

RNA-based Phylogenetic Methods:
Application to Mammalian Mitochondrial RNA Sequences.

Cendrine Hudelot¹, Vivek Gowri-Shankar², Howsun Jow², Magnus Rattray² and Paul G. Higgs³

¹ School of Biological Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PT, UK.

² Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK.

³ Department of Physics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario L8S 4M1, Canada.

Contact details

Paul Higgs

Department of Physics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario L8S 4M1, Canada.

Tel 1 905 525 9140 ext 26870

Fax 1 905 546 1252

email: higgsp@mcmaster.ca

Abstract

The PHASE software package allows phylogenetic tree construction with a number of evolutionary models designed specifically for use with RNA sequences that have conserved secondary structure. Evolution in the paired regions of RNAs occurs via compensatory substitutions, hence changes on either side of a pair are correlated. Accounting for this correlation is important for phylogenetic inference because it affects the likelihood calculation. In the present study we use the complete set of tRNA and rRNA sequences from 69 complete mammalian mitochondrial genomes. The likelihood calculation uses two evolutionary models simultaneously for different parts of the sequence: a paired-site model for the paired sites and a single-site model for the unpaired sites. We use Bayesian phylogenetic methods and a Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm is used to obtain the most probable trees and posterior probabilities of clades. The results are well resolved for almost all the important branches on the mammalian tree. They support the arrangement of mammalian orders within the four supra-ordinal clades that have been identified by studies of much larger data sets mainly comprising nuclear genes. Groups such as the hedgehogs and the murid rodents, which have been problematic in previous studies with mitochondrial proteins, appear in their expected position with the other members of their order. Our choice of genes and evolutionary model appears to be more reliable and less subject to biases caused by variation in base composition than previous studies with mitochondrial genomes.

Introduction

Over the last decade, the use of molecular phylogenetic techniques has led to important changes in the way we understand the evolutionary tree of the mammals. The number of species for which appropriate sequence information is available has been increasing rapidly, and the methods being used have become increasingly sophisticated. This has led to a large interest in mammalian phylogenetics, as witnessed by the June 2002 symposium in Sorrento, and to an increasing degree of confidence in many features of the mammalian tree that were not appreciated only a few years ago.

One important feature that now appears to have strong support is that the mammalian orders can be divided into four principal supra-ordinal groups. This has been shown convincingly using large data sets mainly derived from nuclear genes (Madsen *et al.* 2001, Murphy *et al.* 2001a, 2001b). We will number these groups following Murphy *et al.* (2001a) as:

- group I: Afrotheria, containing Proboscidea, Sirenia, Hyracoidea, Tubulidentata, Macroscelidea and Afrosoricida;
- group II: Xenarthra;
- group III: referred to as either Supraprimates (Lin *et al.* 2002a) or Euarchontoglires (Murphy *et al.* 2001), containing Primates, Dermoptera, Scandentia, Rodentia, and Lagomorpha;
- group IV: usually referred to as Laurasiatheria (Waddell, Okada and Hasegawa 1999; Madsen *et al.* 2001), containing Cetartiodactyla, Perissodactyla, Carnivora, Pholidota, Chiroptera and Eulipotyphla.

It has taken some time for this picture to emerge. The identification of the Afrotheria group (Porter *et al.* 1996, Stanhope *et al.* 1998, Springer *et al.* 1999) was a surprise, since it contains orders which are morphologically diverse and superficially have little in common apart from their presumed African origin. The Xenarthra group (armadillos, sloths and anteaters) is South American and had been recognized as an early diverging group on morphological grounds. Due to the general difficulty of determining the root of the eutherian tree using molecular phylogenetics, the positioning of Xenarthra has been unstable, sometimes appearing quite deep within the eutherian radiation (Waddell *et al.* 1999; Cao *et al.* 2000). The present picture (Delsuc *et al.* 2002) puts Xenarthra back as an early branching group, but it is not possible to distinguish whether it branches before or after Afrotheria or as a sister

group to Afrotheria. Supraprimates and Laurasiatheria are both diverse groups for which a lot of sequence data has been available for some time. These groups contain several species that have been a particular problem with molecular phylogenetics. The murid rodents (rats, mice and voles) and the hedgehogs have been repeatedly found to branch at the base of the eutherian tree in analysis of mitochondrial genomes (Penny *et al.* 1999; Arnason *et al.* 2002) and this would mean that the orders Rodentia and Eulipotyphla would not be monophyletic. However, the monophyly of these orders is supported by nuclear sequence data (Madsen *et al.* 2001, Murphy *et al.* 2001a, 2001b), and if the mitochondrial tree of the eutherians is left as unrooted (without addition of marsupials or monotremes) then there is much less apparent discrepancy between the mitochondrial and nuclear trees. It has therefore been argued that the positioning of the root in the mitochondrial trees is an artifact arising because some lineages contradict the assumption of a homogeneous and stationary substitution model (Lin *et al.* 2002a). Our own approach using RNA sequences from mitochondrial genomes appears to suffer less from these problems than most other methods (Jow *et al.* 2002).

It goes almost without saying that we are always interested in the ‘hard’ parts of the tree. These will be the nodes of the tree that are most ambiguous, and that are most sensitive to changes in methods and in evolutionary models. For this reason, we believe it is important to develop methods that can accurately describe the evolution of the particular types of sequence data that are being used. Our own interest centres on RNA sequences, such as rRNAs and tRNAs, that have conserved secondary structures. It is well known that compensatory substitutions occur frequently in the paired regions of RNA structures and that identification of compensatory changes in sequence alignments is one of the principal ways in which RNA secondary structures have been established (Gutell, 1996; Cannone *et al.* 2002). Several evolutionary models describing compensatory changes have been proposed (Schöniger & von Haeseler, 1994; Rzhetsky, 1995; Muse, 1995; Tillier & Collins, 1995,1998; Higgs 2000) that consider pairs of sites rather than single sites as the basic unit of evolution. We have recently carried out a comparison of these models using likelihood ratio tests (Savill *et al.* 2001).

A key feature of the compensatory substitution mechanism is that the rate of substitution depends on the thermodynamic stability of the intermediate state (Higgs, 2000; Savill *et al.* 2001). For example, GC pairs are observed to change more rapidly to AU pairs than CG pairs because in the first case the intermediate would be a GU pair, whereas in the second case the intermediate would be GG or CC, which would destabilize the helix. In some models used for RNA pairs, changes involving simultaneous double substitutions are disallowed on the grounds that the chance of simultaneous

mutations on both sides of a pair is extremely small. However, it should be remembered that the evolutionary rate matrices describe the changes in the consensus sequence of the population, which is a result of mutation, selection, drift and fixation, and they do not simply represent the process of mutation in individual sequences. The population genetics theory of compensatory mutations (Kimura, 1985; Stephan, 1996; Higgs, 1998) explains how the double substitutions can arise via the one-step process described above. When sequence data is analysed (Savill *et al.* 2001, Higgs 2000) it is found that models that allow both single and double substitution rates fit the data much better than those that only allow single substitutions.

