

Statistical Accuracy of Species Tree Methods

Computational Performance and Statistical Accuracy of *BEAST and Comparisons with Other Methods

HUW A. OGILVIE¹, JOSEPH HELED^{2,3}, DONG XIE^{2,3} AND ALEXEI J. DRUMMOND^{2,3}

¹*Evolution, Ecology and Genetics, Research School of Biology, The Australian National
University, Canberra, Australia;*

²*Department of Computer Science, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand;*

³*Allan Wilson Centre for Molecular Ecology and Evolution, University of Auckland, Auckland,
New Zealand*

Corresponding author: Alexei J. Drummond, Department of Computer Science,
University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand; E-mail: alexei@cs.auckland.ac.nz

Abstract.— Under the multispecies coalescent model of molecular evolution gene trees evolve within a species tree, and follow predicted distributions of topologies and coalescent times. In comparison, supermatrix concatenation methods assume that gene trees share a common history and equate gene coalescence with species divergence. The multispecies coalescent is supported by previous studies which found that its predicted distributions fit empirical data, and that concatenation is not a consistent estimator of the species tree. *BEAST, a fully Bayesian implementation of the multispecies coalescent, is popular but computationally intensive, so the advent of large phylogenomic data sets is both a computational challenge and an opportunity for better systematics. Using simulation studies, we characterise the scaling behaviour of *BEAST, and enable quantitative prediction of the impact increasing the number of loci has on both computational performance and statistical accuracy. Follow up simulations over a wide range of parameters show that the statistical performance of *BEAST relative to concatenation improves both as branch length is reduced and as the number of loci is increased. Finally, using simulations based on estimated parameters from two phylogenomic data sets, we compare the performance of a range of species tree and concatenation methods to show that using *BEAST with a small subset of loci can be preferable to using concatenation with thousands of loci. Our results provide insight into the practicalities of Bayesian species tree estimation, the number of genes required to obtain a given level of accuracy and the situations in which supermatrix or summary methods will be outperformed by the fully Bayesian multispecies coalescent.

(Keywords: Phylogenomics, Species tree, Gene tree, Bayesian phylogenetics, Multispecies coalescent, Concatenation, Supermatrix)

INTRODUCTION

In recent years a number of new techniques have applied next-generation sequencing to phylogenetics and phylogeography (McCormack et al. 2013). These new methods include target enrichment strategies (Mamanova et al. 2010) like exon capture (Bi et al. 2012), anchored phylogenomics (Lemmon et al. 2012) and ultra-conserved elements (Faircloth et al. 2012), as well as RAD sequencing (Baird et al. 2008; Davey et al. 2011). As a result genome-wide samples of large numbers of loci from multiple individuals and multiple species has become increasingly common. This trend is rapidly shifting the *modus operandi* of systematic biology from phylogenetics to phylogenomics. This move from phylogenetics to phylogenomics has also heralded a rapid development and uptake of species tree inference methods that acknowledge and model the discordance among individual gene trees. As with the field of phylogenetics, there is a broad acceptance that probabilistic model-based methods are preferable, however the amount of data produced by next-generation technologies has also spurred the development of many fast methods that

do not utilise all the available data (Liu et al. 2009), or employ statistical shortcuts such as admitting no uncertainty in individual gene trees (Kubatko et al. 2009).

Bayesian species tree estimation

The theory of incomplete lineage sorting and its implications for phylogenetic inference has been appreciated for some time (Pamilo and Nei 1988), and early approaches to applying this theory inferred the species tree that minimises deep coalescences using gene tree parsimony (Maddison 1997; Page and Charleston 1997; Slowinski and Page 1999). The fully probabilistic application of the theory to molecular sequence analysis has only begun more recently with the introduction of Bayesian implementations of the multispecies coalescent (Rannala and Yang 2003; Edwards et al. 2007; Liu 2008; Liu et al. 2008; Heled and Drummond 2010). This model embeds gene trees within a birth-death or pure Yule species tree, and within each lineage (or branch) of the species tree, gene trees are assumed to follow a coalescent process (Heled and Drummond 2010). Prior to the development of these methods it was necessary to assume that the history of each gene is shared and equal to the history of the species tree being studied.

However gene trees are actually embedded within the species tree, and the approximation of equating them becomes increasingly problematic as one samples more loci, which in reality each have distinct gene tree topologies and divergence times. The multispecies coalescent brings together coalescent and birth-death models of time-trees into a single model. It describes the probability distribution of one or more gene trees that are nested inside a species tree. The species tree describes the relationship between the

sampled species, or sometimes, sampled populations that have been separated for long periods of time relative to their population sizes. In the latter case it may be referred to as a *population tree* instead.

The initial implementations of the multispecies coalescent made very simple assumptions including no recombination within each locus and free recombination between loci. While these simple assumptions can be robust to violation including some forms of gene flow (Heled et al. 2013) (but see Leaché et al. (2013)), researchers have begun to acknowledge that additional processes (such as hybridisation) may need to be incorporated (Chung and Ané 2011; Yu et al. 2011; Camargo et al. 2012). A number of simulation studies have also looked at various facets of performance of Bayesian species tree estimation including the influence of missing data (Wiens and Morrill 2011), the influence of low rates and rate variation among loci (Lanier et al. 2014) and comparisons of performance with “super matrix” concatenation approaches (DeGiorgio and Degnan 2010; Larget et al. 2010; Leaché and Rannala 2011; Bayzid and Warnow 2013).

There has also been recent developments aimed at treating the number of species as unknown. The so-called *species delimitation* problem conceptually involves both estimating the number of species, the assignment of individuals to species, and the estimation of the phylogenetic relationships between species. Fully Bayesian solutions to this problem have recently been published (Yang and Rannala 2014; Jones et al. 2015), which will enable researchers to resolve taxonomies where both species boundaries and relationships are presently unclear.

Although these modelling advances are exciting, in the face of a next-generation data deluge, this study asks and answers the following, heretofore unanswered questions: (i) How do fully Bayesian multispecies coalescent models scale to large data sets? (ii) How much more accurate will phylogenetic species tree estimates be with more sequence data? (iii) When should one use a multispecies coalescent approach instead of computationally more efficient Bayesian supermatrix approaches, or summary methods which do not use all available data? To address the first of these questions we investigate the computational performance of the *BEAST implementation of the multispecies coalescent (Heled and Drummond 2010), so as to assess the feasibility of conducting large phylogenomic analyses using existing computational tools. To shed light on the second question we investigate how estimation accuracy improves with increasing loci.

To address the final question, we investigate how the statistical accuracy of the multispecies coalescent compares with concatenation across a broad range of conditions. We also investigate the statistical accuracy of the multispecies coalescent, supermatrix and summary methods using simulations based on two published sequence data sets; RAD tag sequences from a study of the Sino-Himalayan plant clade *Cyathophora* (Eaton and Ree 2013), and RNA-seq assemblies from a study of Primates (Perry et al. 2012). *Cyathophora*, a section of the genus *Pedicularis*, is probably no older than 8 Ma, originating in the late Miocene or the Pliocene (Yang and Wang 2007) and is therefore a shallow study system. In contrast Primates are a deep study system, as the oldest split in this order is estimated to have occurred in the Cretaceous around 80 Ma (Tavaré et al. 2002; Steiper and Young

2006; Wilkinson et al. 2011).

