{-2} dy dx^{n-k} \\ &= \frac{2}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_0^{1/m} (my)^k (1-y)^{-2} (1-(my)^{n-k}) dy \end{aligned}$$

and then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T - \tau] &\stackrel{(B.4)}{=} \frac{2}{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (ne_{n,m} - ke_{k,m}) \\ &\stackrel{(B.3)}{=} 2ne_{n,m} - \frac{2}{n-1} \left(\frac{ne_{n,m} + n}{m-1} - \frac{m}{(m-1)^2} \left(a_n + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which combined with Eq. (17) gives Eq. (18).

6. Variance of sample mean and expectation of sample variance

Our formulae for ρ_n and $\mathbb{E}[T]$ obtained in the previous sections imply the following compact expressions for $\text{Var}[\bar{X}_n]$ and $\mathbb{E}[S_n^2]$ thanks to Eqs. (1) and (2).

In the Yule case ($\mu = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$) Eqs. (6) and (10) give

$$\text{Var}[\bar{X}_n] = \sigma^2 \left(2 - \frac{a_n}{n}\right). \quad (21)$$




Figure 5: Variance of sample mean in the Yule case given by Eq. (21) with points indicating simulated values. Each point is the estimate of the variance based on 10000 simulations for each value of n . In simulations $X_0 = 0$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$.

In Fig. 5 we can see that the above formula and its consequence $\text{Var}[\bar{X}_n] \rightarrow 2\sigma^2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ agree well with simulations. Notice that this immediately implies that the unbiased point estimate \bar{X} of the ancestral state X_0 is not consistent as the variance of the estimator tends to a constant $2\sigma^2$. We can compare this with the result of Ané (2008) who deals with another estimator of the ancestral state. The estimator of Ané (2008) is unbiased and converges (in L^2 and almost surely) to a random variable with a non-zero variance, bounded from below by $\sigma^2 t/k$, where t is the maximum length of a branch stemming from the root and k is the number of branches stemming from the root ($k = 2$ in our model). However, Ané (2008) considers a different model of tree growth as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the tree is assumed to start at the root.

Using Eqs. (2) and (21) we obtain for the Yule case

$$\text{E}[S_n^2] = \sigma^2 \left(\frac{n+1}{n-1} a_n - \frac{n}{n-1} 2 \right), \quad (22)$$

so that $\text{E}[S_n^2] \sim \sigma^2 \ln n$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This suggests an unbiased estimate for the variance σ^2 .

In the supercritical case ($\mu = 1$ and $\lambda > 1$) Eqs. (16) and (12) entail

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\bar{X}_n] &= 2\sigma^2 \left(\frac{1+e_{n,\lambda}}{\lambda-1} - \frac{1}{n} \frac{\lambda+1}{(\lambda-1)^2} \left(a_n + e_{n,\lambda} - \ln \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} \right) \right), \\ \text{E}[S_n^2] &= \sigma^2 \frac{\left(\frac{2\lambda}{\lambda-1} + n \right) \left(a_n - \ln \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} \right) + \left(\frac{2\lambda}{\lambda-1} - n \right) e_{n,\lambda} + 1 - 2n}{(\lambda-1)(n-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the critical case ($\mu = \lambda = 1$) with a proper prior imposed on the time of

origin we use Eqs. (17) and (18) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var} [\bar{X}_n] &= \sigma^2 \left(e_{n,m} \left(2n - 2N + \frac{2N(N+1)}{n} - 1 \right) - \frac{A_{n,N}}{n} \right), \\ \text{E} [S_n^2] &= \sigma^2 \left(e_{n,m} \left(\frac{2Nn}{n-1} - \frac{2N(N+1)}{n-1} - n \right) + \frac{A_{n,N}}{n-1} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $m = 1 + 1/N$ and

$$A_{n,N} = 2N(n - (N+1)(a_n - \ln(N+1))).$$

To compare different cases we put together asymptotic formulae as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (and additionally $n/N \rightarrow \alpha$ in the critical case):

$$\sigma^{-2} \text{Var} [\bar{X}_n] \sim \begin{cases} 2 & \text{in the Yule case,} \\ \frac{2}{\lambda-1} & \text{in the supercritical case,} \\ c_\alpha n & \text{in the critical case,} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where $c_\alpha = 2\alpha^{-2}((\alpha^2 - \alpha + 1)I_\alpha - \alpha + \ln \alpha)$, and

$$\sigma^{-2} \text{E} [S_n^2] \sim \begin{cases} \ln n & \text{in the Yule case,} \\ \frac{\ln n}{\lambda-1} & \text{in the supercritical case,} \\ d_\alpha n & \text{in the critical case,} \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

where $d_\alpha = \alpha^{-2}((2\alpha - \alpha^2 - 2)I_\alpha + \alpha - \ln \alpha)$.

