

Efficient Quartet Representations of Trees and Applications to Supertree and Summary Methods

Ruth Davidson, MaLyn Lawhorn, Joseph Rusinko*, and Noah Weber

Abstract—Quartet trees which are displayed by larger phylogenetic trees have long been used as inputs for species tree and supertree reconstruction. Computational constraints prevent the use of all displayed quartets when the number of genes or number of taxa is large. We introduce the Efficient Quartet System (EQS) to represent a phylogenetic tree with a subset of the quartets displayed by the tree. We show mathematically that the set of quartets obtained from a tree via EQS contains all of the combinatorial information of the tree itself. We also demonstrate via performance tests on some simulated datasets that the use of EQS to reduce the number of quartets input to quartet-based species tree methods (including summary methods) and supertree methods only corresponds to small reductions in accuracy.

Index Terms—Phylogenetics, quartets, supertree, species tree

I. INTRODUCTION

Phylogenetic reconstruction algorithms turn a single set of input data about a set of taxa into a tree which reflects the evolutionary relationships among the taxa. While the taxa may most commonly be thought of as species, the most universal term is the *operational taxonomic unit* (OTU). The nature of the OTU depends on the type of phylogenetic problem. The quality of the species data collected for a problem may be uncertain, and the very notion of species boundaries are a matter of debate in some situations [1]. Furthermore, phylogenetic trees may be inferred within species populations to gain insight about trait evolution [2]. Due to the advance of molecular sequencing technology in recent decades, the input to a phylogenetic reconstruction problem is usually a set of molecular sequences which is then used to infer trees.

When using molecular sequence data, there are many types of inference pipelines for phylogenetic trees including Bayesian methods such as BUCKy [3] or BEAST 2 [4], co-estimation methods that simultaneously infer an alignment and a tree such as PASTA [5], PHYLOG [5], and BALi-Phy [6], and *two-step pipelines* that first infer an alignment of the sequence data and then infer a tree.

Two-step methods infer a sequence alignment using a program such as MUSCLE [7], Clustal- ω [8], or PRANK [9] and then infer a tree from the alignment. Common methods for inferring trees from alignments are maximum-likelihood heuristics such as RAXML [10] or FastTree2 [11]

and distance-based methods such as Neighbor-Joining [12] or FastME [13].

Modern analysis requires combining information from a set of trees into a single phylogeny on the entire set of taxa. To streamline this process we introduce the Efficient Quartet System (EQS) to represent a tree with a subset of the quartets displayed by the tree. We provide both theoretical and experimental evidence which support the use of efficient quartet systems as a component in phylogenetic analysis.

II. PHYLOGENOMIC CONTEXT

A. Gene Trees vs Species Trees

When the input to two-step phylogenetic inference methods is molecular sequence data from genomes from different taxa, there are different paths of inference to obtain a phylogeny. Starting with the full sequences, which we will refer to as “long reads”, for each taxon, there are two primary methodologies for inferring phylogenies. In the first, one divides the sequence data into short sub-sequences, referred to as *genes*. For each gene a *gene tree* is inferred using a standard second-stage method for two-step methods such as those described in Section I. These gene trees are then combined into a single *species tree*. Methods which take gene trees as input to produce a species tree are known as *summary methods*.

The challenge of species tree reconstruction is that different genes can correspond to conflicting evolutionary histories. Combining a collection of gene trees into a single tree representing the relationships among the species is known as the gene-species tree problem [14]. The relationship between gene and species trees can be modeled by multi-species coalescent (MSC) [15], [16], [17]. The MSC provides a theoretical basis, examined in [18], [19], for advances in the development of species tree reconstruction methods such as [20].

The difficulty of the gene-species tree problem grows rapidly as a function of both numbers of genes and numbers of species. Driven by advances in sequencing technology, biologists have access to sequence data on the order of thousands of genes and hundreds of thousands of species. These computational challenges have been addressed by ongoing large-scale interdisciplinary projects such as the 1000 Transcriptome Project which lead to the use of phylogenies to form new biological hypotheses [21], as well as evidence in support of rejection of other long-standing phylogenetic hypotheses [22].