As far as phylogenetics is concerned, the most important point about compensatory substitutions is that they introduce correlations in the changes occurring in the two, paired sites. Almost all phylogenetic methods assume that substitutions at different sites are independent of one another. Strictly speaking, to use these methods with RNA sequences is invalid (but it is frequently done nevertheless). If sites are strongly correlated, but the correlation is ignored, then each piece of information is effectively counted twice. This leads to falsely high confidence levels in strongly supported clades in a tree, and falsely low support values for alternatives. Jow *et al.* (2002) give explicit examples of this. In view of the widespread use of RNA sequences (particularly rRNA) in phylogenetic studies in many groups of organisms, we felt it important to develop phylogenetic software that can deal more rigorously with correlations in paired sites. In our recent work (Jow *et al.* 2002), we introduced a program for Bayesian phylogenetic methods called PHASE (“PHYlogenetics And Sequence Evolution”). This uses a new implementation of a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) procedure to search tree space and allows a choice from a range of evolutionary models applicable to DNA and RNA sequence evolution. We applied it to a set of 54 Mammalian mitochondrial genomes, focussing on the paired regions of rRNA and tRNA genes. The results were obtained were very promising, with good resolution of some of the most important deep level nodes within the mammalian tree.

The method used in our previous paper had one important limitation. Although the first version of the PHASE software could deal with either single-site models or paired-site models, it could only do one of these at once. Therefore when using the paired regions of the sequence, it was necessary to eliminate all the unpaired sites. In the version of PHASE described here, we are able to use a paired-site and an unpaired-site model simultaneously in the likelihood calculation. Thus, we are able to make use of the whole of the RNA sequence. A second improvement in the present study is that several

important additional mitochondrial genomes have become available. This study therefore includes representatives of the orders Sirenia, Macroscelidea, Pholidota and Dermoptera that were not in our previous study, plus additional species in some of the other orders.

Materials and Methods

Sequence data

The sequence data is taken from the complete set of tRNA and rRNA genes extracted from all mammalian genomes available in the NCBI database on August 6th, 2002. There are 69 taxa in total, including 62 placental mammals and an outgroup of 5 marsupials and 2 monotremes. The taxa and their NCBI accession numbers are listed in table 1. In particular, the following genomes have become available since our previous study (Jow *et al.* 2002): the echidna, *Tachyglossus aculeatus* and the wombat, *Vombatus ursinus* (Janke *et al.* 2002); the sea-lion, *Eumetopias jubatus*, the walrus, *Odobenus rosmarus*, the flying lemur, *Cynocephalus variegatus*, the hare, *Lepus europaeus*, the elephant shrew, *Macroscelides proboscideus*, the pangolin, *Manis tetradactyla*, the ring-tailed lemur, *Lemur catta*, the dugong, *Dugong dugon*, and the tamandua, *Tamandua tetradactyla* (Arnason *et al.* 2002); and three bear species *Ursus americanus*, *U. arctos*, and *U. maritimus* (Delisle & Strobeck, 2002). All the sequences and source references for the species used in this paper (together with many other metazoan species) can be obtained from our own database of mitochondrial genomes known as OGRE (Jameson *et al.* 2003), which also contains information on gene order in mitochondria.

We have used all 22 tRNAs and the small (12S) and large (16S) rRNAs. Missing tRNA Lys in three marsupials (the bandicoot, wallaroo and wombat) was treated as missing data in the analysis. The rRNA secondary structures were aligned by eye using the human rRNA structure from the Gutell lab as a guide (Cannone *et al.* 2002, <http://www.rna.icmb.utexas.edu/>). The mitochondrial tRNA profiles developed by Helm *et al.* (2000) were used as a guide to align the tRNAs. Most of the stem regions have highly conserved sequences, and the variations were carefully checked to allow, in at least 50% of taxa, a Watson-Crick or GU-UG pair. This criterion was chosen to conserve a large part of the molecules' structure and to allow enough flexibility for further addition of species at a later date. However, we also considered an alternative, stricter criterion in which stems were defined only at sites where 90% of species contained Watson-Crick or GU-UG pairs. This alternative criterion was used in order to measure the sensitivity of our results to the exact choice of cut-off used in defining our base-

paired sites (see the Discussion section for details). Data not considered part of the stems under these criteria were included in the aligned loop regions. Loop regions that were very variable in length and could not be reliably aligned across all species were excluded from the analysis. The final data set for the 50% cutoff criterion contained 3571 nucleotides in total, consisting of 967 pairs and 1637 single sites. For the 90% cutoff, these numbers change to 862 pairs and 1847 single sites. The data set is available on request.

Substitution models

We use different substitution models for the stem and loop regions. For the loop regions we use the general time-reversible four-state model GTR4 (see, for example, Page and Holmes 1998, pp. 148-154). For the stem regions we use a model with seven states, six of which represent the most common base pairs (AU, GU, GC, UA, UG and CG), plus a composite mismatch state (MM) representing the other 10 less frequent pairs. We use the most general time-reversible seven-state model GTR7 (referred to as model 7A in Savill *et al.* 2001). Both models have been introduced previously and we do not go into detail here. The GTR4 model has 4 frequency parameters and 6 rate parameters defining the rate of substitution between distinct bases. However, there is a constraint that the frequencies must sum to one, which reduces the number of free parameters to 9. Similarly, the GTR7 model has 7 frequency parameters and 21 rate parameters, but the same constraint reduces the number of free parameters to 27.

Within both loop and stem regions we find significant variation in the substitution rate at different sites. We model this variation using the discrete-gamma model of Yang (1994). This model approximates the distribution of rates across different sites, using a number of discrete categories chosen to approximate a Gamma distribution. A single parameter determines the shape of this Gamma distribution. We use a different discrete-gamma model for the loops and stems respectively, with four rate categories in each case. This introduces two further parameters to be estimated.