7. Connection with total cophenetic index

A recent work due to Mir et al. (2012) considers a new balance index for phylogenetic trees termed the *total cophenetic index*. The total cophenetic index for a given tree with n tips is defined as,

$$\Phi_n = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \phi_{ij},$$

the sum of the number of branches ϕ_{ij} from the root to the most recent common ancestor of tips i and j . Their model of the phylogenetic tree is different from the one we discuss in that there is no branch prior to the root, i.e. the tree “begins” at the first branching point. Under the Yule model they show that the expectation of the total cophenetic index for a tree with n tips is

$$\text{E} [\Phi_n] = n(n+1 - 2a_n). \quad (25)$$

We next demonstrate a short proof of the latter formula based on the approach developed in this paper. Denote by T_n the time of the tree root so that $T - T_n$ is the length of the initial branch until the first splitting (for illustration see Fig. 1, panel A). For the conditional Yule tree with n tips the random variable

$$\Phi_n^* = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (T_n - \tau_{ij})$$

is the sum of branch lengths connecting the root with the most recent common ancestor of tips i and j . Since the mean branch length of this random tree is 0.5 (see Mooers et al., in press; Stadler and Steel, 2012, for results on branch length expectations) we have $E[\Phi_n] = 2 E[\Phi_n^*]$, and Eq. (25) follows from

$$E[\Phi_n^*] = E \left[\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (T_n - \tau_{ij}) \right] = \binom{n}{2} E[T_n - \tau],$$

where as before τ is the time to the most recent common ancestor for a randomly chosen pair of tips. Indeed, using the simple fact proved in Appendix A,

$$E[T - T_n] = 1, \tag{26}$$

we get the required equality

$$\begin{aligned} E[\Phi_n^*] &= \binom{n}{2} (E[T - \tau] - 1) \\ &= \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{2(n-a_n)}{n-1} - 1 \right) = \frac{n}{2} (n + 1 - 2a_n). \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgments

The research of Serik Sagitov was supported by the Swedish Research Council grant 621-2010-5623. The research of Krzysztof Bartoszek was partially supported by the Center of Theoretical Biology at the University of Gothenburg. We would like to thank Graham Jones for numerical procedures for calculation of $e_{n,m}$ and providing R code for this.

Appendix A.

This section contains derivation of formulae (1), (2), (8), and (26). Relations (1) and (2) come straightforwardly from

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 \text{Var}[\bar{X}_n] &= \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right] \\ &= n \text{Var}[X] + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \text{Cov}[X_i, X_j] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} (1 + (n-1)\rho_n) \text{Var}[X] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E[S_n^2] &= \frac{n}{n-1} E \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 - (\bar{X}_n)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{n-1} (E[X^2] - E[\bar{X}_n]^2) = \frac{n}{n-1} (\text{Var}[X] - \text{Var}[\bar{X}_n]) \\ &= (1 - \rho_n) \text{Var}[X] \end{aligned}$$

due to the variance formula $\text{Var}[X] = \sigma^2 E[T]$ characterizing the Brownian motion model of evolution considered here.

Equation (8) is obtained as follows. If κ is the corresponding distance between the sampled tips, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\kappa = k) = \frac{n-k}{\binom{n}{2}}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

because in a row of n positions there are $n-k$ pairs on a distance k . Since τ is the maximum of κ independent and identically distributed speciation times, we get,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau > s|T, \kappa) = 1 - F_T^\kappa(s),$$

and Eq. (8) follows from,

$$\mathbb{E}[T - \tau|T, \kappa] = T - \int_0^T (1 - F_T^\kappa(s)) ds = \int_0^T F_T^\kappa(s) ds.$$

Finally, (26) follows from (7) and (9)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T - T_n] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T F_T^{n-1}(s) ds\right] \\ &= \int_0^\infty n e^{-t} \int_0^t (1 - e^{-s})^{n-1} ds dt \\ &= n \int_0^1 \int_u^1 (1-v)^{n-1} v^{-1} dv du \\ &= n \int_0^1 (1-v)^{n-1} dv = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Appendix B.