When working with long reads, computational tractability of summary methods quickly becomes an issue. Alternatively one can infer the species tree phylogeny directly using the set of

R. Davidson is with the University of Illinois. email: redavid2@illinois.edu
M. Lawhorn and N. Weber are with Winthrop University. email: lawhornc2@winthrop.edu and webern2@winthrop.edu

J. Rusinko is with Hobart and William Smith Colleges. email: rusinko@hws.edu

*Corresponding Author

long reads. In this case one often begins with a set of genes and concatenates them into a single long read before applying the preferred phylogenetic inference method. The concatenation approach is the subject of lively debate [23] which lies outside the scope of this paper.

B. Supertrees

While the construction of accurate species trees is a fundamental problem in phylogenomics, it may not be a sufficient tool for reconstructing the entire tree of life. To do so may necessitate combining a collection of species trees to construct a *supertree* which reflects the relationships among a larger set of taxa. This process is called *supertree reconstruction*.

While the Tree of Life is best understood as a tree with a root, in practice most phylogenies are inferred without a root due to the prevalence of time-reversible models of sequence evolution such as JC69 [24] and the more general extensions of such a model meant to allow for realistic parameter variation such as the General Time-Reversible model [25].

Finding an unrooted supertree which is maximally consistent with a set of input trees is computationally difficult: even determining whether a set of unrooted trees are compatible is NP-complete [26]. As a result traditional supertree reconstruction algorithms are currently limited in scale [27], [28].

III. EFFICIENT QUARTET SYSTEM

A. Overview

The fastest supertree and summary method algorithms use four-taxon trees known as *quartets*, as inputs, and either use all quartets displayed by each input tree, or sample randomly from among that set [20], [29].

Quartet amalgamation remains a popular technique in phylogenetic reconstruction despite the fact that the Maximum Quartet Consistency Problem is known to be an NP-hard optimization problem [30]. Effective heuristics exist for combining quartets such as Quartets Max Cut (QMC) [31] and the recent modification of QMC, wQMC [32]. QMC and wQMC are popular due to their speed and, as we will discuss in this manuscript, their accuracy under simulation tests. However, the work of Swenson et.al. shows that QMC using all the quartets fails to return an answer using 500 taxa (as does Matrix Representation with Parsimony [33]).

One strength of quartet-based reconstruction is that in order to reconstruct an n -taxon tree one does not need all $\binom{n}{4}$ input quartets. Theoretically, a carefully selected $n - 3$ quartets is sufficient, but this requires knowledge of the correct tree [34]. In practice, some studies have indicated that randomly sampled quartets on the order of n^3 are sufficient for reliable reconstruction [31]. However, even QMC using quartets sampled via a stochastic method can fail once the number of taxa approaches 1000 [29]. This random sampling approach is also used in the biological analysis in [35] as well as the simulations in [32].

In this paper we propose a deterministic method of quartet sampling which is based on the combinatorics of definitive quartets. A collection of trees is called *definitive* if there exists a unique tree which displays all of the trees in the collection.

Our method builds off of the combinatorial structures developed in [34], [36], and proposes sampling a particular set of input quartets which we call an *efficient quartet system* (EQS).

An EQS is definitive and thus captures all of the phylogenetic signal contained in the input trees. Since QMC is a heuristic algorithm with no theoretical guarantees it does not always return the correct tree even when the input quartets are definitive (see [36] for a six-taxon example). However we demonstrate that QMC returns the correct input tree given an EQS-derived set of quartets with extremely high probability. We test the efficacy using EQS as inputs for summary methods in the context of both species and supertree reconstruction.

Sampling using an EQS is an alternative to an empirical study which supports the idea of sampling *short quartets*, or those with a smaller diameter in the input tree, with larger probability than sampling trees at random [37]. The short quartets approach prioritizes the inclusion of quartets thought to be accurately reconstructed, while our approach prioritizes selecting quartets which are guaranteed to retain the combinatorial features of the inferred tree.

B. Theoretical Properties of an EQS

A *tree* is an unrooted binary graph without cycles with leaves labelled by a set of taxa. A *quartet tree* is a binary tree with four leaves denoted $ab|cd$ where a and b form a *cherry* of T . Figure 1 shows this tree.