METHODS

Using simulation, we investigated the trends in computational performance and statistical accuracy of the multispecies coalescent model as implemented in BEAST 2 (*BEAST), and its statistical accuracy relative to other methods of species tree inference. In designing these simulation studies there were a number of parameters to consider. The key parameters that might determine performance of inference under the multispecies coalescent are:

n : The number of species.

n_i : The number of individuals sampled per species.

n_l : The number of independent loci.

n_s : The number of sites in a single locus.

N_e : The effective population sizes of extant and ancestral species.

τ : The branch lengths in units of time or expected substitutions.

Of these parameters it is the number of loci n_l and the number of individuals per species n_i that are largely determined by experimental design. In addition, a complete specification of a multispecies coalescent model requires a speciation model (parameterised model of the species tree), a substitution model (model of the relative rates and base

frequencies) and a clock model describing the absolute rate of evolution across the branches of each gene tree. In the following sections we describe the simulation conditions for our computational experiments.

*Experiment 1: Performance of *BEAST with increasing numbers of loci*

The first set of simulations we performed was primarily concerned with the effect that increasing the number of loci had on the computational performance and statistical accuracy of Bayesian species tree estimation. We simulated 100 random (rapidly speciating) species trees of each of three different sizes, $n = 5, 8, 13$, using the birth-death process (Kendall 1948; Nee et al. 1994; Gernhard 2008). In all cases the speciation rate was $\lambda = 1$ and the extinction rate $\mu = 0.2$ (nominally per million years). For 5 species trees we considered $n_i = 2, 4, 8$, for 8 species trees $n_i = 2, 4$ and for 13 species trees $n_i = 2$. For each combination of n and n_i we simulated 256 gene trees. Gene alignments were simulated from these gene trees assuming a per-site substitution rate of 1% per lineage per million years, and the locus length was 200bp each to mimic short-read next-generation sequence data. Finally, we drew successively larger subsets of each group of 256 alignments to form a set of *BEAST analyses (Heled and Drummond 2010). We considered increasing numbers of loci on a logarithmic scale, i.e. $n_l \in \{2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256\}$.

The largest 256 gene data sets were only analyzed for 5 species and 2 individuals per species, because of limitations in available computational resources. Each *BEAST analysis was run using the same CPU (Intel E5-2680 @ 2.70 GHz) for a fair comparison. If the effective sample size (ESS) of either the log posterior or the age of the species tree in

an analysis was not ≥ 200 after the initial MCMC chain was completed, we used the *resume* function in BEAST 2 (Bouckaert et al. 2014) to extend the MCMC chain from the final state of the previous run, until sufficient samples were obtained to achieve a minimum ESS of 200. All statistics and trees for each set of 100 replicates were logged and the MCMC chains that needed extension were combined into a single long chain. Pseudocode for the experimental protocol can be found in Algorithm S1 in supplementary information.

Experiment 2: Comparing Bayesian multispecies coalescent with the Bayesian supermatrix approach

In the second set of simulations we compare the statistical accuracy of the multispecies coalescent to partitioned concatenation, both implemented in BEAST 2. We refer to these methods as *BEAST and Bayesian supermatrix respectively. Specifically we tested the hypothesis that the comparative accuracy would depend on mean branch length in coalescent units of $\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$.

For every combination of $n = 4, 5, 6, 8$ and $n_l = 1, 2, 4$ we simulated species trees with a range of branch lengths in coalescent units. In order to vary branch lengths, species trees were simulated with expected root heights of $R = \frac{1}{2}, 1, 2, 4, 8, 16$ (nominally in millions of years) and population sizes chosen from $N_e = \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1$ (nominally in units of million individuals), changing the coalescent branch length unit numerator and denominator respectively. Additional expected root heights were included where the most accurate method switches from *BEAST to Bayesian supermatrix, to obtain denser sampling in that zone.

Species trees were generated under the pure birth Yule model (Yule 1924). The birth rate for each combination of parameters was set to $\lambda = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{1}{k}$, that is, the birth which generates trees with an expected root height of R . These settings roughly correspond to mammalian nuclear genes of species with an effective population size of one-quarter, one half or one million individuals.

A single individual per species was simulated for all loci. We used the Jukes-Cantor substitution model (Jukes and Cantor 1969) and a strict clock model for each locus, but with rate variation between loci. The mutation rate for the first locus was fixed at $\mu_0 = 0.01$, and the rates for other loci drawn from the range $[\mu_0/F, \mu_0 \times F]$. We used $F = 3$, giving a factor of 9 between the fastest and slowest possible rates. The rate was drawn in log space, so there is equal density of slower and faster rates around μ_0 . The number of sites per alignment (n_s) was fixed at 1000.

We generated 100 replicates for each combination of n , n_l , R and N_e . For each unique combination of n , R and N_e only one set of 100 species trees was generated and used (regardless of n_l) to minimise species tree sampling error when analysing the effect of increasing n_l . Gene trees and extant sequences were generated separately for each replicate and for each value of n_l .

Both Bayesian supermatrix and *BEAST analyses used the Yule prior on the species tree, with a uniform prior of $[1/100, 100]$ on λ , and n_l partitions with a strict clock model for each, where the clock rate for the first partition is fixed to the truth (μ_0) and the other rates were estimated. The *BEAST effective population size hyperparameter (popMean)

was given a uniform prior in the range $[\frac{1}{5}, 5]$, and all population sizes were estimated.

The Bayesian supermatrix analysis used a fixed chain length of 4 million states, sampling every 1000 states. The *BEAST analysis used a fixed chain length of 40 million states, sampling every 10,000 states. The ESS values of the posterior, likelihood and prior statistics of each chain were estimated, and replicates where the ESS was < 200 for any of those statistics were discarded. For each combination of simulated parameters and method there were never more than 4% of replicates discarded for this reason. More information on the distribution of ESS values is presented in supplementary information.

Experiment 3: Many-method comparison of species tree inference using parameters estimated from two phylogenomic datasets

The purpose of the third set of simulations was two-fold: to check that the trends in statistical accuracy observed for the first two sets of simulations held for empirically derived simulations, and to compare statistical accuracy across a range of species tree inference methods. To simulate more realistic trees and sequences, we derived a range of properties and phylogenetic parameters from two empirical phylogenomic data sets for use as simulation parameters.

The biallelic species tree inference method SNAPP (Bryant et al. 2012) was used to estimate speciation birth rates and effective population sizes because it did not require phasing the sequence data. To estimate base frequencies, substitution rates, between-site rate variation and between-locus rate variation we used a Bayesian supermatrix analysis

with a Yule prior on the species tree. A detailed description of sequence data processing and SNAPP and BEAST settings is given in supplementary information.

