Divergence time estimation

Rachel Warnock





Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich





Computational Evolution http://www.bsse.ethz.ch/cevo Testing hypotheses in evolutionary biology & macroevolution

- *t* speciation or extinction times
- *r* rates of morphological or molecular evolution
- λ rate of speciation
- µ rate of extinction



Macroevolutionary parameters of interest are phylogenetic parameters



Macroevolutionary parameters of interest are phylogenetic parameters



Macroevolutionary parameters of interest are phylogenetic parameters



fossil sampling rate

extant species sampling



- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate



- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate
- ψ fossil sampling rate



- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate
- ψ fossil sampling rate
- ρ extant species sampling



- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate
- ψ fossil sampling rate
- ρ extant species sampling



- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate
- ψ fossil sampling rate
- ρ extant species sampling



- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate
- ψ fossil sampling rate
- ρ extant species sampling

The molecular clock hypothesis



Zuckerkandl, Pauling. 1962, 1965

Building the tree of life



branch lengths = rate x time

 $\vee = rt$

Dating the tree of life



branch lengths = time

Calibrating the molecular clock



branch lengths = time

Calibrating the molecular clock



branch lengths = time

$P(\text{ model} | \text{ data}) = \frac{P(\text{ data} | \text{ model}) P(\text{ model})}{P(\text{ data})}$











Sequence data do not contain information about absolute time







Sequence data do not contain information about absolute time

This has several important consequences:

 We need strong prior information about the divergence times or the substitution rate

 Model selection cannot be used to select among possible calibration strategies

 If there is uncertainty in the calibrations, even an infinite amount of sequence data won't completely eliminate uncertainty in the posteriors

Rate and time are only semi-identifiable



dos Reis et al. 2016. Nature Genetics Reviews

The global molecular clock model

- The substitution rate is constant over time
- All lineages share the same rate



The global molecular clock model



The independent uncorrelated rates model

- Lineage-specific rates are uncorrelated
- The rate assigned to each branch is drawn independently from an underlying distribution



The independent uncorrelated rates model

- Global clock (Zuckerkandl & Pauling, 1962)
- Uncorrelated/independent rates models (Drummond et al. 2006; Rannala & Yang 2007; Lepage et al. 2007)
- Log-normally distributed autocorrelated rates (Thorne, Kishino & Painter 1998; Kishino, Thorne & Bruno 2001; Thorne & Kishino 2002)
- Local clocks (Hasegawa, Kishino & Yano 1989; Kishino & Hasegawa 1990; Yoder & Yang 2000; Yang & Yoder 2003, Drummond and Suchard 2010)
- Mixture models on branch rates (Heath, Holder, Huelsenbeck 2012)
- Punctuated rate change model (Huelsenbeck, Larget and Swoford 2000)

Vagaries of the rock and fossil records

Vagarie	es of the	rock ar	nd fossil	recorc	ls		
• The for	ssil record	is extrem	nely incon	nplete &	highly un	even	
• Preserv	vation gets	(approx	imately) v	vorse as	you go fu	urther back	in
 % of or Ma Te Ne 	riginal habi arine shelf rrestrial ha eogene =30	tat area habitats bitats 0.5 0% of the	that surviv 2% 5% (of wh e total)	ves toda <u>s</u> ich Creta	y at outor	op: 20% and	
				Wall et a	I. 2011. Geolog	gical Society Speci	al Publicatio

Controls on the probability of preservation

Fossil preservation:

Time

Time

Fossil preservation:

Time

Taxonomic uncertainty: crown versus stem groups

Donoghue, Purnell. 2005. TRENDS

Taxonomic uncertainty: crown versus stem groups

- Crown group: all descendants of the last common ancestor of the living members of a group
- Stem group: all species more closely related to the living members of a group than to any other
- Total group: stem + crown group members
- Early crown and stem group members may be difficult to distinguish