Fig. 1: Unrooted quartet $ab|cd$

A quartet is the fundamental unit of evolutionary information when working with methods based on time-reversible models of sequence evolution such as GTR [25]. The *support of a tree*, denoted $supp(T)$, is the collection of taxa at the leaves of T . We say a tree T_1 displays a tree T_2 if $T_1|supp(T_2) = T_2$. The set of quartets of tree, denoted $Q(T)$ is the collection of quartets displayed by T .

The following definition generalizes the notion of a quartet distinguishing an edge of a tree (cf. def. 6.8.3 in [38]).

Definition 1. A quartet $q = ab|cd$ distinguishes a path p between internal vertices v_1 and v_2 of T if the following three conditions are met:

- 1) $\{a, b\}$ and $\{c, d\}$ are subsets of different connected components of $T \setminus p$.
- 2) The path between a and b in T passes through v_1 .
- 3) The path between c and d in T passes through v_2 .

We define a representative subset of $Q(T)$ known as an *efficient quartet system* (EQS) which is both definitive and contains a quartet which distinguishes a path between each pair of internal vertices of T .

To construct an EQS we first assign to each internal vertex a *representative set of taxa*. To do so we first observe that each

internal vertex on a binary tree partitions the taxa into three disjoint sets $S_1(v)$, $S_2(v)$, and $S_3(v)$.

Definition 2. Choose an ordering of the internal vertices of the tree. Sequentially assign each vertex v_i a three-element *representative set of taxa* denoted $RTS(v_i)$ consisting of the elements of $S_1(v_i)$, $S_2(v_i)$, and $S_3(v_i)$, which are the fewest number of edges from v_i . When there are multiple taxa satisfying these conditions we use the following tie-breaking procedure:

- Choose a taxon that is part of a cherry.
- Select the taxon appearing in the most representative sets of taxa for the preceding vertices.
- Select a taxon at random.

Given a choice of representative sets of taxa, we construct a collection of quartets known as *efficient quartets*.

Definition 3. Given a pair of internal vertices v_i and v_j the associated efficient quartet is the unique quartet $q = ab|cd$ such that $supp(q) \subset RTS(v_i) \cup RTS(v_j)$, and such that q distinguishes the path between v_i and v_j .

Definition 4. For a fixed relative set of taxa, the EQS of T which we denote $E(T)$, is the set of all possible efficient quartets associated to T .

The number of quartets under consideration effects the running time of quartet-based supertree reconstruction algorithms. Therefore it is natural to ask if a small subset of quartets could be used without losing any information about the tree. We notice that $|Q(T)| = \binom{n}{4}$ while $|E(T)| = \binom{n-2}{2}$ since there is one efficient quartet for each pair of internal vertices in the tree. Thus reconstruction algorithms based on this limited input must consider approximately n^2 times fewer quartets.

By excluding quartets information may be lost because of the complexity of phylogenetic inference pipelines and the lack of certainty behind models such as the MSC.

Definition 5. A collection of trees on a set of taxa X is *definitive* if there exists a unique tree T with support X which displays each tree in the collection.

Definitive systems of quartets are strong candidates for supertree inputs as they retain all of the combinatorial information from the input trees.

Proposition III.1. *An EQS is a definitive set of quartets.*

Proof: Let $E(T)$ be an EQS for a tree T . We denote $L(T)$ to be the subset of $E(T)$ of size $n-3$ of quartets which distinguished edges of T .

If q_i and q_j are elements of $E(T)$ which distinguish adjacent edges, it follows from the construction of $E(T)$ that $|supp(q_i) \cup supp(q_j)| = 5$. Thus $L(T)$ is a linked system of quartets (see [36] for details). It follows from Theorem 3.1 in [36] that $L(T)$ is a definitive set of quartets. Since each quartet in $E(T)$ is displayed by a tree, then T must be the unique tree which displays the quartets in $L(T)$. Therefore $E(T)$ is a definitive set of quartets. ■

IV. EXPERIMENTAL PROPERTIES OF EQS

In our first experiment we choose an input tree T and ask if QMC returns the tree T given the input $E(T)$. This baseline

# Taxa	$T = QMC(E(T))$	$RF(T, QMC(E(T)))$	Avg. Topological Error
100	99.5%	.024	0.01%
200	98.3%	.090	0.02%
300	95.3%	.039	0.07%
400	95.3%	.039	0.05%
500	92.7%	.516	0.06%
600	82.8%	1.15	0.10%
700	84.2%	1.34	0.10%
800	85.0%	1.33	0.08%
900	78.8%	1.85	0.10%
1000	79.0%	1.70	0.09%

TABLE I: Comparison between T and $QMC(E(T))$ for 1000 trees generated under the Yule-Harding model. Robinson-Foulds distance and average topological error is the mean over all 1000 trees in each data set.

test ensures that information is not being lost in the conversion of input data from T to $E(T)$.