We simulated 100 replicates each of “deep” and “shallow” Yule species trees of $n = 12$ and $n = 8$ respectively, using the inferred empirical birth rates, with per-branch population sizes picked from a gamma distribution of shape 2 and a mean equal to the mean inferred population sizes. For the deep species trees we simulated 512 gene trees, and for the shallow species trees we simulated 4096 gene trees as coalescent trees within each species tree, with two individuals per species. All trees were simulated using biopy (Heled 2013).

For each simulated gene tree we chose a strict clock rate from the gamma distribution defined by the inferred shape parameters and scale parameters. Nucleotide sequences were simulated for every gene tree using the empirically derived GTR+G base frequencies, substitution rates and gamma rate variation from the applicable study. As the shallow study used 64nt RAD tags, we picked that fixed length for the sequence simulations based on that study. For simulations based on the deep study, we resampled the sequence lengths of the alignments from that study.

Species trees were reconstructed from simulated sequences using five different multi-locus inference methods; *BEAST, Bayesian supermatrix, RAxML version 8 (Stamatakis 2014) and BIONJ (Gascuel 1997). We tested *BEAST performance given $n_l = 1, 2, 4, 8$ for the deep study based simulations and $n_l = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32$ for the shallow study based simulations. For all simulations, we tested the performance of Bayesian

supermatrix given $n_l = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512$. For the deep study simulations we tested RAxML and BIONJ with $n_l = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 512$. For the shallow study simulations we also analysed $n_l = 1024, 2048, 4096$.

We also compared *BEAST with MP-EST version 1.5 (Liu et al. 2010), a method which uses gene tree topologies to estimate the underlying species tree topology and branch lengths (in coalescent units). Because MP-EST relies on incongruence between gene tree topologies to estimate branch lengths, we did not test its performance given a single locus as no branch lengths can be estimated in that case. Instead we tested MP-EST for all other values of n_l also analysed using supermatrix methods.

Both *BEAST and MP-EST can infer species trees utilising more than one individual per species. For the shallow study simulations we tested both methods using $n_i = 1, 2$. For the deep study simulations where gene trees should be more concordant with species trees and population genetics are less relevant, we limited our analysis to $n_i = 1$. Detailed descriptions of the settings used for all methods are given in supplementary information.

RESULTS

*Experiment 1: Performance of *BEAST with increasing numbers of loci*

Computational performance.— We evaluated the scaling of computational performance of *BEAST as a function of the number of loci analysed. We recorded the elapsed

computational time for each replicate analysis running in a single thread. This was then used to calculate the effective number of samples per hour (ESS per hour), to measure how much computational effort is required to produce a sample from the posterior for a given number of loci. Figure 1a illustrates the scaling of computational performance for 5 species and 2 individuals per species. Each box-and-whisker in the plot summarises the variance in computational performance of 100 different species trees and a fixed number of loci. The linear relationship in the log-log plot indicates that a power-law fits well for the range from 32 to 256 loci. We extrapolate that for $n_l > 32$, ESS per hour follows a power law with an exponent of -2.79 ± 0.052 . Corresponding figures for different number of species and individuals can be found in the supplementary information.

Applying this functional relationship, we could estimate the computational cost to analyse a similar data set with a larger number of loci. For example, given 5 species and 2 individuals in the simulation, the median of ESS per hour is 1.00 ± 0.23 for 256 genes, which indicates that it would take approximate 200 CPU hours to obtain an ESS of 200. We can therefore estimate that a similar analysis of 1024 loci would take roughly 300 CPU days (nevertheless an analysis this size might be achieved within a month by parallelising the problem into 20 independent MCMC chains for a month each and discarding a few days of burnin from each of them, to achieve on the order of ten independent samples from each chain).

Figure 1b plots median computational performance as a function of number of loci for each combination of number of species and number of individuals per species. This




Figure 1: A plot of the ESS per hour as a function of the number of loci. (a) Performance for analyses of 5 species each with 2 individuals. The box-and-whisker shows the variance in mixing across a hundred replicate data sets for each number of loci. (b) The median ESS per hour as a function of number of loci, with one line for each combination of number of species and number of individuals per species.

figure clearly shows that the slope of the relationship does not vary with the number of species or the number of individuals, although a larger range of n and n_i would need to be examined to understand the scaling relationship of computational performance with those quantities. Combining all the simulations, a multiple linear regression describing a response variable Y (e.g. ESS per hour) as a function of three explanatory variables: number of loci n_l , number of species n , and number of individuals per species n_i , can be constructed as follows:

$$\log(Y) = \beta_1 \log(n_l) + \beta_2 n + \beta_3 n_i + \alpha \quad (1)$$

Taking the ESS per hour as the response variable, the linear regression estimates of the coefficients are $\beta_1 = -2.62 \pm 0.02$, $\beta_2 = -0.23 \pm 0.01$, $\beta_3 = -0.27 \pm 0.01$, and the intercept is $\alpha = 8.04 \pm 0.07$. Since we only have two distinct values for each of n and n_i , a general scaling relationship cannot be derived for these explanatory variables, but it appears clear from Figure 1b that the β_1 coefficient is not greatly influenced by n and n_i .

We also considered the scaling of the number of effective samples per million states (ESS per million states) in the MCMC analyses. This quantity is complimentary to our first result; it is easier to investigate as it does not require running all simulations on identical and dedicated hardware, however because the CPU time per state will increase as the number of loci is increased, it cannot by itself be used to predict how run time will increase.

Again in fitting a power law to the computational performance as a function of n_i we excluded results from analyses with less than 32 loci, as the contribution to MCMC mixing rates for aspects of the model beyond gene tree uncertainty (e.g. substitution parameters) appears to become significant with small problem sizes so that the scaling law breaks down.

Figure 2a illustrates that, as expected, ESS per million states also exhibits a power law in the number of loci. The exponent of its trend line is -1.86 ± 0.043 . Using the above example of 256 genes, in which the median of ESS per million states is 0.052 ± 0.008 , it would take approximately 3.8 billion states to obtain an ESS of 200. We can therefore extrapolate that a similar analysis of 1024 loci would require an MCMC chain of roughly $3.8 \times \left(\frac{1024}{256}\right)^{1.86} \approx 50$ billion states.




Figure 2: A plot of the ESS per million states as a function of the number of loci. (a) Performance for analyses of 5 species each with 2 individuals. The box-and-whisker shows the variance in mixing across a hundred replicate data sets for each number of loci. (b) The median ESS per million states as a function of number of loci, with one line for each combination of number of species and number of individuals per species.

Assigning the ESS per million states to Y in the multiple linear regression in

Equation 1, results in estimates of the coefficients of $\beta_1 = -1.92 \pm 0.02$,

$\beta_2 = -0.17 \pm 0.005$, $\beta_3 = -0.17 \pm 0.01$, and the intercept is $\alpha = 4.49 \pm 0.06$.