Bayesian phylogenetic inference

The main features of our Bayesian inference algorithm have been described previously in Jow *et al.* (2002). We use an MCMC algorithm to sample from the space of topologies, branch lengths and substitution model parameters. The fraction of each topology appearing in the MCMC sample provides us with an estimate of the *posterior probability* of that topology given our model and given some prior

probabilities for the parameters, branch lengths and topologies. We can also estimate the posterior probability distribution for the substitution model parameters and branch lengths, but we will typically summarise these quantities by their mean when reporting results. We use uniform priors on all quantities, as we have no strong prior preferences (we do not go into details here, see Jow *et al.* 2002). Two recent reviews provide a useful introduction to Bayesian phylogenetic inference using MCMC techniques (Huelsenbeck *et al.* 2001, Lewis 2001). The PHASE software and documentation are available from <http://www.bioinf.man.ac.uk/resources/>. The difference between the MCMC algorithm introduced by Jow *et al.* (2002) and the one used here is that we can now include an arbitrary number of different substitution models for different classes of site.

Rate models in phylogenetics are usually normalized to that there is one substitution per site per unit time. We normalize our GTR7 model for paired sites so that there is one substitution per pair per unit time (which can either be a double or single substitution). When the two models are used simultaneously, the rates in the GTR4 model for single sites are defined relative to the GTR7. Rates in the GTR4 model are first normalized within this model and are then multiplied by an additional parameter that determines the relative rate of evolution of single sites and pairs. We choose a uniform positive prior for this parameter with a cut-off at some upper limit to ensure the prior distribution is properly normalised. A Gaussian proposal distribution is used for this parameter with reflecting boundaries at zero and the upper limit defined by the prior.

Time in the MCMC simulations was measured in cycles. In each cycle we made one attempted change to a branch length and attempted to change one type of property of one of the two rate models. These property types are (i) all the frequency parameters, (ii) all the rate ratio parameters, (iii) the gamma shape parameter, or (iv) the relative rate of the GR4 to GR7 model. In addition, every 10 cycles one of the two topology-changing proposals (nearest neighbour interchange or subtree pruning and regrafting) was attempted with equal probability. Note that topology can also change as a result of the continuous branch length changes (see Jow *et al.* for a detailed description of these proposal mechanisms).

In order to check the consistency of the MCMC results we carried out four independent runs. For each run, the initial burn-in period was 1,400,000 cycles. The sampling period was then 400,000 cycles, during which a tree configuration was sampled every 10 cycles. This gives 40,000 trees from each run, and 160,000 trees in total. A long burn-in period was used because it was found that some parameters equilibrated much more slowly than others and we wanted to be confident that the

simulations had reached equilibrium. With hindsight, we have improved the proposal mechanism so that the burn-in part of the simulation will be more efficient in future. The results from four independent MCMC runs were combined and summarised in the consensus tree shown in figure 1. The tree was constructed using the majority rule consensus methods implemented in PHYLIP (Felsenstein 1989) and numbers represent the posterior probability supporting each clade, *i.e.* the percentage of times that clade appears in the combined set of MCMC samples. Support values from all four runs were generally very consistent (see figure caption for details), even though they began from independent random starting configurations.

Results

Our results show good support for monophyly of the four supra-ordinal groups defined in the introduction. Groups I, II and III are found to be monophyletic with 100% posterior probability while group IV is monophyletic with 96% posterior probability. We find strong support for the sister relationship of groups III and IV (96%) but the relative positioning of I, II and (III,IV) is not well resolved. With 52% support we find groups I and II as sisters (as shown in figure 1), with 31% support we find group II branching first followed by group I and then (III,IV), and with 17% support we find group I branching first. These percentages have changed slightly from those in our previous analysis with only the paired regions (Jow *et al.* 2002), where the group I first alternative had less than 1% support. With our current results, we can therefore not rule out any of the three possibilities. It is interesting to note that we find weakest support for group I being the earliest branching group, while Murphy *et al.* (2001b) find 99% posterior support for this scenario in their Bayesian analysis. This question has also been addressed in detail by Delsuc *et al.* (2002), who also find the same three possibilities as us, but are unable to distinguish conclusively between them. The currently available sequence data thus seems to be insufficient to resolve this question.

Within group I, Afrotheria, we find 100% support for the sister relationship of the dugong and the elephant, in accordance with morphological and molecular results which place them in Paenungulata (Lavergne, 1996). The positioning of the elephant shrew is not well resolved. With highest probability it is found as a sister group to the Paenungulata (49%) but it is also possibly a sister species to the armadillo and tenrec (36%) or at the root of Afrotheria (14%). Several other studies (Murphy *et al.* 2001b, Delsuc *et al.* 2002, Arnason *et al.* 2002) find the arrangement

(aardvark,(elephant shrew,tenrec)), but this arrangement occurs very rarely in our results. Instead, we find strong support (99%) for the pairing of between the aardvark and tenrec, to the exclusion of the elephant shrew. Afrotheria is a diverse group and there are still rather few complete mitochondrial genomes available. Better taxon sampling is likely to help resolve these questions.

Within group III we find 100% support for the rodents forming a monophyletic group. This is usually observed with nuclear sequences (e.g. Delsuc *et al.* 2002, Murphy *et al.* 2001b), and was also found in an early study of mitochondrial RNA sequences that used a very restricted set of species (Frye and Hedges, 1995). However, many previous studies with mitochondrial genomes in which the rodents have not been monophyletic due to the positioning of the murids close to the root of the tree (e.g. D'Erchia, 1996, Penny *et al.* 1999, Corneli & Ward, 2000, Arnason *et al.* 2002). It is likely that the apparent paraphyly of rodents in these studies is an artefact due to variation in the mutational mechanism in this lineage (see the arguments of Philippe, 1997, and Lin *et al.* 2002a). This study is the first using the full set of currently available mitochondrial sequences in which the rodents appear as a monophyletic group. This suggests that our choice of sequences and evolutionary model is less subject to biases than most previous methods used on mitochondrial sequences. There is a considerable improvement in resolution in the present study in comparison with our results using only the paired regions of the RNAs (Jow *et al.* 2002). In that case, both the murids and the other rodents appeared together in group III, but they were paraphyletic.

If we accept that the rodents are indeed monophyletic, the branching order of the three principal rodent groups is an important question. Our results (figure 1) give the murids as earliest branching and the squirrel group as sister to the guinea pig group. Support for all the branches within the rodents is 96-100%. However, given the tendency of the murids to move to the base of the tree, we do not find this completely convincing. Our result is the same as that of Lin *et al.* (2002a) in the case where they constrain the rodents to be monophyletic. In contrast, Madsen *et al.* (2001), Murphy *et al.* (2001a,b) and Delsuc *et al.* (2002) all have the squirrel group as earliest branching, although usually with fairly low support. Recent results using a variety of nuclear genes and a range of additional species are still unresolved on several important questions of phylogeny within the rodents (Adkins *et al.* 2001, Huchon *et al.* 2002).