The second and third components in our analysis test how effective QMC is at returning the correct supertree S given the input $q = \{E(T_1), E(T_2), \dots, E(T_k)\}$. We first do this in the context of a summary method by fixing a species tree S , and generate input gene trees $\{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k\}$ under reasonable model assumptions. We then compute $\{E(T_1), E(T_2), \dots, E(T_k)\}$ and ask a weighted version of Quartets MaxCut (wQMC) [32] to reconstruct a supertree S' which we compare to S .

In the final experiment the input trees $\{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k\}$ are estimated from sequence data generated in a pipeline which mimics the biological practice of supertree reconstruction [39].

We do not investigate different weighting systems for wQMC, but instead if a quartet appears in the EQS representations of l trees it receives a weight of l . Since the input data is in terms of unrooted tree topologies, in each case we analyse the results in terms of the topological distance between the model tree and the reconstructed tree.

A. Baseline Finding

Given a tree T , we denote by $QMC(E(T))$ the tree constructed by applying QMC to the efficient representation $E(T)$. To measure the amount of information lost by using $E(T)$ as a representation of T , we generate a tree T and then compute the Robinson-Foulds distance ([40]) between T and $QMC(E(T))$. The Robinson Foulds (RF) distance measures the number of bipartitions of the taxa (commonly known as splits) which appear in one tree but not the other. As a result RF distances tend to be larger for trees with more taxa. To account for this we also report the average topological error which scales the RF distance by the maximum possible RF distance. Since QMC is a heuristic algorithm it is impossible to provide a proof that $QMC(E(T)) = T$ for all trees T .

We used the R package *ape* to create different sized unrooted, binary trees without assigned branch lengths [41]. With the *rmtree* command in *ape*, we generated 1,000 trees under the Yule-Harding distribution with 100 to 1,000 taxa in increments of 100 taxa. For each tree we computed the Robinson-Foulds distance between T and $QMC(E(T))$. The results of this study are displayed in Table I.

B. Application of $E(T)$ to the use of wQMC as a Summary Method

A *summary method* is a method for estimating a species history on n species X that has two steps (1) gene trees are inferred from multiple loci using a tree-inference method, and (2) the gene trees \mathcal{G} from each loci are combined into a species tree S . Summary methods which return a species tree in *reasonable* amount of time include NJst [42], ASTRAL-II [20] and recently developed ASTRID [43]. Here we are defining *reasonable* as something that will terminate on 50 taxa in less than 24 hours on a typical laptop or desktop machine purchased after 2011.

The quartet-agglomeration methods Weighted Quartets Max Cut (wQMC) [44] is a modification to [31] that allows the quartets input to the method to be assigned weights by the user. Therefore wQMC can be used as a summary method (as shown in [45]) by first computing the set of all quartets q that are displayed by a gene tree in \mathcal{G} , and then computing the frequency with which q appears in \mathcal{G} , which we denote $w(q, \mathcal{G})$.

The computational challenge presented by this approach is driven by the growth rate of the binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{4}$. One approach to dealing with this obstacle is to provide the quartet-agglomeration method with a selection of randomly sampled subsets of quartets. For example, this is the approach used in the initial study in [35] to complete an analysis on 52 OTUS. This approach is also used in [29], [32], [44].

We argue that the EQS method proposed in this paper could be used in summary species trees estimation methods as a way to reduce total the total number of quartets to agglomerate. We deliberately chose a data set with 50 taxa to provide as a much of a "side-by-side" comparison as possible to the study in [35], as they ran their most of their analyses on desktop machines without appealing to access to high-performance computing resources.

