



Some of these slides have been borrowed from Dr. Paul Lewis, Dr. Joe Felsenstein. Thanks!


Paul has many great tools for teaching phylogenetics at his web site:

<http://hydrodictyon.eeb.uconn.edu/people/plewis>

A matter of confidence



Maximum likelihood ancestral state estimation



"Mk" models

"Cavender-Farris" model:

2 possible states ($k = 2$)

expected no. changes = μt

$$P_{ii}(t) = 0.5 + 0.5 e^{-2\mu t}$$

$$P_{ij}(t) = 0.5 - 0.5 e^{-2\mu t}$$

Haldane, J. B. S. 1919. The combination of linkage values and the calculation of distances between the loci of linked factors. *Journal of Genetics* 8:299-309.

Cavender, J. A. 1978. Taxonomy with confidence. *Mathematical Biosciences* 40:271-280.

Farris, J. S. 1973. A probability model for inferring evolutionary trees. *Systematic Zoology* 22:250-256.

Felsenstein, J. 1981. A likelihood approach to character weighting and what it tells us about parsimony and compatibility. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 16:183-196.

Jukes-Cantor (1969) model:

4 possible states ($k = 4$)

expected no. changes = $3 \mu t$

$$P_{ii}(t) = 0.25 + 0.75 e^{-4\mu t}$$

$$P_{ij}(t) = 0.25 - 0.25 e^{-4\mu t}$$

Jukes, T. H., and C. R. Cantor. 1969. Evolution of protein molecules. Pages 21-132 *in* *Mammalian Protein Metabolism* (H. N. Munro, ed.) Academic Press, New York.

For branch of length 0.1

$$\mu t = 0.1$$

$$P_{00}(0.1) = 0.5 + 0.5 e^{-2(0.1)} = 0.90936$$

$$P_{01}(0.1) = 0.5 - 0.5 e^{-2(0.1)} = 0.09064$$

$$P_{10}(0.1) = 0.5 - 0.5 e^{-2(0.1)} = 0.09064$$

$$P_{11}(0.1) = 0.5 + 0.5 e^{-2(0.1)} = 0.90936$$

For branch of length 0.2

$$\mu t = 0.2$$


$$P_{00}(0.2) = 0.5 + 0.5 e^{-2(0.2)} = 0.83516$$

$$P_{01}(0.2) = 0.5 - 0.5 e^{-2(0.2)} = 0.16484$$

$$P_{10}(0.2) = 0.5 - 0.5 e^{-2(0.2)} = 0.16484$$

$$P_{11}(0.2) = 0.5 + 0.5 e^{-2(0.2)} = 0.83516$$

Calculating conditional likelihoods at upper node



$$L_0 = P_{01}(.1) P_{01}(.1) \\ = [.09064]^2 = 0.00822$$


$$L_1 = P_{11}(.1) P_{11}(.1) \\ = [0.90936]^2 = 0.82694$$

L_0 and L_1 are known as *conditional likelihoods*.
 L_0 , for example, is the likelihood of the subtree
given that the node has state 0.

$$L_0 = \Pr(\text{data above node} \mid \text{node state} = 0)$$

Calculating likelihood at basal node


conditional on
basal node having
state 0



$$L_0 = 0.00822 \quad L_1 = 0.82694$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_0 &= P_{00}(.2) P_{00}(.2) P_{00}(.1) L_0 \\
 &\quad + P_{00}(.2) P_{00}(.2) P_{01}(.1) L_1 \\
 &= (.83516)^2 (.90936) (.00822) \\
 &\quad + (.83516)^2 (.09064) (.82694) \\
 &= 0.05749
 \end{aligned}$$

Calculating conditional likelihoods at upper node



$$L_0 = P_{01}(.1) P_{01}(.1) \\ = [.09064]^2 = 0.00822$$

$$L_1 = P_{11}(.1) P_{11}(.1) \\ = [0.90936]^2 = 0.82694$$


L_0 and L_1 are known as *conditional likelihoods*.
 L_0 , for example, is the likelihood of the subtree
given that the node has state 0.