The Glires group (rodents plus lagomorphs) has appeared in several recent studies (Murphy *et al.* 2001a,b; Lin *et al.* 2002a). We also find a close relationship between rodents and lagomorphs, however the tree shrew is also included in this group in our results: there is 100% support for a sister

group relationship between tree shrew and lagomorphs. This differs from studies using mainly nuclear genes (Murphy *et al.*, 2001b) where the tree shrew has been placed close to the primate but is congruent with other mitochondrial DNA phylogenies (Schmitz *et al.* 2000; Lin, Waddell and Penny, 2002) where it has been suggested that the tree shrew may be problematic due to unusual base composition. The higher primates (anthropoids) are also a strongly supported monophyletic group. We find strong support for the sister relationship of the loris and ring-tailed lemur but the position of the tarsier is unresolved and variable. The tarsier is another problematic species in mitochondrial phylogenies (Schmitz *et al.* 2002), although evidence from SINES suggests that it should be closest to the anthropoids (Schmitz *et al.* 2001). The primates are found to be monophyletic with posterior probability 59% and therefore appear as a monophyletic group in the consensus tree (figure 1) with the flying lemur (Dermoptera) as a sister group. However, there is also some support (41%) for the flying lemur being placed within the primates, in a clade with the loris and ring-tailed lemur, which is why monophyly of the primates is not supported with 100% posterior probability. Using mitochondrial amino acid sequences, Arnason *et al.* (2002) also placed the flying lemur within the primates, as did Murphy *et al.* (2001a) with nuclear proteins. Madsen (2001), in contrast, has the flying lemur outside the primates but within group III. The position of Dermoptera is therefore still an interesting unresolved issue.

Within group IV we find strong support that all orders are monophyletic. Group IV contains the hedgehog/moonrat group, which is one of the most problematic in mitochondrial phylogenies, since it has unusual nucleotide and amino acid composition (Waddell *et al.* 1999). Rooted trees using mitochondrial sequences continue to find the hedgehog at the root of Eutheria (Cao *et al.* 2000; Arnason *et al.* 2002). This is almost certainly an artifact, and one recent study excludes the hedgehog completely due to these problems (Lin *et al.* 2002a). In contrast, when nuclear sequences are used, the hedgehog group is better behaved, and appears within Eulipotyphla with the moles and shrews (Murphy *et al.* 2001a,b; Madsen *et al.* 2001). It is therefore striking that Eulipotyphla appears as a monophyletic group in figure 1. This is the first study with mitochondrial sequences in which this is the case. As with the murids, this indicates that the methods we use here with RNA sequences are less biased by problems of non-stationarity in the rate matrix than the methods usually used with mitochondrial protein sequences. We obtain 96% support for the Eulipotyphla clade, whilst the hedgehog/moonrat pair is sister group to the shrew with 94% support, thus leaving the mole at the base of Eulipotyphla. This is equivalent to the arrangement obtain with nuclear genes (Murphy *et al.* 2001b).

We obtain Eulipotyphla as the earliest branching order within group IV, in agreement with nuclear sequence studies. This is a notable improvement in resolution over our previous study with only paired regions (Jow *et al.* 2002) where we found the eulipotyphlan species all in group IV, but in a poorly-resolved paraphyletic arrangement with the bats. The new grouping Fereuungulata (= Cetartiodactyla + Perissodactyla + Carnivora + Pholidota), proposed by Waddell *et al.* (1999), occurs in our consensus tree, but with only 65% support. This is mainly due to the mobility of the pangolin and because the relationship between Carnivora, Perissodactyla and Cetartiodactyla is not well resolved. The studies of Murphy *et al.* (2001b) and Arnason *et al.* (2002) strongly support the Carnivora with the pangolin as sister to Perissodactyla. We only find 6% support for this scenario and we also find relatively low support for Perissodactyla and Cetartiodactyla as sisters (65%). The most likely alternative, with 27% support, is that Carnivora and Perissodactyla are sisters. It is hoped that a larger sampling of the taxa in this part of the tree will stabilise the relationships in future studies. Unfortunately, however, Pholidota, of which the pangolin is a member, has only seven living species, which all belong to the same genus, and therefore this is likely to remain as a long branch. It is notable that the branching order of species within Cetartiodactyla is now much better resolved than our previous study (Jow *et al.* 2002), and is in agreement with other studies of this group (Gatesy *et al.* 1999).

Discussion

Trees obtained from mitochondrial proteins using similar species (Arnason *et al.* 2002) and the rooted trees in Lin *et al.* (2002a) differ from ours and are less congruent with the consensus emerging from studies using nuclear genes. One reason for the difference is probably in our choice of genes. In a previous study we used only the stems of all mitochondrial RNA genes (Jow *et al.* 2002) and also found support for the same four primary supra-ordinal clades, although resolution of other details was not as good as in the present study. Here we have added several species, as well as improving the method to combine both loops and helices. It is interesting to compare the results obtained with both helices and loops with those obtained using the two sets of sites separately. When only helices are used we obtain a tree very similar to that shown in Jow *et al.* (2002). The major clades I to IV are all fully resolved but some orders are paraphyletic within these clades. Eulipotyphla and Chiroptera mix together in a paraphyletic arrangement at the base of group IV, whilst within group III, the murids are separate from the remaining rodents, and the loris, lemur and tarsier are separate from the remaining primates. When only the loops are used, groups III and IV are no longer monophyletic. This is because the hedgehog and moonrat move right to the base of the eutherian tree (as with mitochondrial proteins) and because the lagomorphs move to become the second earliest branching group within the eutherians. With the exception of Eulipotyphla, all the orders are monophyletic with the loops only (including primates and rodents, which were paraphyletic with stems only). However, some of the orders have very low support values and the degree of resolution for the inter-ordinal nodes is very low. It is clear therefore, that combining stems and loops gives a better resolved and more reliable tree than either of the two sets of sites alone. In general, the stems contain more useful information for resolving the inter-ordinal relationships than the loops, however, loops add significant extra information that resolves some of the problems listed above when only stems are used.

It is also noticeable that the loop regions are significantly more variable in base composition than the stems, presumably because structural constraints disallow large changes in the base content on stems. It has been observed (Foster *et al.* 1997; Schmitz *et al.* 2002; Saccone *et al.* 2002) that this nucleotide bias in the codons affects the amino acid composition, so that phylogenetic methods using amino acids, codons and DNA may all be adversely affected. Since non-stationarity in the substitution model has been implicated as one reason for anomalous results in phylogenetic inference (Mooers and Holmes 2000) this may be significant, and it is probably the reason why the hedgehog moves to the

base of the tree for both proteins and RNA-loops. Further work investigating non-stationarity of substitution models and mutational bias in mitochondrial genomes will be of great interest.