We measure accuracy as the deviation measured by the average topological error in the species tree estimated from true gene tree simulated on a model species tree. In particular, we use the dataset on 50 taxa from [20], which was generated using the program SimPhy [46]. This dataset is described in detail in the original paper, but briefly, we mention that the dataset contained 50 replicates, each containing 1000 gene trees simulated on a model species tree under the MSC model.

The control for this experiment was created by first computing the set of all quartets displayed by each gene tree in \mathcal{G} for each replicate in the data set, and then computing the frequency $w(q, \mathcal{G})$ with which each quartet appeared in \mathcal{G} . Then, to test the efficacy of the EQS for conserving the information of the gene trees in a summary method, we first found an EQS representation of each gene tree for each replicate in the data set, combined the resulting quartets for each replicate, which we will denote Q_E , and then computed the frequency $w_E(q, \mathcal{G})$ with which each quartet in this reduced set of quartets appeared. The total set of quartets appearing in the complete set of gene trees with weights $w(q, \mathcal{G})$ was given as input to wQMC as input to compute a species tree for the Control Version and the total set of efficient quartets Q_E with

weights $w_E(q, \mathcal{G})$ was also given to wQMC as input, which we will refer to the Efficient Version of the experiment.

The results were that for the Control Version (1) the average topological error rate across all 50 replicates for the Control Version was 0.009992 and (2) the average number of quartets across all replicates given to wQMC as input was 649,474. For the Efficient Version, (1) the average topological error rate across all 50 replicates for the Control Version was 0.018332 and (2) the average number of quartets across all replicates given to wQMC as input was 87,576.

Our experiments indicate that a pipeline incorporating EQS reduces the total number of quartets derived from the original gene trees but does not lead to a significant reduction in accuracy.

C. Application of $E(T)$ to the use of wQMC as a Supertree Method

When reconstructing the evolutionary history of large and diverse samples of taxa, one must combine information from a variety of source trees into one large supertree reflecting the history of all taxa under consideration. Quartet-based algorithms such as wQMC can be used to combine these input trees into one large supertree. However, the MaxCut algorithm may fail to complete in a reasonable time when the number of taxa studied is over 500 when using all quartets, or over 1000 when using randomly sampled quartets [29].

An experimental methodology for testing supertree reconstruction algorithms was developed in [39]. Swenson et. al. use a sophisticated protocol to generate simulated source trees mimicking the process a computational biologist would use to construct a supertree. For each supertree they construct source trees which reflect the process of estimating 25 clade-based trees from genes which evolved along the species tree and a single scaffold tree estimated from genes along the species tree. A scaffold tree contains a more disparate set of species and is meant to help glue the clade trees together.

We use the data from this study to test the accuracy of wQMC when applied to the EQS in the case when the true species tree has 1,000 taxa. The density of the taxa which were included in the scaffold tree ranged from .2 to 1 [39].

Swenson et. al. compared Matrix Representation with Parsimony ([33]) which used the source trees as inputs, and a combined analysis using maximum likelihood which reconstructed the species tree directly after concatenating the DNA sequence data. Methods were evaluated based on speed and on the average topological error rate between the reconstructed tree and the true species tree.

Table II shows the average topological error rate when wQMC is applied to quartets derived from EQS in comparison with the results found in [29]. Differences in computing power prevent a precise comparison between the running times published in [29] and wQMC applied to EQS. As a rough comparison, wQMC using efficient quartets returns a supertree on 1,000 tree in approximately 5 minutes. The equivalent process was reported to take 1 hour and 47 using Matrix Representation with Parsimony and almost 31 hours when using the combined analysis with maximum likelihood [29].

Scaffold Factor	$wQMC(E(T))$	MRP*	Combined Analysis with ML*
.2	43.2%	23%	14%
.5	22.5%	21%	15%
.75	14.5%	18%	13%
1	12.6%	15%	13%

TABLE II: Average topological error rate between true supertree and tree reconstructed using qWMC applied to efficient quartets, Matrix Representation with Parsimony, and a combined analysis using maximum likelihood. Error is the mean over ten 1,000 taxa supertrees. *Accuracy from MRP and Combined Analysis estimated from Figure 5. of [39].

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

As quartets remain a common input for summary and supertree methods one should carefully consider which sets of quartets best reflect the input data. In this article we demonstrate that an EQS theoretically encodes all of the data of the input tree, and in practice contains enough information for a fast heuristic algorithm to reconstruct over 99.9% of the topological data of the original input trees.