$$L_0 = \Pr(\text{data above node} \mid \text{node state} = 0)$$

Calculating likelihood of the tree

using conditional likelihoods at the basal node

D here refers to the observed data at the tips
0 here refers to the state at the basal node




$$\begin{aligned} L &= \Pr(0) \Pr(D|0) + \Pr(1) \Pr(D|1) \\ &= (0.5) L_0 + (0.5) L_1 \\ &= (0.5) (0.05749) + (0.5) (0.02045) \\ &= (0.5)(0.07794) = 0.03897 \end{aligned}$$

$$\ln L = -3.24496$$

$$L_0 = 0.05749 \quad L_1 = 0.02045$$

Choosing the maximum likelihood ancestral state is simply a matter of seeing which conditional likelihood is the largest



state is simply a matter of seeing which conditional likelihood is the largest


In this case, L_0 is larger of the two so, if forced to decide, you would go with 0 as the ancestral state.

$$L_0 = 0.05749 \quad L_1 = 0.02045$$

(73.8%) (26.2%)

Is this a ML or Bayesian approach?

$$L_0 = 0.05749 \quad L_1 = 0.02045$$
$$(73.8\%) \quad (26.2\%)$$


$$0.738 = \frac{\text{prior} \quad \text{likelihood}}{\text{marginal probability of the data}}$$
$$0.738 = \frac{(0.5) (0.05749)}{(0.5) (0.05749) + (0.5) (0.02045)}$$

posterior probability of state 0

Converting likelihoods to percentages produces Bayesian posterior probabilities (and implicitly assumes a flat prior over ancestral states)

Yang, Z., S. Kumar, and M. Nei. 1995. A new method of inference of ancestral nucleotide and amino-acid sequences. *Genetics* 141:1641-1650.

Empirical Bayes vs. Full Bayes

The likelihood used in the previous slide is the maximum likelihood, i.e. the likelihood at one particular combination of branch length values (and values of other model parameters).


A **fully Bayesian** approach would approximate the posterior probability associated with state 0 and state 1 at the node of interest using an MCMC analysis that allowed all the model parameters to vary, including the branch lengths.

Because some parameters are fixed at their maximum likelihood estimates, this approach is often called an **empirical Bayesian** method.

Marginal vs. Joint Estimation

- **marginal** estimation involves summing likelihood over all states at all nodes except one of interest (most common)
- **joint** estimation involves finding the combination of states at all nodes that *together* account for the highest likelihood (seldom used)


Joint Estimation



Find likelihood of this particular combination of ancestral states (call it L_{00})

$$\begin{aligned} L_{00} &= 0.5 P_{00}(.2) P_{00}(.2) P_{00}(.1) P_{01}(.1) P_{01}(.1) \\ &= (0.5) (.83516)^2 (.90936) (.09064)^2 \\ &= 0.00261 \end{aligned}$$


Joint Estimation



Now we are calculating the likelihood of a different combination of ancestral states (call this one L_{01})

$$\begin{aligned} L_{01} &= 0.5 P_{00}(.2) P_{00}(.2) P_{01}(.1) P_{11}(.1) P_{11}(.1) \\ &= (0.5) (.83516)^2 (.09064) (.90936)^2 \\ &= 0.02614 \end{aligned}$$

Joint Estimation



Summary of the four possibilities:

$$L_{00} = 0.00261$$


$$L_{01} = 0.02614 \leftarrow \text{best}$$

$$L_{10} = 0.00003$$

$$L_{11} = 0.01022$$

X Y

Returning to marginal estimation...




What about a pie diagram for this node?

Previously, we computed these conditional likelihoods for this node:

$$L_0 = 0.00822 \quad L_1 = 0.82694$$

Can we just make a pie diagram from these two values?

Returning to marginal estimation...



The conditional likelihoods we computed only included data above this node (i.e. only half the observed states)

Estimation of where changes take place

1. What is the probability that a change $0 \rightarrow 1$ took place on a particular branch in the tree?
2. What is the probability that the character changed state exactly x times on the tree ?

Should we answer these questions with a joint or marginal ancestral character state reconstruction?

No

We should figure out the probability of explaining the character state distribution with exactly the set of changes we are interested in.


Marginalize over all states that are not crucial to the question

1. What is the probability that a change $0 \rightarrow 1$ took place on a particular branch in the tree? – fix the ancestral node to 0 and the descendant to 1, calculate the likelihood and divide that by the total likelihood.
2. What is the probability that the character changed state exactly x times on the tree ?