We find that the mean evolutionary rate for the loops and stems is almost identical, with the GTR4 model having an evolutionary rate 0.96 times that of the GTR7 rate. This is perhaps surprising since one would usually expect DNA within the loops to be under weaker evolutionary constraints. Springer *et al.* (1995) observed significantly faster substitution rates in the loops of mammalian rRNAs, for example. However, it should be remembered that we have removed many of the most variable sites in the loops from the analysis because they cannot be reliably aligned. Furthermore, for the single sites the unit of branch length is the substitution per site, whereas for the paired site it is a state-change per pair (where the state change can be either a single or double transition). For these reasons, it is difficult to accurately compare rates in helices and loops. The variable rate gamma distribution parameter is also quite similar for both models ($\alpha = 0.4$ for GTR4 and $\alpha = 0.58$ for GTR7) indicating a comparable variation in mean substitution rates over sites. One possible reason for the better resolution of the stem model for the earliest branch points is the larger alphabet. Another possibility is suggested when we look at the substitution rates in greater detail. Table 3 shows the substitution rates for the GTR4 model of the loops. We see that the rate of transitions is roughly double the rate of transversions. Table 5 shows the substitution rates for the GTR7 model, which was applied to the stems. There is a characteristic pattern showing relatively high substitution rates between AU, GU and GC on one hand, and between UA, UG and CG on the other. Within these two groups mutations can cause substitutions in the consensus sequence without passing through a mismatch pair and that is why these substitutions are preferred. However, substitutions between these groups are much slower and therefore provide information on a longer timescale.

In tables 2 and 4 we show the estimated state frequency parameters of the GTR4 and GTR7 substitution models respectively, and we also show the empirical state frequencies in the data set. The estimates for GTR4 differ from the empirical values and this might be improved with a non-stationary substitution model which could model compositional changes between species. The results for the GTR7 model show quite good agreement between the estimated and empirical values, except for the mismatch (MM) state, which has an estimated value about three times higher than the empirical value. This effect was explained by Jow *et al.* (2002) and is due to the combination of a base-pair model with a variable rates model. The rapidly evolving sites show a higher proportion of MM states. These sites also contribute more to the estimate of the frequencies because they provide less correlated samples

from the state distribution, and this in turn biases the MM frequency estimate towards a higher value than typically observed. It was thought that our liberal cut-off criterion, defining a paired site as one in which 50% of species with a Watson-Crick or GU-UG pair, might exacerbate this problem. We therefore experimented with a data set constructed using a much stricter criterion with sites only assumed to be paired if Watson-Crick or GU-UG pairs were observed in at least 90% of species. The resulting inferred topology distribution was not greatly affected and the consensus tree was exactly the same as the one in figure 1, with similar support values. However, the estimated MM frequency was reduced to about 5% while the empirical frequency was reduced to about 1.5%. The difference in the empirical and estimated frequency was therefore not improved by using the stricter cut-off criterion. It was suggested in Jow *et al.* (2002) that we should use a different substitution model for each rate category in order to rectify this effect and we are currently considering how best to implement this.

In cases where both Bayesian and maximum likelihood (ML) methods are carried out on the same data, it is often found that the Bayesian posterior probabilities are significantly higher than the corresponding support values obtained by bootstrapping the ML method. For example, Murphy *et al.* (2001b) and Wilcox *et al.* (2002) observed this phenomenon and argued that the support values obtained by bootstrapping are too conservative and that the Bayesian posterior probabilities provide a better estimate of the confidence that can be attached to the inference. On the other hand, Suzuki *et al.* (2002) considered a simulation where equal numbers of sites are generated on three different trees and the data are concatenated. Bayesian methods often found strong support for one of the alternative trees, which they interpreted as a false positive. They therefore argue that posterior probabilities give overcredibility to the inferred result. Clearly more theoretical work is necessary to understand how to interpret both the posterior and bootstrap probabilities.

In our own case, we are using linked mitochondrial genes, so the possibility of different genes having different trees seems remote. It could also be argued that if one seriously suspects that concatenated nuclear genes evolved on different trees then one should be analysing them separately rather than concatenating them. In our view, the principal source of error in phylogenetics occurs when an inappropriate model is used to describe the data, rather than due to the concatenation of genes that have different trees. If the model is incorrect, then high likelihoods can be assigned to incorrect trees. This is clearly a problem for Bayesian methods, but it is equally a problem for every other method: bootstrapping does not tell you if the model used was inadequate. In our own results, we obtain many nodes with very high posterior probabilities (all the unlabelled nodes in the figure have 100% support).

We have used evolutionary models that are as realistic as possible for the RNA genes that we use. The posterior probabilities are therefore our best interpretation of the data *according to this model*. We cannot rule out the possibility that the results would change if more sophisticated features were added to the model. Bayesian methods are in fact a very practical way to allow the use of complex models with many parameters. We also wish to point out that the occurrence of the nodes with 100% support gives us confidence that our MCMC simulation is reaching equilibrium, since these same strongly supported clades arise during the burn-in periods of simulations starting in different random configurations.

Conclusion

Our work adds to the support of some of the most important aspects of the mammalian tree. We find strong support for monophyly of all established orders of placental mammals, with the possible exception of Dermoptera/Primates as discussed above. We also find strong support for four principal supra-ordinal clades, and good resolution is obtained at the species level within many of the larger orders. Taxa such as the murids and hedgehogs that have posed particular problems in previous analyses using mitochondrial genomes appear in what we take to be their correct positions in our analysis. We find that the rRNA and tRNA genes from mitochondrial genomes are extremely informative at many levels of the tree. The issues that are not resolved here are by and large not conclusively resolved by other data sets either, including some much larger sets of nuclear genes. Indeed, it is notable that our results are found using a relatively small data set of about 3.5 kb of DNA, compared with typical mitochondrial data sets of about 7-10kb. By introducing new evolutionary models that are specific to RNA sequence evolution and by using state-of-the-art MCMC methods for tree search, we have helped to resolve some of the contradictions between previous results based on mitochondrial and nuclear sequences. Our software package is now freely available, and we expect that these methods will prove useful for many other groups of organisms in addition to mammals.

Acknowledgements

Cendrine Hudelot and Magnus Rattray were supported by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council of the UK. Paul Higgs is supported by the Canada Research Chairs organization.