In the main text we use the following relations for the function in Eq. (4):

$$e_{k,m} = \int_0^1 \frac{x^k dx}{m-x}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e_{k,m} = \frac{1}{m-1} \left(a_n + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1} \right), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} k e_{k,m} = \frac{n+n e_{n,m}}{m-1} - \frac{m(a_n + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1})}{(m-1)^2}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$m^k \int_0^{1/m} y^k (1-y)^{-2} dy = \frac{1}{m-1} - k e_{k,m}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Equation (B.1) follows from,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \frac{v^k}{1-vm^{-1}} dv &= m^{k+1} \int_0^{1/m} \frac{x^k dx}{1-x} = m^{k+1} \int_0^{1/m} \left(\frac{1}{1-x} - \frac{1-x^k}{1-x} \right) dx \\ &= m^{k+1} \ln \frac{m}{m-1} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{m^{k+1-i}}{i} = m e_{k,m}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove Eq. (B.2) put $x = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e_{k,m}$ and using,

$$me_{k-1,m} = k^{-1} + e_{k,m}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

set up a linear equation,

$$mx = a_n + x + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1}$$

whose solution is Eq. (B.2). Similarly, to obtain Eq. (B.3) put $x = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} ke_{k,m}$ and use Eq. (B.5) to get a linear equation,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n mke_{k-1,m} = mx + m \sum_{k=1}^n e_{k-1,m} = n + x + ne_{n,m},$$

which in view of Eq. (B.2) gives Eq. (B.3). Equation (B.4) follows from Eqs. (B.1) and (B.5) as,

$$\begin{aligned} m^k \int_0^{1/m} y^k (1-y)^{-2} dy &= m^k \int_0^{1/m} \left(\frac{m}{m-1} - \frac{1}{1-y} \right) dy^k \\ &= \frac{m}{m-1} - km^k \int_0^{1/m} \frac{y^{k-1} dy}{1-y}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF EQS. (14) AND (19). Let us write o_m instead of $O\left((m-1)^2 \ln \frac{m}{m-1}\right)$ as $m \downarrow 1$. Observe that,

$$a_n + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{i} - \frac{m^{n-i}}{i} \right) + (m^n - 1) \ln \frac{m}{m-1}.$$

Thus as $m \downarrow 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_n + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1}}{m-1} &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m^i \right) \ln \frac{m}{m-1} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-i-1} m^j}{i} \\ &= n \ln \frac{m}{m-1} + \ln \frac{m}{m-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i \right) (m-1) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{n-i}{i} + \frac{(m-1) \sum_{j=1}^{n-i-1} j}{i} \right) + o_m \\ &= n \left(1 - a_n + \ln \frac{m}{m-1} \right) \\ &\quad + \binom{n}{2} \left(\ln \frac{m}{m-1} - a_n + \frac{3}{2} \right) (m-1) + o_m, \end{aligned}$$

since,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-i-1} j}{i} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{(n-i-1)(n-i)}{2i} \\ &= \binom{n}{2} a_{n-2} - \frac{(2n-1)(n-2)}{2} + \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{4} = \binom{n}{2} \left(a_n - \frac{3}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + e_{n,m} &= \left(1 - a_n + \ln \frac{m}{m-1}\right) (1 + n(m-1)) + o_m, \\ n(1 + e_{n,m}) &= \left(a_n + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1}\right) \left(\frac{1}{m-1} + n\right) \\ &\quad - \binom{n}{2} \left(\ln \frac{m}{m-1} - a_n + \frac{3}{2}\right) (m-1) + o_m, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{2(1+e_{n,m})}{(n-1)(m-1)} - \frac{2m(a_n + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1})}{n(n-1)(m-1)^2} \\ &= 2 \left(1 - a_n + \ln \frac{m}{m-1}\right) - \ln \frac{m}{m-1} + a_n - \frac{3}{2} + \frac{o_m}{m-1} \\ &= \ln \frac{m}{m-1} - a_n + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{o_m}{m-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these results we find that Eq. (18) indeed implies Eq. (19):

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n &= 2 - \frac{1}{e_{n,m}} \left(\frac{2(1+e_{n,m})}{(n-1)(m-1)} - \frac{2m(a_n + e_{n,m} - \ln \frac{m}{m-1})}{n(n-1)(m-1)^2} \right) \\ &= 2 - \frac{\ln \frac{m}{m-1} - a_n + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{o_m}{m-1}}{\ln \frac{m}{m-1} - a_n + \frac{o_m}{m-1}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1/2}{\ln \frac{m}{m-1} - a_n + o(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (14) is derived from Eq. (12) in a similar way.