Taxonomic uncertainty: preservation biases

1. Oldest certain fossil in lineage

2. Lithostratigraphy of formation

4. Chronostratigraphy

Stratigraphic age uncertainty

Soft maximum constraints on divergence times

Soft maximum constraints on divergence times

- Minimum constraint: 552.85 Ma Kimberella, interpreted as a protostome
- Maximum constraint: 833 Ma Lagerstätten in the Bitter Springs and Svanbergfjellet Formations, preserve in 3 dimensions at the cellular level prokaryotes, sphaeromorph acritarchs, multicellular algae, but nothing that could be interpreted as a total group metazoan

Calibrations: Benton et al. 2015. Palaeontologica Electronica. Plots: Ho, Phillips. 2009, Sys Bio

Probabilistic divergence times priors

Modified from Heath 2012. Sys Bio

The impact of different calibration priors

Specified versus effective priors

Warnock et al. 2015. Biology Letters

A prior for the non-fossil calibrated nodes

Extant species phylogeny

A prior for the uncalibrated nodes

A prior for the non-fossil calibrated nodes: the tree prior

A prior for the non-fossil calibrated nodes: the tree prior

• Different combinations of λ and μ produce different tree shapes

A prior for the non-fossil calibrated nodes: the tree prior

- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate
- ψ fossil sampling rate
- ρ extant species sampling

Incorporating fossils into the tree prior

- The simpler models can be considered special cases of the FBD model
- Traditional node dating may depend on a small number of fossils
- Molecular clock analyses will be sensitive to both the calibration priors & the tree prior

Sampled ancestors

- The probability of sampling an ancestor in the fossil record is not zero (Foote, 1996. Paleobiology)
- Bayesian inference of sampled ancestor trees now possible in λ BEAST2, MrBayes, RevBayes, DPPDiv 1, μ = 0.08, r = 0.8
 - Different combinations of λ , μ , ρ , ψ affect the probability of having a sampling an ancestor (Wright, Heath. in prep)

 $\lambda = 0.1, \mu = 0.05, r = 0.5$

Sampled ancestors

 $\lambda = 0.1, \, \mu = 0.03, \, r = 0.3$

 $\lambda = 0.1, \mu = 0.05, r = 0.5$

 $\lambda = 0.1, \, \mu = 0.08, \, r = 0.8$

Wright et al. in prep.

The fossilised birth-death process: taxonomic uncertainty

- MCMC is used to propose possible fossil placements
- rjMCMC is used to propose sampled ancestor
 placements

Fossil occurrenceSpeciation event

The fossilised birth-death process: taxonomic uncertainty

Each fossil can
attach anywhere
along the tree,
including along
unobserved
branches

The fossilised birth-death process: taxonomic uncertainty

The probability of any given realisation of the FBD process is conditional on the model parameters: λ, μ, ρ, ψ

Application with or without character data for fossils

- Three alternative scenarios to applying to FBD model in divergence time estimation
 - Molecular data for extant taxa only ACAC...
 TCAC...
 ACAG...
 - Molecular data for extant taxa + morphological data for both extant & extinct taxa ACAC... 0101... TCAC... 1101... ACAG... 0100...
 - Morphological data for both extant and extinct taxa or extinct taxa or extinct taxa only 0101...
 1101...
 0100...

Application with or without character data for fossils

- Three alternative scenarios to applying to FBD model in divergence time estimation
 - Molecular data for extant taxa only ACAC...
 TCAC...
 ACAG...
 - Molecular data for extant taxa + morphological data for both extant & extinct taxa ACAC... 0101... TCAC... 1101... ACAG... 0100...
 - Morphological data for both extant and extinct taxa or extinct taxa or extinct taxa only 0101...
 1101...
 0100...
 - The model can also be applied to estimate macroevolutionary parameters when you have no character data

Stratigraphic range data

- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate
- ψ fossil sampling rate
- ρ extant species sampling

Stratigraphic range data

- λ speciation rate
- μ extinction rate
- ψ fossil sampling rate
- ρ extant species sampling

Putting things in a graphical modelling framework

Putting things in a graphical modelling framework

Gavryushkina et al. 2016. Sys Bio

Gavryushkina et al. 2016. Sys Bio