References

- Adkins, R.M., Gelke, E.L., Rowe, D., Honeycutt, R.L. 2001. Molecular phylogeny and divergence time estimates for major rodent groups: Evidence from multiple genes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 18, 777-791.
- Arnason, U., Adegoke, J.A., Bodin, K., Born, E.W., Yuzine, B.E., Gullberg, A., Nilsson, M., Short, V.S., Xu, X., Janke, A., 2002. Mammalian mitogenomic relationships and the root of the eutherian tree. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 99, 8151-8156.
- Cannone, J.J., Subramanian, S., Schnare, M.N. *et al.* (14 co-authors), 2002. The comparative RNA web (CRW) site: an online database of comparative sequence and structure information for ribosomal, intron, and other RNAs. *BioMed. Central Bioinformat.* 3, 2.
- Cao, Y., Fujiwara, M., Nikaido, M., Okada, N., Hasegawa, M., 2000. Interordinal relationships and timescale of eutherian evolution as inferred from mitochondrial genome data. *Gene* 259, 149-158.
- Corneli, P.S., Ward, R.H., 2000. Mitochondrial Genes and Mammalian Phylogenies: Increasing the Reliability of Branch Length Estimation. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 17, 224-234.
- Delisle, I., Strobeck, C. 2002. Conserved primers for rapid sequencing of the complete mitochondrial genome from carnivores, applied to three species of bears. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 19, 357-361.
- Delsuc, F., Scally, M., Madsen, O., Stanhope, M.J., de Jong, W.W., Catzeflis, M., Springer, M.S., Douzery, J.P., 2002. Molecular phylogeny of living Xenarthrans and the impact of character and taxon sampling on the placental tree rooting. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 19, 1656-1671.
- D'Erchia, A.M., Gissi, C., Pesole, G., Saccone, C., Arnason, U. 1996. The guinea-pig is not a rodent. *Nature* 381, 597-600.
- Felsenstein, J.P., 1989. PHYLIP (phylogeny inference package). Version 3.2. *Cladistics* 5, 164-166.

- Foster, P.G., Jermiin, L.S., Hickey, D.A. 1997. Nucleotide composition bias affects amino acid content in proteins coded by animal mitochondria. *J. Mol. Evol.* 44, 282-288.
- Frye, M.S. Hedges, S.B. 1995. Monophyly of the order Rodentia inferred from mitochondrial DNA sequences of the genes for 12S rRNA, 16S rRNA and tRNA-Valine. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 12, 168-176.
- Gatesy, J., Milinkovitch, M., Waddell, V., Stanhope, M., 1999. Stability of cladistic relationships between Cetacea and other higher level artiodactyl taxa. *Syst. Biol.* 48, 6-20.
- Gutell, R.R., 1996. Comparative sequence analysis and the structure of 16S and 23S RNA, in: Zimmermann, R.A., Dahlberg, A.E. (Eds.), *Ribosomal RNA: structure, evolution, processing, and function in protein biosynthesis*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp. 15-27.
- Helm, M., Brulé, H., Friede, D., Giegé, R., Pütz, D., Florentz, C., 2000. Search for characteristic structural features of mammalian mitochondrial tRNAs. *RNA* 6, 1356-1379.
- Higgs, P.G., 1998. Compensatory Neutral Mutations and the Evolution of RNA. *Genetica* 102/103, 91-101.
- Higgs, P.G., 2000. RNA Secondary Structure: Physical and Computational Aspects. *Quart. Rev. Biophys.* 33, 199-253.
- Huchon, D., Madsen, O., Sibbald, M.J.J.B., Ament, K., Stanhope, M.J., Catzeflis, F., de Jong, W.W., Douzery, E.J.P. 2002. Rodent phylogeny and a timescale for the evolution of Glires: Evidence from an extensive taxon sampling using three nuclear genes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 19, 1053-1065.
- Huelsenbeck, J.P., Ronquist, F., Nielsen R., Bollback, J.P., 2001. Bayesian inference of phylogeny and its impact on evolutionary biology. *Science*, 294, 2310-2314.

- Jameson, D., Gibson, A.P., Hudelot, C., Higgs, P.G. 2003. OGRE: a relational database for comparative analysis of mitochondrial genomes. *Nucl. Acids. Res.* 31, 202-206. <http://www.bioinf.man.ac.uk/ogre>
- Janke, A., Magnell, O., Wiczorek, G., Westerman, M., Arnason, U. (2002) Phylogenetic analysis of 18S rRNA and the mitochondrial genomes of the wombat, *Vombatus ursinus*, and the spiny anteater, *Tachyglossus aculeatus*: increased support for the Marsupionta hypothesis. *J. Mol. Evol.* 54, 71-80.
- Jow, H., Hudelot, C., Rattray, M., Higgs, P.G., 2002. Bayesian phylogenetics using an RNA substitution model applied to early mammalian evolution. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 19, 1591-1601.
- Kimura, M., 1985. The role of compensatory neutral mutations in molecular evolution. *J. Genet.* 64, 7-19.
- Lavergne, A., Douzery, E., Stichler, T., Catzeflis, F.M., Springer, M.S. 1996. Interordinal mammalian relationships: evidence for Paenungulate monophyly is provided by complete mitochondrial 12S rRNA sequences. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 6, 245-258.
- Lewis, P.O., 2001. Phylogenetic systematics turns over a new leaf. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 16, 30-37.
- Lin, Y-H., Waddell, P.J., Penny, D., 2002a. Pika and vole mitochondrial genomes increase support for both rodent monophyly and glires. *Gene* 294, 119-129.
- Lin, Y-H., McLenachan, P.A., Gore, A.R., Phillips, M.J., Ota, R., Hendy, M.D., Penny, D. 2002b Four new mitochondrial genomes and the increased stability of evolutionary trees of mammals from improved taxon sampling. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 19, 2060-2070.
- Madsen, O., Scally, M., Douady, C.J., Kao, D.J., DeBry, R.W., Adkins, R., Amrine, H.M., Stanhope, M.J., de Jong, W., Springer, M.S., 2001. Parallel adaptive radiations in two major clades of placental mammals. *Nature* 409, 610-614.