Statistical accuracy.— We also calculated the relative error in the species tree estimate for each replicate. We define the “relative species tree error” e_T to be the posterior expectation of the branch score distance BS between the estimated species tree \hat{T} and the true species tree T_{true} , normalised by the tree length of the true species tree L_{true} :

$$e_T = \frac{\frac{1}{k} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k BS(T_{true}, \hat{T}_i)}{L_{true}} \quad (2)$$

$BS(T_{true}, \hat{T}_i)$ is the branch score distance between the true tree and the i 'th posterior sample \hat{T}_i as previously defined (Heled and Drummond 2010), and k is the number of samples drawn from the posterior distribution. We chose branch score distance because it incorporates both topological and branch length error, and normalise by the length of the true species tree to make the error comparable between species trees of differing units and/or number of species.

For some of the larger analyses it was challenging to achieve acceptable ESSs for every replicate data set, even with chain lengths of several billion states and access to high performance computational infrastructure. To retain the larger analyses without biasing statistical accuracy, we excluded replicates in which the ESS of either the log posterior or the species tree age was smaller than 200. The remaining number of replicates is displayed at the top of each box-and-whisker in Figure 3a. Again we fit a linear regression to all remaining replicates, and Figure 3a shows the relative species tree error e_T as a function of number of loci. This analysis revealed a power law from 2 to 256 genes. The exponent of its trend line is -0.4298 ± 0.0079 . Looking at the 256 genes example again, the median of the relative species tree errors is 0.036 ± 0.0058 , after the replicates with insufficient ESSs were excluded. By extrapolation we would therefore estimate that the relative error of analysing 1024 loci would go down to $0.036 \times \left(\frac{1024}{256}\right)^{-0.4298} \approx 0.0198$. Figure 3b shows the median relative species tree errors and the log-log regression for relative species tree error for different combinations of n and n_l . There is no result illustrated for 128 loci, 13 species and 2 individuals per species, because none of the 100 replicates reached sufficient ESS with the

chain lengths used. Assigning the median relative species tree error to Y in the multiple linear regression in Equation 1, the estimates of the coefficients are $\beta_1 = -0.434 \pm 0.004$, $\beta_2 = -0.122 \pm 0.005$, $\beta_3 = -0.180 \pm 0.008$, and the intercept is $\alpha = -0.322 \pm 0.045$. More detail of all multiple linear regression models are available in supplementary information.




Figure 3: The relative error in the estimated species tree (for replicates with an ESS ≥ 200) as a function of the number of loci. (a) Performance for 5 species each with 2 individuals, with the box- and-whisker showing the variance in relative error across replicate data sets with ESS ≥ 200 , for each number of loci. (b) The median relative error in the estimated species tree as a function of the number of loci, with one line for each combination of number of species and number of individuals per species.

Finally, in the third part, we count the number of species tree topologies sampled in each posterior distribution (for replicates in which ESS ≥ 200). It appears that for the analyses involving 8 and 13 species (Figure 4) there is a rapid reduction in the number of topologies in the 95% credible set with increasing loci, but it does not seem to follow a power law. An investigation of species trees with more taxa would be needed to further

elucidate this relationship.




Figure 4: A plot of the number of distinct species tree topologies in the posterior sample (for replicates with an ESS ≥ 200) as a function of the number of loci. (a) Number of distinct posterior topologies for 8 species each with 2 individuals per species, with the box-and-whisker showing the variance in number of topologies across only replicate data sets with ESS ≥ 200 . (b) The median number of distinct species tree topologies in the posterior sample as a function of number of loci with 2 individuals per species for 8 and 13 species, and 4 individuals per species for 8 species only.

Experiment 2: Statistical accuracy of Bayesian multispecies coalescent relative to Bayesian supermatrix

To assess the statistical accuracy of the Bayesian multispecies coalescent relative to the standard Bayesian supermatrix approach, we conducted a simulation study where we simulated species trees with a broad range of mean branch lengths for varying numbers of species and loci. Gene coalescences occur prior to species divergence times, and the

severity of this discrepancy will depend on species tree branch lengths in units of coalescent time. Because the multispecies coalescent accounts for this phenomenon but the Bayesian supermatrix approach does not, we expected the multispecies coalescent to outperform the Bayesian supermatrix approach for trees with shorter branch lengths.

The “species tree error ratio” e_{T_a}/e_{T_b} is a measure of the comparative accuracy and is specified as follows, where a is Bayesian multispecies coalescent and b is Bayesian supermatrix:

$$\frac{e_{T_a}}{e_{T_b}} = \frac{\frac{1}{k_a} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k_a} BS(T_{true}, \hat{T}_{ai})}{\frac{1}{k_b} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k_b} BS(T_{true}, \hat{T}_{bi})} \quad (3)$$

Values below 1 indicate lower error, or equivalently superior accuracy, when using Bayesian multispecies coalescent instead of Bayesian supermatrix. For all numbers of species tested, the statistical accuracy of Bayesian multispecies coalescent was superior to Bayesian supermatrix for trees with shorter mean branch lengths (Figure 5). Using LOESS regression, it is clear that as the number of loci increases, Bayesian multispecies coalescent performance improves relative to Bayesian supermatrix because for a given mean branch length, the species tree error ratio decreases as the number of loci increases (Figure 5).

For all numbers of species and loci tested, there is a mean branch length cut-over point where for shorter mean branch lengths, Bayesian multispecies coalescent is expected to outperform Bayesian supermatrix, and *vice versa* for longer mean branch lengths. The cut-over point depends on the number of loci; as the number of loci increases, the point shifts right (Figure 5), indicating that Bayesian multispecies coalescent is expected to




Figure 5: Species tree error ratio ($*\text{BEAST}/\text{BEAST}$) as a function of the average species tree branch length (in coalescent units) for trees of 4, 5, 6 and 8 species. Data points are below 1 (black line) where the $*\text{BEAST}$ error is lower than the BEAST error, indicating that $*\text{BEAST}$ was more accurate than BEAST . Data points above 1 show the opposite. Only results with both mean branch lengths and error ratios between 0.1 and 10.0 are included. The red, green and blue lines show the local regression for one, two and four locus estimates respectively. The shaded region indicates where the cut-over point depended on the combination of simulation parameters chosen, $*\text{BEAST}$ was always preferred for average branch lengths shorter than this zone.

outperform Bayesian supermatrix for a larger range of mean branch lengths, consistent with the general trend of improved performance of Bayesian multispecies coalescent when increasing the number of loci.

Within the parameter region explored in this experiment, depending on the number of species, loci and the effective population sizes, the cut-over point was found in the range $0.382\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$ to $5.416\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$ (Figure S10). For mean branch lengths smaller than $0.382\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$, Bayesian multispecies coalescent was preferred regardless of the parameters explored, even when using a single locus (Figure 5). However, the cut-over point given a single locus was always smaller than $0.5\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$ (Figure S10) and given longer mean branch lengths the relative performance of Bayesian supermatrix was much higher than for multi-locus inference (Figure 5). This implies that Bayesian multispecies coalescent is still useful for single locus studies of species trees with short branches, but should be applied with caution.