PROOF OF EQS. (15) AND (20). Equations (15) and (20) are easily obtained from Eqs.(12) and (18) using the following integral approximation for the function in Eq. (4),

$$e_{n,m} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+i)m^i} \rightarrow \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-x} dx}{\alpha + x}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad n(m-1) \rightarrow \alpha$$

for a given positive α . The last convergence follows from a Riemann sum representation,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+i)m^i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta f(i\delta),$$

where $\delta = m-1$ and

$$f(x) = \frac{m^{-x/(m-1)}}{n(m-1) + x} \rightarrow \frac{e^{-x}}{\alpha + x}.$$

We can recognize that $e_{n,m}$ converges to a transformation of the exponential integral namely,

$$e_{n,m} \rightarrow e^{-\alpha} \int_{\alpha}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-x}}{x} dx, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad n(m-1) \rightarrow \alpha.$$

The previously presented formulae for $e_{n,m}$ are not suitable for numerically calculating its value but Graham Jones pointed out in personal correspondence that by a change of variables

$$e_{n,m} = \int_{\ln(m-1)}^{\ln(m)} (m - e^x) dx \quad (\text{B.6})$$

which is well suited for computation. Alternatively, as again pointed out by Graham Jones, in Eq. (4) one can directly bound the tail (sum of terms from some K_0) of the infinite series by $m^{1-K_0}/((K_0 + n)(m - 1))$.

References

- D. Aldous and L. Popovic. A critical branching process model for biodiversity. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 37(4):1094–1115, 2005.
- C. Ané. Analysis of comparative data with hierarchical autocorrelation. *Ann. Appl. Stat.*, 2(3):1078–1102, 2008.
- K. Bartoszek, J. Pienaar, P. Mostad, S. Andersson, and T. F. Hansen. A comparative method for studying multivariate adaptation. *J. Theor. Biol.*, in review.
- M. A. Butler and A. A. King. Phylogenetic comparative analysis: a modelling approach for adaptive evolution. *Am. Nat.*, 164(6):683–695, 2004.
- J. Felsenstein. Phylogenies and the comparative method. *Am. Nat.*, 125(1): 1–15, 1985.
- T. Gernhard. The conditioned reconstructed process. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 253: 769–778, 2008.
- T. F. Hansen, J. Pienaar, and S. H. Orzack. A comparative method for studying adaptation to randomly evolving environment. *Evolution*, 62:1965–1977, 2008.
- J. P. Huelsenbeck and B. Rannala. Detecting correlation between characters in a comparative analysis with uncertain phylogeny. *Evolution*, 57(6):1237–1247, 2003.
- P. Lemey, A. Rambaut, J. J. Welch, and M. A. Suchard. Phylogeography takes a relaxed random walk in continuous space and time. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 27(8): 1877–1885, 2010.
- A. Mir, F. Rossello, and L. Rotger. A new balance index for phylogenetic trees. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2012.
- A. Mooers, O. Gascuel, T. Stadler, H. Li, and M. Steel. Branch lengths on birth-death trees and the expected loss of phylogenetic diversity. *Syst. Biol.*, in press.

- M. Pagel and F. Lutzoni. Accounting for phylogenetic uncertainty in comparative studies of evolution and adaptation. In M. Laessig, editor, *Biological Evolution and Statistical Physics*. Springer Verlag, 2001.
- R Development Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2010. URL <http://www.R-project.org>. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.
- T. Stadler. On incomplete sampling under birth-death models and connections to the sampling-based coalescent. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 261(1):58–68, 2009.
- T. Stadler. Simulating trees with a fixed number of extant species. *Syst. Biol.*, 60(5):676–684, 2011.
- T. Stadler and M. Steel. Distribution of branch lengths and phylogenetic diversity under homogeneous speciation models. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 297:33–40, 2012.
- G. U. Yule. A mathematical theory of evolution: based on the conclusions of Dr. J. C. Willis. *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. B*, 213:21–87, 1924.