- Mooers, A.O., Holmes, E.C., 2000. The evolution of base composition and phylogenetic inference. *TREE* 15, 365-369.
- Murphy, W.J., Eizirik, E., Johnson, W.E., Zhang, Y.P., Ryder, A., O'Brien, S.J., 2001a. Molecular phylogenetics and the origins of placental mammals. *Nature* 409, 614-618.
- Murphy, W.J., Eizirik, E., O'Brien, S.J., Madsen, O., Scally, M., Douady, C.J., Teeling, E., Ryder, O.A., Stanhope, M.J., de Jong, W.W., Springer, M.S., 2001b. Resolution of the early placental mammal radiation using Bayesian phylogenetics. *Science* 294, 2348-2351.
- Muse, S., 1995. Evolutionary Analyses of DNA Sequences Subject to Constraints on Secondary Structure. *Genetics* 139, 1429-39.
- Page, R.D.M., Holmes, E., 1998. *Molecular Evolution, a phylogenetic approach*. Blackwell Science.
- Penny, D., Hasegawa, M., Waddell, P.J., Hendy, M.D., 1999. Mammalian Evolution: Timing and Implications from using the LogDeterminant Transform for Proteins of Differing Amino Acid Composition. *Syst. Biol.* 48, 76-93.
- Philippe, H. 1997. Rodent monophyly: pitfalls of molecular phylogenies. *J. Mol. Evol.* 45, 712-715.
- Porter, C.A., Goodman, M., Stanhope, M.J. 1996. Evidence on mammalian phylogeny from sequences of exon 28 of the von Willebrand factor gene. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 5, 89-101.
- Rzhetsky, A., 1995. Estimating Substitution Rates in Ribosomal RNA Genes. *Genetics* 141, 771-783.
- Saccone, C., Gissi, C., Reyes, A., Larizza, A., Sbisà, E., Pesole, G., 2002. Mitochondrial DNA in metazoa: degree of freedom in a frozen event. *Gene* 186, 3-12.

- Savill, N.J., Hoyle D.C., Higgs P.G., 2001. RNA sequence evolution with secondary structure constraints: comparison of substitution rate models using maximum likelihood methods. *Genetics* 157, 399-411.
- Schmitz, J., Ohme, M., Zischler, H., 2000. The complete mitochondrial genome of *Tupaia belangeri* and the phylogenetic affiliation of Scandentia to other Eutherian orders. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 17, 1334-1343.
- Schmitz, J., Ohme, M., Zischler, H., 2001. SINE insertions in Cladistic Analyses and the phylogenetic affiliations of *Tarsius bancanus* to other primates. *Genetics* 157, 777-784.
- Schmitz, J., Ohme, M., Zischler, H., 2002. The complete mitochondrial sequence of *Tarsius bancanus*: Evidence for an extensive nucleotide compositional plasticity of primate mitochondrial DNA. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 19, 544-553.
- Schöniger, M., von Haeseler, A., 1994 A Stochastic Model for the Evolution of Autocorrelated DNA Sequences. *Mol. Phylogen. Evol.* 3, 240-247.
- Springer, M.S., Hollar, L.J., Burk, A. 1995. Compensatory substitutions and the evolution of the mitochondrial 12S rRNA gene in mammals. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 12, 1138-1150.
- Springer, M.S., Amrine, H.M., Burk, A., Stanhope, M.J., 1999. Additional support for Afrotheria and Paenungulata, the performance of mitochondrial versus nuclear genes, and the impact of data partitions with heterogeneous base composition. *Syst. Biol.* 48, 65-75.
- Stanhope, M.J., Waddell, V.G., Madsen, O., de Jong W., Hedges, S.B., Cleven, G.C., Kao, D., Springer, M.S., 1998. Molecular evidence for multiple origins of Insectivora and for a new order of endemic African insectivore mammals. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 95, 9967-9972.
- Stephan, W., 1996. The rate of compensatory evolution. *Genetics* 144, 419-426.

Tillier, E.R.M., Collins, R. A., 1995. Neighbour Joining and Maximum Likelihood with RNA Sequences: Addressing the Interdependence of Sites. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 12, 7-15.

Tillier, E.R.M., Collins, R. A., 1998. High Apparent Rate of Simultaneous Compensatory Base-Pair Substitutions in Ribosomal RNA. *Genetics* 148, 1993-2002.

Waddell, P.J., Cao, Y., Hauf, J., Hasegawa, M., 1999a Using Novel Phylogenetic Methods to Evaluate Mammalian mtDNA, Including Amino Acid-Invariant Sites-LogDet plus Site Stripping, to Detect Internal Conflicts in the Data, with Special Reference to the Positions of Hedgehog, Armadillo and Elephant. *Syst. Biol.* 48, 31-53.

Waddell, P.J., Okada, N., Hasegawa, M., 1999b. Towards resolving the interordinal relationships of placental mammals. *Syst. Biol.* 48, 1-5.

Wilcox, T.P., Zwickl, D.J., Heath, T.A., Hillis, D.M. 2002. Bayesian phylogenetics of the dwarf boas and a comparison of Bayesian and bootstrap measures of phylogenetic support. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 25, 361-371.

Yang, Z., 1994. Maximum likelihood phylogenetic estimation from DNA sequences with variable rates over sites: approximate methods. *J. Mol. Evol.* 39, 306-314.

Tables

Classification	Scientific name	Common name	NCBI accession
Prototheria			
Ornithorynchidae	<i>Ornithorhynchus anatinus</i>	platypus	NC_000891
Tachyglossidae	<i>Tachyglossus aculeatus</i>	Australian echidna	NC_003321
Theria			
Metatheria (Marsupials)			
Didelphimorphia	<i>Didelphis virginiana</i>	North-American opossum	NC_001610
Diprotodontia	<i>Macropus robustus</i>	wallaroo	NC_001794
Diprotodontia	<i>Trichosurus vulpecula</i>	silver-gray possum	NC_003039
Diprotodontia	<i>Vombatus ursinus</i>	common wombat	NC_003322
Peramelemorphia	<i>Isodon macrourus</i>	nothern brown bandicoot	NC_002746
Eutheria (placentals)			
Afrosoricida	<i>Echinops telfairi</i>	small madagascar hedgehog (tenrec)	NC_002631
Carnivora	<i>Arctocephalus forsteri</i>	New-Zealand fur seal	NC_004023
Carnivora	<i>Canis familiaris</i>	dog	NC_002008
Carnivora	<i>Eumetopias jubatus</i>	Steller sea lion	NC_004030
Carnivora	<i>Felis catus</i>	cat	NC_001700
Carnivora	<i>Halichoerus grypus</i>	gray seal	NC_001602
Carnivora	<i>Odobenus rosmarus</i>	walrus	NC_004029
Carnivora	<i>Phoca vitulina</i>	harbor seal	NC_001325
Carnivora	<i>Ursus americanus</i>	American black bear	NC_003426
Carnivora	<i>Ursus arctos</i>	brown bear	NC_003427
Carnivora	<i>Ursus maritimus</i>	polar bear	NC_003428
Cetartiodactyla	<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	blue whale	NC_001601
Cetartiodactyla	<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	finback whale	NC_001321
Cetartiodactyla	<i>Bos taurus</i>	cow	NC_001567
Cetartiodactyla	<i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i>	hippopotamus	NC_000889
Cetartiodactyla	<i>Lama pacos</i>	alpaca	NC_002504
Cetartiodactyla	<i>Ovis aries</i>	sheep	NC_001941
Cetartiodactyla	<i>Physeter catodon</i>	sperm whale	NC_002503
Cetartiodactyla	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	pig	NC_000845
Chiroptera	<i>Artibeus jamaicensis</i>	fruit eating bat	NC_002009
Chiroptera	<i>Chalinolobus tuberculatus</i>	New-Zealand long-tailed bat	NC_002626
Chiroptera	<i>Pteropus dasymallus</i>	Ryukyu flying fox	NC_002612
Chiroptera	<i>Pteropus scapulatus</i>	little red flying fox	NC_002619
Dermoptera	<i>Cynocephalus variegatus</i>	Malayan flying lemur	NC_004031
Eulipotyphla	<i>Echinosorex gymnura</i>	moon rat	NC_004031
Eulipotyphla	<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>	western European hedgehog	NC_002080
Eulipotyphla	<i>Soriculus fumidus</i>	shrew	NC_003040
Eulipotyphla	<i>Talpa europaea</i>	European mole	NC_002391
Lagomorpha	<i>Lepus europaeus</i>	hare	NC_004028
Lagomorpha	<i>Ochotona collaris</i>	pika	NC_003033
Lagomorpha	<i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i>	rabbit	NC_001913
Macroscelidea	<i>Macroscelides proboscideus</i>	short-eared elephant shrew	NC_004026