Experiment 3: Inferred parameters of phylogenomic data sets and multi-method comparison

Sequence data sets from two published studies were realigned and reanalysed to calculate their empirical properties and phylogenetic parameters. Besides the expected difference in birth rate (which for the shallow study rate was over six times faster, corresponding to much shorter branch lengths), the shallow plant study sequences were very AT rich, whereas the deep primate study sequences were moderately GC rich (Table 1). $C \rightleftharpoons T$ substitutions were a greater proportion of all substitutions for the deep

study, but the between-site gamma rate variation was flatter. The mean effective population size N_e of the deep study was estimated to be only 2.4% of the shallow study.

The original publication of *Cyathophora* sequences and phylogeny suggested that *P. rex* subsp. *rockii* is the sister taxon to subsp. *rex* and subsp. *lipskyana* (Eaton and Ree 2013). The most common species tree topology seen in both Bayesian supermatrix and SNAPP posterior distributions supports this placement. The original study left open the question of *P. thamnophila* monophyly but raised the possibility that the apparent paraphyly of this species, as replicated by our reanalysis, is an artefact of introgression (Eaton and Ree 2013). Species trees inferred by SNAPP and Bayesian supermatrix from reanalysis of the deep phylogenetic study agreed with the accepted Primate phylogeny (Perry et al. 2012). SNAPP and Bayesian supermatrix posterior distributions of species trees, visualised using DensiTree (Bouckaert 2010), are available in supplementary information.

Analysis of empirical-based simulations.— We simulated species trees, gene trees and sequences based on the properties and estimated parameters of both data sets (Table 1), and refer to these simulations as shallow and deep phylogenetic simulations respectively. The mean branch length of the simulated shallow species trees was $0.539\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$, compared to $159.8\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$ for the simulated deep species trees. We computed the relative species tree error for all *BEAST analyses of these simulations.

The median relative species tree errors and their log-log regression lines for all values of n_l and n_i considered were computed for both simulation types (Figure 6). Median

errors closely tracked the regression lines, suggesting that a power law also well-describes the statistical accuracy of these empirically-derived simulations. The log-log slope also appears mostly independent of n_i ; the difference in slope between 1 and 2 individuals was only $(-0.31194) - (-0.35926) = 0.04732$ for the shallow simulations. This result is consistent with the statistical accuracy of the initial set of simulations, detailed in “Statistical accuracy”. However, the log-log slopes varied substantially between *BEAST inference of shallow and deep phylogenetic simulations; the difference in slope between $n_i = 1$ shallow and deep simulations was $(-0.31194) - (-0.68034) = 0.36830$. More detail of each log-log simple linear regression is available in supplementary information.

Table 1: Data set properties and mean values of inferred parameters.

Phylogenetic depth	Shallow	Deep
Clade name	Cyathophora	Primates
Taxonomic rank	Section	Order
Sequence data	RAD tag	RNA-seq
In-group nS	8	12
Base frequency: A	0.290	0.266
Base frequency: C	0.212	0.240
Base frequency: G	0.204	0.263
Base frequency: T	0.294	0.231
$A \rightleftharpoons C$ rate	0.367	0.152
$A \rightleftharpoons G$ rate	0.940	0.694
$A \rightleftharpoons T$ rate	0.246	0.100
$C \rightleftharpoons G$ rate	0.305	0.155
$C \rightleftharpoons T$ rate	1.000	1.000
$G \rightleftharpoons T$ rate	0.353	0.127
Gamma rate variation	3.83×10^{-2}	2.33×10^{-1}
Speciation birth rate	125.3	20.7
Per-branch N_e	6.35×10^{-3}	1.53×10^{-4}
Locus length	64nt	Variable
Clock variation shape	6.22	5.15
Clock variation scale	0.173	0.195

All inferred parameters are rounded to three significant figures or one decimal place, whichever is more precise.




Figure 6: The median relative species tree error as a function of the number of loci for empirical-based simulations. Log-log regression lines are based on the median relative species tree error for each combination of simulation type and number of individuals per species. Both shallow and deep phylogenetic simulation results are presented.

Results from the initial simulation study, detailed in “Computational performance”, suggest that a power law relationship of ESS and number of loci only applies to *BEAST analyses of 32 loci and above. As we only inferred deep phylogenetic trees utilising up to 8 loci and shallow phylogenetic trees up to 32 loci using *BEAST, we cannot make firm conclusions regarding the scaling laws of ESS performance using this set of simulations.

Alternative methods for multi-locus phylogenetic inference.— The second analysis we conducted based on the empirically-derived shallow and deep phylogenetic simulations was a comparison of common multi-locus methods of species tree inference. This encompassed the multispecies coalescent (*BEAST), Bayesian supermatrix (BEAST), Maximum-likelihood supermatrix (RAxML), neighbor-joining (BioNJ) and summary (MP-EST) methods. As some methods provide only a single tree estimate in place of a sample from the posterior distribution of trees, we used common ancestor summary trees (CAT; Heled and Bouckaert 2013) for *BEAST and BEAST analyses in this comparison.

Based on relative species tree error, *BEAST outperformed all other methods for any given number of loci or individuals per species for the shallow simulations (Figure 7a), whereas its statistical accuracy was comparable to Bayesian supermatrix for the deep simulations (Figure 7b). The statistical accuracy of Bayesian supermatrix, RAxML and BIONJ all plateaued beyond 64 loci for the shallow simulations, whereas *BEAST appears to follow a power law as previously suggested. The statistical accuracy of all methods improve with increasing numbers of loci for the deep simulations, however we limited the simulations to a maximum of 8 loci when running *BEAST. It is notable that BIONJ does

not increase as quickly as other methods beyond 64 loci.




Figure 7: The average relative species tree error as a function of the number of loci, for different multi-locus species tree inference methods. Both (a) shallow and (b) deep phylogenetic simulation results are presented. Averages are trimmed (25%) means, ranges are 95% confidence intervals calculated by bootstrapping.

A major factor causing the poor performance of methods other than *BEAST for the shallow simulations is a bias when estimating pendant edge (also known as leaf or tip) length in units of time or substitutions. While the mean bias of estimated pendant edge length trends towards zero in *BEAST, other methods converge on a bias of approximately 400%, meaning estimated pendant edges are on average $5\times$ the true length (Figure 8a). In contrast, there is only a small positive bias using methods other than *BEAST for the deep simulations (Figure 8b).