Next, when an EQS is incorporated into a quartet-based summary method, the data loss from our initial study appears to be insignificant in terms of accuracy measured by the average topological error. Since computing the EQS representation for the gene trees in the summary methods portion of our study was done on a Macintosh laptop running OSX version 10.9.5 in less than 24 hours, we feel that there is a significant potential for EQS combined with other quartet-based tree inference methods in terms of combining accuracy and speed on affordable and accessible computational resources.

When used in a supertree reconstruction wQMC applied to efficient quartets has comparable performance to Matrix Representation with Parsimony and a combined Analysis using Maximum Likelihood when the scaffold density is at least fifty percent. The performance is not as strong when the scaffold density is only 20%. The decrease in accuracy of wQMC when using a low scaffold density is offset by the dramatic increase in speed. This preliminary analysis shows that wQMC using efficient quartets should be considered as a potential supertree reconstruction algorithm when large numbers of taxa need to be considered. However, care should be taken to ensure sufficient taxon coverage. It may also be possible that the low accuracy could be corrected by using multiple scaffold trees with lower taxon coverage.

We conclude with three open questions which we believe may help further improve the field.

Question 1. Can one modify the QMC algorithm to ensure that $T = QMC(E(T))$ or even better that it has the property $T = QMC(f(T))$ where $f(T)$ is a definitive set of quartets on the order of n ?

Question 2. Could quartet-based summary and supertree methods be improved by using a weighting functions, such as weighting functions that account for potential error in gene tree estimation, or account for implementation-based biases in algorithms such as wQMC known to have no theoretical guarantees, but good performance in data simulation tests [45].

Question 3. Another quartet amalgamation method, Quartets FM (QFM) was introduced in [47]. The simulations in [47] showed improved accuracy over QMC but at a cost of slower running time. Recently, QFM has been re-implemented in the open-source version of PAUP* [48] with a refined implementation [49] over the original implementation in [47]. Could QFM in combination with EQS produce better results than with wQMC?

A. Description and availability of Software

Supporting materials, including the Efficient Quartets software developed by M. Lawhorn and N. Weber and the pipeline developed by R. Davidson for incorporating the use of the Efficient Quartets software into the use of summary methods is available at: <http://goo.gl/TSFzeD>

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank Laura Brunner for her assistance in running the supertree reconstruction analysis at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point.

Research reported in this publication was supported by an Institutional Development Award (IDeA) from the National Center for Research Resources (5 P20 RR016461) and the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (8 P20 GM103499) from the National Institutes of Health. R.D. was supported by NSF grant DMS-1401591.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Altschul, W. Gish, W. Miller, E. Myers, and D. Lipman, "Basic local alignment search tool," *J. Mol. Biol.*, vol. 3, pp. 403–410, 1990.
- [2] K. L. Thompson and L. S. Kubatko, "Using ancestral information to detect and localize quantitative trait loci in genome-wide association studies," *BMC bioinformatics*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 200, 2013.
- [3] B. R. Larget, S. K. Kotha, C. N. Dewey, and C. Ané, "Bucky: gene tree/species tree reconciliation with bayesian concordance analysis," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 26, no. 22, pp. 2910–2911, 2010.
- [4] R. Bouckaert, J. Heled, D. Kühnert, T. Vaughan, C.-H. Wu, D. Xie, M. A. Suchard, A. Rambaut, and A. J. Drummond, "Beast 2: a software platform for bayesian evolutionary analysis," *PLoS Comput Biol*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. e1003537, 2014.
- [5] S. Mirarab, N. Nguyen, and T. Warnow, "Pasta: ultra-large multiple sequence alignment," in *Research in Computational Molecular Biology*. Springer, 2014, pp. 177–191.
- [6] M. A. Suchard and B. D. Redelings, "Bali-phy: simultaneous bayesian inference of alignment and phylogeny," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 22, no. 16, pp. 2047–2048, 2006.
- [7] R. C. Edgar, "Muscle: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput," *Nucleic acids research*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 1792–1797, 2004.
- [8] F. Sievers, A. Wilm, D. Dineen, T. J. Gibson, K. Karplus, W. Li, R. Lopez, H. McWilliam, M. Remmert, J. Söding *et al.*, "Fast, scalable generation of high-quality protein multiple sequence alignments using clustal omega," *Molecular systems biology*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 539, 2011.
- [9] A. Löytynoja and N. Goldman, "Phylogeny-aware gap placement prevents errors in sequence alignment and evolutionary analysis," *Science*, vol. 320, no. 5883, pp. 1632–1635, 2008.
- [10] A. Stamatakis, "RAxML Version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 30, pp. 1312–1313, 2014.
- [11] M. Price, P. S. Dehal, and A. P. Arkin, "FastTree 2: approximately maximum-likelihood trees for large alignments," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 5, p. e9490, 2010.
- [12] N. Saitou and M. Nei, "The neighbor-joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees," *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 406–425, 1987.