Perissodactyla	<i>Ceratotherium simum</i>	white rhinoceros	NC_001808
Perissodactyla	<i>Equus asinus</i>	ass	NC_001788
Perissodactyla	<i>Equus caballu</i>	horse	NC_001640
Perissodactyla	<i>Rhinoceros unicornis</i>	greater Indian rhinoceros	NC_001779
Pholidota	<i>Manis tetradactyla</i>	long-tailed pangolin	NC_004027
Primates	<i>Cebus albifrons</i>	white-fronted capuchin	NC_002763
Primates	<i>Gorilla gorilla</i>	gorilla	NC_001645
Primates	<i>Homo sapiens</i>	human	NC_001807
Primates	<i>Hylobates lar</i>	common gibbon	NC_002082
Primates	<i>Lemur catta</i>	ring-tailed lemur	NC_004025
Primates	<i>Macaca sylvanus</i>	barbary ape	NC_002764
Primates	<i>Nycticebus coucang</i>	slow loris	NC_002765
Primates	<i>Pan paniscus</i>	pygmy chimpanzee	NC_001644
Primates	<i>Pan troglodydes</i>	chimpanzee	NC_001643
Primates	<i>Papio hamadryas</i>	baboon	NC_001992
Primates	<i>Pongo pygmaeus</i>	orangutan	NC_001646
Primates	<i>Tarsius bancanus</i>	western tarsier	NC_002811
Proboscidea	<i>Loxodonta africana</i>	African savannah elephant	NC_000934
Rodentia	<i>Cavia porcellus</i>	guinea pig	NC_000884
Rodentia	<i>Mus musculus</i>	house mouse	NC_001569
Rodentia	<i>Myoxus glis</i>	fat dormouse	NC_001892
Rodentia	<i>Rattus norvegicus</i>	Norwegian rat	NC_001665
Rodentia	<i>Sciurus vulgaris</i>	Eurasian red squirrel	NC_002369
Rodentia	<i>Thryonomys swinderianus</i>	greater cane rat	NC_002658
Rodentia	<i>Volemys kikuchii</i>	vole	NC_003041
Scandentia	<i>Tupaia belangeri</i>	northern tree shrew	NC_002521
Sirenia	<i>Dugong dugon</i>	dugong	NC_003314
Tubulidentata	<i>Orycteropus afer</i>	aardvark	NC_002078
Xenarthra	<i>Dasypus novemcinctus</i>	nine-banded armadillo	NC_001821
Xenarthra	<i>Tamandua tetradactyla</i>	southern tamandua	NC_004032

Table 1: List of taxa included in the analysis with scientific names, common names and NCBI accession numbers.

	<i>Empirical frequencies</i>	<i>Estimated frequencies</i>
A	0.4407	0.4852
C	0.1721	0.1602
G	0.1387	0.1082
T	0.2585	0.2464

Table 2: Mean posterior estimates of frequency parameters from the GTR4 model compared to the empirical frequency of nucleotides in the RNA loops.

	<i>A</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>T</i>
A	-	0.1569	0.2472	0.1747
C	0.4753	-	0.0348	1.1953
G	1.1086	0.0515	-	0.2038
T	0.3441	0.7772	0.0895	-

Table 3: Mean posterior estimate of transition rate parameters from the GTR4 model.

	<i>Empirical frequencies</i>	<i>Estimated frequencies</i>
AU	0.2488	0.2430
GU	0.0343	0.0331
GC	0.2414	0.1806
UA	0.2287	0.2346
UG	0.0316	0.0305
CG	0.1804	0.1677
MM	0.0347	0.1105

Table 4: Mean posterior estimate of frequency parameters from the GTR7 model compared to the empirical frequency of base-pairs in the RNA stems.

	<i>AU</i>	<i>GU</i>	<i>GC</i>	<i>UA</i>	<i>UG</i>	<i>CG</i>	<i>MM</i>
AU	-	0.2051	0.3682	0.0147	0.0021	0.0006	0.2809
GU	1.5060	-	1.0638	0.0064	0.0029	0.0095	0.1647
GC	0.4954	0.1950	-	0.0009	0.0009	0.0007	0.1463
UA	0.0153	0.0009	0.0007	-	0.1613	0.2774	0.2498
UG	0.0164	0.0031	0.0052	1.2410	-	0.6989	0.2336
CG	0.0009	0.0019	0.0007	0.3880	0.1271	-	0.1793
MM	0.6177	0.0493	0.2391	0.5303	0.0645	0.2721	-

Table 5: Mean posterior estimate of transition rate parameters from the GTR7 model.

Figure 1 Caption

Phylogeny of Mammals obtained using both paired and unpaired regions of mitochondrial rRNA and tRNA genes. Bayesian posterior probabilities are calculated using the PHASE program. Percentages shown are averaged over four independent MCMC runs. Internal nodes without numbers are supported with 100% posterior probability in all four runs. Percentages marked with an asterisk are the most variable with percentages ranging between 5% and 7.5% from the mean over the four runs. The remaining numbers vary by less than 4% over all runs.