MP-EST was not included in the previous comparisons as it estimates branch lengths in coalescent units $\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$ instead of time or substitutions. As *BEAST infers




Figure 8: The average bias in pendant edge (tip or leaf branch) length as a function of the number of loci, for different multi-locus species tree inference methods. Both (a) shallow and (b) deep phylogenetic simulation results are presented. Averages are trimmed (25%) means, ranges are 95% confidence intervals calculated by bootstrapping.

both branch lengths τ and effective population sizes N_e , *BEAST species trees may be converted to branch lengths in coalescent units, and compared directly with MP-EST species trees. For the shallow simulations, the statistical accuracy of *BEAST improved with increasing numbers of loci, but the accuracy of MP-EST plateaued at a high relative error of approximately 75% (Figure 9a). For the deep simulations MP-EST rarely estimates any branch lengths which results in a relative error of 100% (Figure 9b). The expected accuracy of *BEAST increases monotonically with increasing number of loci for both one or two individuals per species, although with one individual per species the rate of improvement is initially more rapid.

Relative species tree error incorporates both topological error and branch length




Figure 9: The average relative species tree error in coalescent units as a function of the number of loci. Results are necessarily limited to *BEAST and MP-EST, the two methods analysed which can infer branch lengths in coalescent units of $\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$. Both (a) shallow and (b) deep phylogenetic simulation results are presented. Averages are trimmed (25%) means, ranges are 95% confidence intervals calculated by bootstrapping.

error. To separate these two components we calculated the mean rooted subtree prune-and-regraft (rSPR) distances of estimated topologies from the truth, as a measure of purely topological error, using the software package of the same name (Whidden et al. 2010). For shallow simulations, *BEAST was the best performing method, and the topological accuracy of *BEAST and MP-EST was improved given two individuals per species (Figure 10a). For deep simulations, all methods other than *BEAST and MP-EST converged at near-zero topological error given 512 loci (Figure 10b). *BEAST was limited to a maximum of 8 loci, but its performance was very close to Bayesian supermatrix until that point, whereas the topological accuracy of MP-EST was inferior to all other methods

analysed.




Figure 10: The mean rooted SPR distance as a function of the number of loci, for different multi-locus inference methods. All methods including MP-EST are included as this is a purely topological measure not directly influenced by branch lengths. Both (a) shallow and (b) deep phylogenetic simulation results are presented. Ranges are 95% confidence intervals calculated by bootstrapping.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

*Trends *BEAST computational and statistical performance*

We have demonstrated by simulation that the multispecies coalescent (as implemented in *BEAST) can be applied to some problems involving hundreds of loci. In doing so we have also demonstrated several “scaling laws” in both the computational performance of the *BEAST implementation and, more generally, the statistical accuracy

of Bayesian inference under the multispecies coalescent. In terms of computational performance, this provides a benchmark for the efficiency of Bayesian MCMC approaches to inference under the multispecies coalescent. Our results are a product of the particular algorithm design decisions that the authors of *BEAST have made, and we would hope that this scaling law can be improved upon by subsequent efforts to produce more efficient algorithms for inference under the multispecies coalescent model.

In contrast, the power law that describes the decrease in estimation uncertainty associated with inference of the species tree with increasing number of loci is a fundamental property of the model itself, and will hold regardless of the details of the algorithmic approach to inference under this model. It therefore represents a fundamental feature of the problem of species tree inference. With these results it is possible to extrapolate what one might expect to achieve by expanding data from a small pilot study to a more comprehensive sample of the genomic material of a set of study species or individuals.

Given a real data set with similar properties to our first set of simulations, going from a 16 gene pilot study to 256 gene full study would imply a scaling up of data by 16 times so that the increase in chain length would be a factor of:

$$16^{1.92} \approx 200,$$

whereas the increase in CPU hours would be a factor of:

$$16^{2.62} \approx 1400,$$

and the relative uncertainty in the estimate would be:

$$16^{-0.386} \approx 0.34.$$

What this last calculation should remind us about the power law relationship is that expanding data from 1 to 16 genes provides as great an increase in statistical accuracy as expanding from 16 to 256 genes. That is, for each subsequent gene added there is a diminishing return in the increase in statistical accuracy.

**BEAST compared with other methods*

Results from a previous simulation study which used just two species trees showed that the topological accuracy of *BEAST was superior to concatenation for one tree, but inferior for the other tree (Bayzid and Warnow 2013). Because we simulated a new species tree for each replicate, we are able to make more general observations regarding relative performance. As expected the relative performance of *BEAST is higher when branch lengths are shorter. The relative performance of *BEAST is also higher as the number of loci is increased (Figure 5).

The primary measure we chose to explore statistical accuracy, relative species tree error, incorporates both branch length and topological error. This measure is particularly relevant for molecular dating and downstream analyses of macroevolution and ecology. For example, the PD_C measure of phylogenetic diversity and the BiSSE model of binary character influence on birth and death rates both assume accurate tree topologies and

branch lengths (Maddison et al. 2007; Cadotte et al. 2008). When inferring species trees with short branch lengths, *BEAST outperformed supermatrix methods by this measure, even when other methods were able to utilise thousands of loci (7a).

If instead branch lengths are irrelevant for a study, *BEAST still outperformed other methods for a given number of loci when inferring the topology of shallow species trees (Figure 10a). However when using thousands of loci other methods were able to outperform *BEAST, but only because *BEAST was restricted to tens of loci. In the anomaly zone (Degnan and Rosenberg 2006), concatenation is statistically inconsistent (Kubatko and Degnan 2007) and might not outperform *BEAST even when using thousands of loci. For deeper phylogenetic trees, *BEAST performed similarly to the Bayesian supermatrix method (Figure 7b,10b). Because *BEAST requires substantially more computational time, Bayesian supermatrix methods may be the preferable in that case.

The summary method MP-EST performed poorly compared to other methods for inferring the topology of species trees with long branch lengths (Figure 10b), and similarly to concatenation when inferring those with short branch lengths (Figure 10a). MP-EST is known to perform poorly when estimating topologies given short sequences and short branch lengths (Mirarab et al. 2014a), as is the case for the shallow simulations. However our results also show MP-EST performing poorly given very deep species trees. MP-EST was unable to estimate the lengths of many branches, so its coalescent units error plateaued for both shallow and deep phylogenetic simulations (Figure 9). The new summary method ASTRAL (Mirarab et al. 2014b) may perform better at inferring species tree topology, but

was not considered as it only infers unrooted species trees without branch lengths.

Practical implications for applied phylogenetics

Systematists can use the results of this study as a guide to choosing an appropriate phylogenetic method. If both *a priori* estimates or boundaries of root height (clade age) and effective population sizes are available for a particular study system, and the Yule process is a good fit for that system, an approximate estimate of branch length in coalescent units can be made before applying any one particular method.

Previous work has shown that the expected mean branch length of a Yule tree is equal to $1/2\lambda$ (Stadler and Steel 2012). This value can be estimated from the root height as:

$$\frac{1}{2\lambda} = \frac{R(H_n - 1)}{2} \quad (4)$$

Where R is the *a priori* root height and H_n is the n^{th} harmonic number. The average branch length \bar{b} in coalescent units of $\tau(2N_e)^{-1}$ can therefore be approximated as:

$$\bar{b} = \frac{1}{2\lambda \cdot 2N_e} = \frac{R(H_n - 1)}{4N_e} \quad (5)$$

Open questions in phylogenomic inference

Our results point to a number of new areas for further research into the performance of species tree inference.