- [13] V. Lefort, R. Desper, and O. Gascuel, "Fastme 2.0: a comprehensive, accurate, and fast distance-based phylogeny inference program," *Molecular biology and evolution*, p. msv150, 2015.
- [14] W. P. Maddison, "Gene trees in species trees," *Systematic biology*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 523–536, 1997.
- [15] J. F. C. Kingman, "On the genealogy of large populations," *J. Appl. Probab.*, vol. 19A, pp. 27–43, 1982.
- [16] P. Pamilo and M. Nei, "Relationships between gene trees and species trees," *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, vol. 5, pp. 568–583, 1988.
- [17] F. Tajima, "Evolutionary relationship of DNA sequences in finite populations," *Genet.*, vol. 105, pp. 437–460, 1983.
- [18] E. Allman, J. Rhodes, and J. Degnan, "Identifying the rooted species tree from the distribution of unrooted gene trees under the coalescent," *J. Math. Biol.*, vol. 62, pp. 833–862, 2011.
- [19] J. H. Degnan and N. A. Rosenberg, "Discordance of species trees with their most likely gene trees," *PLoS Gen.*, vol. 2, pp. 762–768, 2006.
- [20] S. Mirarab and T. Warnow, "Astral-ii: coalescent-based species tree estimation with many hundreds of taxa and thousands of genes," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. i44–i52, 2015.
- [21] P. M. Delaux, J. D. Radhakrishnan, V. J. Cheemab, M. Malbreild, J. D. Volkening, H. Sekimoto, T. Nishiyama, M. Melkonian, L. Pokornyy, C. J. Rothfels, H. W. Sederoff, D. W. Stevenson, B. Surek, Y. Zhang, M. R. Sussman, C. Dunand, R. J. Morris, C. Roux, G. K. Wong, G. E. D. Oldroyd, and J.-M. Ana, "Algal ancestor of land plants was preadapted for symbiosis," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 112, no. 43, p. 1339013395, 2015.
- [22] N. J. Wickett, S. Mirarab, N. Nguyen, T. Warnow, E. Carpenter, E. Matascie, S. Ayyampalayam, M. S. Barker, J. G. Burleigh, M. A. Gitzendanner, B. R. Ruhfel, E. Wafulal, J. P. Derl, S. W. Graham, S. Sarah Mathews, M. Melkoniano, D. E. Soltish, P. S. Soltish, N. W. Miles, C. J. Rothfels, L. Pokorny, A. J. Shaw, L. DeGironimos, D. W. Stevenson, B. Surek, J. C. Villarreal, B. Roure, H. Philippe, C. W. Claude, W. dePamphilis, T. Chen, M. K. Deyholos, R. S. Baucom, T. M. Kutchan, M. M. Augustiny, J. Wang, Y. Zhang, Z. Tian, Z. Yan, X. Wuz, X. Sun, G. K.-S. Wong, and J. Leebens-Mack, "Phylotranscriptomic analysis of the origin and early diversification of land plants," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 111, no. 45, p. E4859E4868, 2014.
- [23] M. S. Springer and J. Gatesy, "The gene tree delusion," *Molecular phylogenetics and evolution*, vol. 94, pp. 1–33, 2016.
- [24] T. H. Jukes and C. R. Cantor, "{Evolution of protein molecules}," 1969.
- [25] S. Tavaré, *Some probabilistic and statistical problems in the analysis of DNA sequences*. American Mathematical Society, 1986.
- [26] M. Steel, "The complexity of reconstructing trees from qualitative characters and subtrees," *Journal of classification*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 91–116, 1992.
- [27] T. Zimmermann, S. Mirarab, and T. Warnow, "Bbca: Improving the scalability of* beast using random binning," *BMC genomics*, vol. 15, no. Suppl 6, p. S11, 2014.
- [28] N. J. Wickett, S. Mirarab, N. Nguyen, T. Warnow, E. Carpenter, N. Matasci, S. Ayyampalayam, M. S. Barker, J. G. Burleigh, M. A. Gitzendanner *et al.*, "Phylotranscriptomic analysis of the origin and early diversification of land plants," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 111, no. 45, pp. E4859–E4868, 2014.