1. What is the probability that a change $0 \rightarrow 1$ took place on a particular branch in the tree?
2. What is the probability that the character changed state exactly x times on the tree ? – Sum the likelihoods over all reconstructions that have exactly x changes. This is not easy to do! Recall that $\Pr(0 \rightarrow 1 | \nu, \theta)$ from our models accounts for multiple hits. A solution is to sample histories according to their posterior probabilities and summarize these samples.


Ancestral states are one thing...

But wouldn't it be nice to estimate not only what happened at the nodes, but also what happened along the edges of the tree?






Stochastic mapping
simulates an entire
character history
*consistent with the
observed character
data.*

In this case, green
means perennial and
blue means annual
in the flowering
plant genus
Polygonella



Three Mappings for Lifespan




Blue = annual
Green = perennial

Each simulation produces a different history (or mapping) consistent with the observed states.

Kinds of questions you can answer using stochastic mapping

- How long, on average, does a character spend in state 0? In state 1?
- Is the total time in which *two* characters are *both* in state 1 more than would be expected if they were evolving independently?
- What is the number of switches from state 0 to state 1 for a character (on average)?


Step 1: Downpass to obtain conditional likelihoods



This part reflects the calculations needed to estimate ancestral states.

$$L_0 = \Pr(x_3 = 1 | x_5 = 0, v_3) \Pr(x_4 = 1 | x_5 = 0, v_4)$$

Step 2: Up-pass to sample states at the interior nodes




This part resembles a standard simulation, with the exception that we must conform to the observed states at the tips

Likelihood


Prior probability

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(x_7 = 0 | x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) &\propto \Pr(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 | x_7 = 0) \Pr(x_7 = 0) \\ \Pr(x_7 = 1 | x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) &\propto \Pr(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 | x_7 = 1) \Pr(x_7 = 1) \\ \Pr(x_7 = 2 | x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) &\propto \Pr(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 | x_7 = 2) \Pr(x_7 = 2) \end{aligned}$$

Choosing a state at an interior node



Sampling state at node 6




$$\Pr(x_6 = 0 | x_2, x_3, x_4) \propto \Pr(x_2, x_3, x_4 | x_6 = 0) \Pr(x_6 = 0 | x_7 = 2)$$

© 2007 by Paul O. Lewis

Note: only the calculation for $x_6=0$ is presented (but you must do a similar calculation for all three states)


Sampling state at node 5



$$\Pr(x_5 = 0 | x_3, x_4) \propto \Pr(x_3, x_4 | x_5 = 0) \Pr(x_5 = 0 | x_6 = 2)$$

"Mapping" edges

- **Mapping an edge** means choosing an evolutionary history for a character along a particular edge that is consistent with the **observed states** at the tips, the **chosen states** at the interior nodes, and the **model of character change** being assumed
- This is done by choosing random **sojourn times** and "causing" a change in state at the end of each of these sojourns
- What is a sojourn time? It is the time between substitution events, or the time one has to wait until the next change of character state occurs



Sojourn times are related to substitution rates. High substitution rates mean short sojourn times, on average. A **dwell** time is the total amount of time spent in one particular state. For example, the dwell time associated with state 0 is the sum of the 1st. and 3rd. sojourn times.

Substitution rates and sojourn times

Symmetric model for character
with 3 states: 0, 1 and 2

	0	1	2
0	-2β	β	β
1	β	-2β	β
2	β	β	-2β

The rate at which state 0 changes to something else (either state 1 or state 2) is 2β

Note that $2\beta t$ equals the branch length. For these symmetric models, the branch length is $(k-1)\beta t$ where k is the number of states.

Sojourn times are exponentially distributed

If λ is the total rate of leaving state 0, then you can simulate a sojourn by:

- drawing a time according to the cumulative distribution function of the exponential distribution $(1 - e^{-\lambda t})$.
- pick the “destination” state by normalizing the rates away from state 0 such that the rates sum to one.