When using a single locus for species tree inference, experiment 2 shows that Bayesian supermatrix outperforming *BEAST for trees with longer branch lengths. This may be due to the population size priors used in *BEAST. However our many-method comparison shows similar performance for both methods given species trees with long branch lengths. Because deep phylogenetic trees from experiment 3 were longer than the longest trees from experiment 2, this may point to a zone of intermediate branch lengths where *BEAST performs poorly given a single locus.

For all simulations we assumed a constant rate of speciation, however many lineages of life have undergone rapid radiations. RAxML, but not MP-EST, is statistically inconsistent when reconstructing a tree with long pendant edges and short internodes (Liu et al. 2015), a similar tree shape to an ancient rapid radiation. It may be that when inferring species trees of clades containing ancient rapid radiations the performance of phylogenetic methods is closer to the shallow simulations than the deep simulations, and hence *BEAST becomes the preferred method.

For all simulations locus sequences were generated and subsetting uniformly regardless of the number of loci used for each analysis. However researchers may reasonably choose longer, more informative loci when subsetting phylogenomic data sets for use with methods like *BEAST which are computationally intensive. This may improve the relative performance of *BEAST given a subset of the most informative loci relative to supermatrix or summary methods using thousands of loci.

Conclusion and future directions

It appears that the multispecies coalescent is applicable to a wider range of conditions than has been suggested by more limited simulation studies. Our results confirm that the multispecies coalescent should be especially suited to the estimation of shallower evolutionary relationships. We have also demonstrated that scaling of the *BEAST implementation to problems involving hundreds of genes is feasible, however very long chains and/or crude parallelisation approaches need to be employed.

We anticipate that the increasing availability of phylogenomic sequence data will motivate further improvements to the computational efficiency of full Bayesian inference under the multispecies coalescent model, which should allow for analysis of hundreds or even thousands of genes across tens or hundreds of species. These improvements will need to scale efficiently on many core systems such as cluster supercomputers, as these systems offer vastly greater compute power than any desktop workstation.

FUNDING

AJD and JH were supported by a Rutherford Discovery Fellowship awarded to AJD by the Royal Society of New Zealand.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of New Zealand eScience Infrastructure (NeSI) high-performance computing facilities to the results of this research, which are funded jointly by NeSI's collaborator institutions and through the Ministry of

Business, Innovation & Employment's Research Infrastructure programme. This research was undertaken with the assistance of resources from the National Computational Infrastructure (NCI), which is supported by the Australian Government. Inference of phylogenetic parameters from RAD tag and RNA-seq datasets was done on a computer cluster managed by the Genome Discovery Unit of the Australian Cancer Research Foundation Biomolecular Resource Facility.

*

References

Baird, N. A., P. D. Etter, T. S. Atwood, M. C. Currey, A. L. Shiver, Z. A. Lewis, E. U.

Selker, W. A. Cresko, and E. A. Johnson. 2008. Rapid SNP discovery and genetic mapping using sequenced RAD markers. *PLoS One* 3:e3376.

Bayzid, M. S. and T. Warnow. 2013. Naive binning improves phylogenomic analyses.

Bioinformatics 29:2277–84.

Bi, K., D. Vanderpool, S. Singhal, T. Linderoth, C. Moritz, and J. Good. 2012.

Transcriptome-based exon capture enables highly cost-effective comparative genomic data collection at moderate evolutionary scales. *BMC Genomics* 13:403.

Bouckaert, R., J. Heled, D. Kühnert, T. Vaughan, C. H. Wu, D. Xie, M. A. Suchard,

A. Rambaut, and A. J. Drummond. 2014. BEAST 2: A software platform for bayesian evolutionary analysis. *PLOS Computational Biology* 10:e1003537.

Bouckaert, R. R. 2010. DensiTree: making sense of sets of phylogenetic trees.

Bioinformatics 26:1372–1373.

Bryant, D., R. Bouckaert, J. Felsenstein, N. A. Rosenberg, and A. RoyChoudhury. 2012.

Inferring species trees directly from biallelic genetic markers: Bypassing gene trees in a full coalescent analysis. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 29:1917–1932.

- Cadotte, M. W., B. J. Cardinale, and T. H. Oakley. 2008. Evolutionary history and the effect of biodiversity on plant productivity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105:17012–17017.
- Camargo, A., L. J. Avila, M. Morando, and J. W. Sites. 2012. Accuracy and precision of species trees: effects of locus, individual, and base pair sampling on inference of species trees in lizards of the *Liolaemus darwini* group (Squamata, Liolaemidae). *Systematic Biology* 61:272–288.
- Chung, Y. and C. Ané. 2011. Comparing two Bayesian methods for gene tree/species tree reconstruction: simulations with incomplete lineage sorting and horizontal gene transfer. *Systematic Biology* 60:261–275.
- Davey, J. W., P. A. Hohenlohe, P. D. Etter, J. Q. Boone, J. M. Catchen, and M. L. Blaxter. 2011. Genome-wide genetic marker discovery and genotyping using next-generation sequencing. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 12:499–510.
- DeGiorgio, M. and J. H. Degnan. 2010. Fast and consistent estimation of species trees using supermatrix rooted triples. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 27:552–69.
- Degnan, J. H. and N. A. Rosenberg. 2006. Discordance of species trees with their most likely gene trees. *PLoS Genetics* 2:e68.
- Eaton, D. A. R. and R. H. Ree. 2013. Inferring phylogeny and introgression using RADseq data: An example from flowering plants (*Pedicularis*: Orobanchaceae). *Systematic Biology* 62:689–706.

- Edwards, S. V., L. Liu, and D. K. Pearl. 2007. High-resolution species trees without concatenation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104:5936–5941.
- Faircloth, B. C., J. E. McCormack, N. G. Crawford, M. G. Harvey, R. T. Brumfield, and T. C. Glenn. 2012. Ultraconserved elements anchor thousands of genetic markers spanning multiple evolutionary timescales. *Systematic Biology* 61:717–26.
- Gascuel, O. 1997. BIONJ: an improved version of the NJ algorithm based on a simple model of sequence data. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 14:685–695.
- Gernhard, T. 2008. The conditioned reconstructed process. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 253:769–78.
- Heled, J. 2013. biopy v0.1.8. <http://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/~yhel002/biopy/>.
- Heled, J. and R. Bouckaert. 2013. Looking for trees in the forest: summary tree from posterior samples. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 13:221.
- Heled, J., D. Bryant, and A. J. Drummond. 2013. Simulating gene trees under the multispecies coalescent and time-dependent migration. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 13:44.
- Heled, J. and A. Drummond. 2010. Bayesian inference of species trees from multilocus data. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 27:570–580.
- Jones, G., Z. Aydin, and B. Oxelman. 2015. DISSECT: an assignment-free Bayesian

discovery method for species delimitation under the multispecies coalescent.