- [29] M. S. Swenson, R. Suri, C. R. Linder, and T. Warnow, "An experimental study of quartets maxcut and other supertree methods," *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 7, 2011.
- [30] M. Steel, "The complexity of reconstructing trees from qualitative characters and subtrees," *Journal of classification*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 91–116, 1992.
- [31] S. Snir and S. Rao, "Quartets maxcut: a divide and conquer quartets algorithm," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics (TCBB)*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 704–718, 2010.
- [32] E. Anvi, R. Cohen, and S. Snir, "Weighted quartets phylogenetics," *Syst. Biol.*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 233–242, 2015.
- [33] M. A. Ragan, "Phylogenetic inference based on matrix representation of trees," *Molecular phylogenetics and evolution*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 53–58, 1992.
- [34] S. Böcker, A. W. Dress, and M. A. Steel, "Patching upx-trees," *Annals of Combinatorics*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 1999.
- [35] J. Chifman and L. Kubatko, "Quartet inference from snp data under the coalescent model," *Bioinformatics*, p. btu530, 2014.
- [36] E. Moan and J. Rusinko, "Combinatorics of linked systems of quartet trees," *Involve: A Journal of Mathematics*, vol. in press, 2015.
- [37] S. Snir, T. Warnow, and S. Rao, "Short quartet puzzling: A new quartet-based phylogeny reconstruction algorithm," *Journal of Computational Biology*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 91–103, 2008.
- [38] C. Semple and M. A. Steel, *Phylogenetics*. Oxford University Press, 2003, vol. 24.
- [39] M. S. Swenson, F. Barbaçon, T. Warnow, and C. R. Linder, "A simulation study comparing supertree and combined analysis methods using smidgen," *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, vol. 5, no. 8, 2010.
- [40] D. Robinson and L. R. Foulds, "Comparison of phylogenetic trees," *Math. Biosci.*, vol. 53, pp. 131–147, 1981.
- [41] E. Paradis, J. Claude, and K. Strimmer, "Ape: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in r language," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 289–290, 2004.
- [42] L. Liu and L. Yu, "Estimating species trees from unrooted gene trees," *Syst. Biol.*, vol. 60, pp. 661–667, 2011.
- [43] P. Vachaspati and T. Warnow, "Astrid: Accurate species trees from internode distances," *BMC genomics*, vol. 16, no. Suppl 10, p. S3, 2015.
- [44] S. Snir and S. Rao, "Quartet maxcut: A fast algorithm for amalgamating quartet trees," *Mol. Phylogenetics Evol.*, vol. 62, pp. 1–8, 2012.
- [45] R. Davidson, P. Vachaspati, S. Mirarab, and T. Warnow, "Phylogenomic species tree estimation in the presence of incomplete lineage sorting and horizontal gene transfer," *BMC genomics*, vol. 16, no. Suppl 10, p. S1, 2015.
- [46] D. Mallo, L. de Oliveira Martins, and D. Posada, "Simphy: Phylogenomic simulation of gene, locus and species trees," *Systematic Biology*.
- [47] R. Reaz, M. S. Bayzid, and M. S. Rahman, "Accurate phylogenetic tree reconstruction from quartets: a heuristic approach," *PLOS One*, vol. 9, no. 8, 2014.
- [48] D. Swofford, *PAUP* 4.0 beta version, phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (and other methods)*. Sunderland, Massachusetts: Sinauer Associates, Incorporated, 1998.
- [49] —, "Personal communication," May 19, 2015.