This is picking j and t by:

$$\Pr(0 \rightarrow j, t) = \Pr(\text{mut. at } t) \Pr(j|\text{mut.})$$

But we want quantities like:


$$\Pr(0 \rightarrow j, t | 0 \rightarrow 2, \nu_1)$$

Conditioning on the data


We simulate according to $\Pr(0 \rightarrow j, t | 0 \rightarrow 2, \nu_1)$ by rejection sampling:

1. Simulate a series of draws of the form: $\Pr(0 \rightarrow j, t)$ until the sum of t exceeds ν_1 ,
2. If we ended up in the correct state, then accept this series of sojourns as the mapping.
3. If not, go back to step 1.


"Mapping" edge 1



Failed mapping



Completed mapping



“Stochastic character mapping” or “Mutational Mapping”

- allows you to sample from the posterior distribution of histories for characters
- conditional on an assumed model
- conditional on the observed data
- implemented in Simmap (v1 by J. Bollback; v2 by J. Bollback and J. Yu) and Mesquite (module by P. Midford)

“Stochastic character mapping”

You can calculate summary statistics on the set of simulated histories to answer almost any type of question that depends on knowing ancestral character states or the number of changes:

- What proportion of the evolutionary history was ‘spent’ in state 0?
- What is the posterior probability that there were between 2 and 4 changes of state?
- Does the state in one character appear to affect the probability of change at another? – Map both characters and do a contingency analysis.

See [Minin and Suchard \(2008a,b\)](#); [O’Brein et al. \(2009\)](#) for rejection free approaches to generate mappings.

Often we are more interested in the “forces” driving evolutionary patterns than the outcome.

Perhaps we should focus on fitting a model of character evolution rather than the ancestral character state estimates.

Rather than this:

1. estimate a tree,
2. estimate character states,
3. figure out what model of character evolution best fits those ancestral character state reconstructions.


We could do this:

1. estimate a tree,
2. figure out what model of character evolution best fits tip data


Or even this:

1. Jointly estimate character evolution in trees in MCMC (marginalizing over trees when answering questions about character evolution).

Correlation of states in a discrete-state model




Example from pp. 429-430 of the MacClade 4 manual.



Q: Does character 2 tend to change from yellow → blue only when character 1 is in the blue state?

Concentrated Changes Test



More precisely: how often would three yellow→blue changes occur in the blue areas of the cladogram on the left if these 3 changes were *thrown down at random* on branches of the tree?

Answer: 12.0671% of the time. Thus, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that the observed coincident changes in the two characters were simply the result of chance.

Model-based approach to detecting correlated evolution

View the problem as model-selection or use LRT if you prefer the hypothesis testing framework.

Consider two binary characters. Under the simplest model, there is only one rate:

		0	1	2	3
		(0,0)	(0,1)	(1,0)	(1,1)
0	(0,0)	-	q	q	0
1	(0,1)	q	-	0	q
2	(1,0)	q	0	-	q
3	(1,1)	0	q	q	-


Why are there 0's?

Under a model assuming character independence:

		0	1	2	3
		(0,0)	(0,1)	(1,0)	(1,1)
0	(0,0)	-	q_{*1}	q_{1*}	0
1	(0,1)	q_{*0}	-	0	q_{1*}
2	(1,0)	q_{0*}	0	-	q_{*1}
3	(1,1)	0	q_{0*}	q_{*0}	-

Under a the most general model (letter indicates the character changing, subscripts=start state):

		0	1	2	3
		(0,0)	(0,1)	(1,0)	(1,1)
0	(0,0)	-	s_{00}	f_{00}	0
1	(0,1)	s_{01}	-	0	f_{01}
2	(1,0)	f_{10}	0	-	s_{10}
3	(1,1)	0	f_{11}	s_{11}	-



We can calculate maximum likelihood scores under any of these models and do model selection.

Or we could put priors on the parameter values and using Bayesian model selection (e.g. reversible jump methods in BayesTraits).

References

- Minin, V. N. and Suchard, M. A. (2008a). Counting labeled transitions in continuous-time markov models of evolution. *J. Math. Biol*, 56:391–412.
- Minin, V. N. and Suchard, M. A. (2008b). Fast, accurate and simulation-free stochastic mapping. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond, B, Biol Sci*, 363:3985–3995.
- O’Brein, J. D., Minin, V., and Suchard, M. (2009). Learning to count: Robust estimates for labeled distances between molecular sequences. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 26(4):801–814.