Bioinformatics 31:991–998.

Jukes, T. and C. Cantor. 1969. Evolution of protein molecules. Pages 21–132 *in*

Mammalian Protein Metabolism (H. Munro, ed.). Academic Press, New York.

Kendall, D. G. 1948. On the generalized “birth-and-death” process. *Annals of*

Mathematical Statistics 19:1–15.

Kubatko, L. S., B. C. Carstens, and L. L. Knowles. 2009. STEM: species tree estimation

using maximum likelihood for gene trees under coalescence. *Bioinformatics* 25:971–3.

Kubatko, L. S. and J. H. Degnan. 2007. Inconsistency of phylogenetic estimates from

concatenated data under coalescence. *Systematic Biology* 56:17–24.

Lanier, H. C., H. Huang, and L. L. Knowles. 2014. How low can you go? the effects of

mutation rate on the accuracy of species-tree estimation. *Molecular Phylogenetics and*

Evolution 70:112–9.

Larget, B. R., S. K. Kotha, C. N. Dewey, and C. Ané. 2010. BUCKy: gene tree/species

tree reconciliation with bayesian concordance analysis. *Bioinformatics* 26:2910–1.

Leaché, A. D., R. B. Harris, B. Rannala, and Z. Yang. 2013. The influence of gene flow on

species tree estimation: A simulation study. *Systematic Biology* .

Leaché, A. D. and B. Rannala. 2011. The accuracy of species tree estimation under

simulation: a comparison of methods. *Systematic Biology* 60:126–137.

- Lemmon, A. R., S. A. Emme, and E. M. Lemmon. 2012. Anchored hybrid enrichment for massively high-throughput phylogenomics. *Systematic Biology* 61:727–44.
- Liu, L. 2008. BEST: Bayesian estimation of species trees under the coalescent model. *Bioinformatics* 24:2542–2543.
- Liu, L., D. K. Pearl, R. T. Brumfield, and S. V. Edwards. 2008. Estimating species trees using multiple-allele DNA sequence data. *Evolution* 62:2080–91.
- Liu, L., Z. Xi, and C. C. Davis. 2015. Coalescent methods are robust to the simultaneous effects of long branches and incomplete lineage sorting. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 32:791–805.
- Liu, L., L. Yu, and S. Edwards. 2010. A maximum pseudo-likelihood approach for estimating species trees under the coalescent model. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 10:302.
- Liu, L., L. Yu, D. K. Pearl, and S. V. Edwards. 2009. Estimating species phylogenies using coalescence times among sequences. *Systematic Biology* 58:468–77.
- Maddison, W. P. 1997. Gene trees in species trees. *Systematic Biology* 46:523–536.
- Maddison, W. P., P. E. Midford, and S. P. Otto. 2007. Estimating a binary character's effect on speciation and extinction. *Systematic Biology* 56:701–710.
- Mamanova, L., A. J. Coffey, C. E. Scott, I. Kozarewa, E. H. Turner, A. Kumar, E. Howard, J. Shendure, and D. J. Turner. 2010. Target-enrichment strategies for next-generation sequencing. *Nature Methods* 7:111–8.

- McCormack, J. E., S. M. Hird, A. J. Zellmer, B. C. Carstens, and R. T. Brumfield. 2013. Applications of next-generation sequencing to phylogeography and phylogenetics. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 66:526–38.
- Mirarab, S., M. S. Bayzid, and T. Warnow. 2014a. Evaluating summary methods for multilocus species tree estimation in the presence of incomplete lineage sorting. *Systematic Biology* published online August 26, 2014.
- Mirarab, S., R. Reaz, M. S. Bayzid, T. Zimmermann, M. S. Swenson, and T. Warnow. 2014b. ASTRAL: genome-scale coalescent-based species tree estimation. *Bioinformatics* 30:i541–i548.
- Nee, S., E. C. Holmes, R. M. May, and P. H. Harvey. 1994. Extinction rates can be estimated from molecular phylogenies. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 344:77–82.
- Page, R. D. M. and M. A. Charleston. 1997. From gene to organismal phylogeny: Reconciled trees and the gene tree/species tree problem. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 7:231 – 240.
- Pamilo, P. and M. Nei. 1988. Relationships between gene trees and species trees. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 5:568–83.
- Perry, G. H., P. Melsted, J. C. Marioni, Y. Wang, R. Bainer, J. K. Pickrell, K. Michelini, S. Zehr, A. D. Yoder, M. Stephens, J. K. Pritchard, and Y. Gilad. 2012. Comparative

- RNA sequencing reveals substantial genetic variation in endangered primates. *Genome Research* 22:602–610.
- Rannala, B. and Z. Yang. 2003. Bayes estimation of species divergence times and ancestral population sizes using DNA sequences from multiple loci. *Genetics* 164:1645–56.
- Slowinski, J. B. and R. D. M. Page. 1999. How should species phylogenies be inferred from sequence data? *Systematic Biology* 48:814–825.
- Stadler, T. and M. Steel. 2012. Distribution of branch lengths and phylogenetic diversity under homogeneous speciation models. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 297:33 – 40.
- Stamatakis, A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* 30:1312–1313.
- Steiper, M. E. and N. M. Young. 2006. Primate molecular divergence dates. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 41:384 – 394.
- Tavaré, S., C. R. Marshall, O. Will, C. Soligo, and R. D. Martin. 2002. Using the fossil record to estimate the age of the last common ancestor of extant primates. *Nature* 416:726–9.
- Whidden, C., R. G. Beiko, and N. Zeh. 2010. Fast FPT algorithms for computing rooted agreement forests: Theory and experiments. Pages 141–153 *in* *Experimental Algorithms* (P. Festa, ed.) vol. 6049 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- Wiens, J. J. and M. C. Morrill. 2011. Missing data in phylogenetic analysis: reconciling results from simulations and empirical data. *Systematic Biology* 60:719–31.
- Wilkinson, R. D., M. E. Steiper, C. Soligo, R. D. Martin, Z. Yang, and S. Tavaré. 2011. Dating primate divergences through an integrated analysis of palaeontological and molecular data. *Syst Biol* 60:16–31.
- Yang, F. S. and X. Q. Wang. 2007. Extensive length variation in the cpDNA trnT-trnF region of hemiparasitic *Pedicularis* and its phylogenetic implications. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* 264:251–264.
- Yang, Z. and B. Rannala. 2014. Unguided species delimitation using DNA sequence data from multiple loci. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 31:3125–3135.
- Yu, Y., C. Than, J. H. Degnan, and L. Nakhleh. 2011. Coalescent histories on phylogenetic networks and detection of hybridization despite incomplete lineage sorting. *Systematic Biology* 60:138–149.
- Yule, G. U. 1924. A mathematical theory of evolution based on the conclusions of Dr. J.C. Willis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 213:21–87.