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## OUTLINE

$\square$ Methods for phylogenetic network inference from gene tree topologies when both incomplete lineage sorting (ILS) and hybridization are at play
$\square$ Part I: A probabilistic approach
$\square$ Part II: A parsimony approach

## PHYLOGENY RECONSTRUCTION IN THE POST-GENOMIC ERA

## gene family 1 <br> B1 A1 C1 D1

 gene family 2
## INCOMPLETE LINEAGE SORTING (ILS)



## HYBRIDIZATION



## HYBRIDIZATION AND ILS
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If a gene tree has been inferred for each gene family, then:
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L(\Psi \mid \mathcal{G})=c \cdot \prod_{g t \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)
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## A PROBABILISTIC APPROACH

species phylogeny and its parameters
sequences of gene families

If a gene tree has been inferred for each gene family, then:

$$
L(\Psi \mid \mathcal{G})=c \cdot \prod_{g t \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)
$$

How do we compute $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ ?

## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$

$\square$ The probability of observing the gene tree topolpogy gt given species phylogeny $\Psi$
$\square$ Three cases:
$\square$ Under the coalescent
$\square$ Under HGT
$\square$ Under both

## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ UNDER THE COALESCENT

$\square$ Denote by $\mathrm{H}_{\Psi}(\mathrm{gt})$ the set of all coalescent histories of species tree $\Psi$ and gene tree topology gt


$$
H_{\Psi}(g t)=\{(1,2),(2,2)\}
$$

## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ UNDER THE COALESCENT

$\square$ Degnan and Salter (Evolution, 2005) gave the mass probability function of a gene tree topology gt for a given species tree with topology $\Psi$ and vector of branch lengths $\lambda$ :

$$
P_{\Psi, \lambda}(g t)=\sum_{h \in H_{\Psi}(g t)} \frac{w(h)}{d(h)} \prod_{b=1}^{n-2} \frac{w_{b}(h)}{d_{b}(h)} p_{u_{b}(h) v_{b}(h)}\left(\lambda_{b}\right)
$$

## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ UNDER HYBRIDIZATION



## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ UNDER HYBRIDIZATION

$$
P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\left(1-\gamma_{1}\right)\left(1-\gamma_{2}\right)
$$



## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ UNDER HYBRIDIZATION

$$
P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\left(1-\gamma_{1}\right)\left(1-\gamma_{2}\right)
$$


$P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\gamma_{1}\left(1-\gamma_{2}\right)$

## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ UNDER HYBRIDIZATION

$$
P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\left(1-\gamma_{1}\right)\left(1-\gamma_{2}\right) \quad P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\left(1-\gamma_{1}\right) \gamma_{2}
$$


$P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\gamma_{1}\left(1-\gamma_{2}\right)$

## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ UNDER HYBRIDIZATION

$$
P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\left(1-\gamma_{1}\right)\left(1-\gamma_{2}\right) \quad P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\left(1-\gamma_{1}\right) \gamma_{2}
$$


$P_{N, \gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}}(g t)=\gamma_{1} \gamma_{2}$

## $\mathbf{P}(g t \mid \Psi)$ UNDER BOTH SCENARIOS



## A SOLUTION

1. Convert the phylogenetic network N into a MUL-tree T
2. Consider all allele mappings from the leaves of gt to the leaves of T
3. For each allele mapping, compute the probability of observing gt, given T, and sum the probabilities.
[Yu, Degnan, Nakhleh, PLoS Genetics, 2012.]

## I. FROM A NETWORKTO A MUL-TREE



## 2. CONSIDER ALL ALLELE MAPPINGS FROM gt TOT



## 2. CONSIDER ALL ALLELE MAPPINGS FROM gt TO T

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Phylogenetic network } \\
& \text { Valid allele mappings } \\
& P_{N, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}}(g t)=\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_{T, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime}, f}(g t)
\end{aligned}
$$
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## 2. CONSIDER ALL ALLELE MAPPINGS FROM gt TO T

$\square$ We need to account for dependence among the branches of the MUL-tree

$\square$ The edge-mapping $\phi$ solves this problem.

## 3. THE PROBABILITY OF gt GIVEN MUL-TREE T

$$
\begin{gathered}
P_{T, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime}, f}(g t)=\sum_{h \in H_{T, f}(g t)} \frac{w(h)}{d(h)} \prod_{b=1}^{n-2} \gamma_{b}^{\prime v_{b}(h)} P_{b}^{\prime}(h) \\
\prod_{b \in \phi^{-1}\left(b^{\prime}\right)} P_{b}^{\prime}(h)=\left[\frac{1}{d_{b^{\prime}}(h)} p_{u_{b^{\prime}}(h) v_{b^{\prime}}(h)}\left(\lambda_{b^{\prime}}\right)\left[\left(u_{b^{\prime}}(h)-v_{\left.b^{\prime}(h)\right)!} \prod_{b \in \phi^{-1}\left(b^{\prime}\right)} \frac{w_{b}(h)}{\left(u_{b}(h)-v_{b}(h)\right)!}\right]\right]\right. \\
u_{b^{\prime}}(h)=\sum_{b \in \phi^{-1}\left(b^{\prime}\right)} u_{b}(h) \quad v_{b^{\prime}}(h)=\sum_{b \in \phi^{-1}\left(b^{\prime}\right)} v_{b}(h)
\end{gathered}
$$

## ACCOUNTING FOR UNCERTAINTY IN GENE TREES

$\square$ We have implemented two methods for accounting for uncertainty in the estimated gene trees:
$\square$ Using gene tree distributions: $L(N, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \gamma \mid \mathscr{G})=\prod_{g \in \mathscr{G}}\left[\mathbf{P}_{N, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \gamma}(G=g)\right]^{p_{g}}$
$\square$ Using consensus trees:

$$
L(N, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \gamma \mid \mathscr{G})=\prod_{g \in \mathscr{G}} \max _{g^{\prime} \in b(g)}\left\{\mathbf{P}_{N, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}}\left(G=g^{\prime}\right)\right\}
$$

## THE YEAST DATA SET OF ROKAS ET AL. (NATURE 2003)

$\square$ The authors concatenated the sequences of 106 genes, and inferred a single species tree, which had $100 \%$ bootstrap support of all branches
$\square$ The method BEST inferred the same tree [Edwards et al., PNAS 2007]
$\square$ The MDC method inferred the same tree [Than\&Nakhleh, PLoS Comp Bio 2009]


## REANALYSIS OF THE YEAST DATA


B





| Species phylogeny | $t_{1}$ | $t_{2}$ | $t_{3}$ | $t_{4}$ | $\gamma$ | $-\ln L$ | AIC | AICc | BIC |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fig. 3(A) | 0.3 | 1.25 | 3.6 | N/A | N/A | 205 | 416 | 417 | 424 |
| Fig. 3(B) | 0.2 | 1.35 | 3.6 | N/A | N/A | 208 | 423 | 423 | 431 |
| Fig. 3(C) | 1.1 | 1.05 | 3.6 | N/A | 0.34 | 188 | 384 | 385 | 395 |
| Fig. 3(D) | 3.45 | 1.15 | 3.6 | 3.05 | 0.34 | 157 | 325 | 326 | 338 |
| Fig. 3(E) | 0.3 | 1.25 | 3.6 | N/A | 1.0 | 205 | 420 | 421 | 434 |
| Fig. 3(F) | 1.55 | 0.05 | 3.7 | N/A | 0.18 | 252 | 512 | 512 | 523 |

## A PROBABILISTIC APPROACH

$\square$ The method produced very accurate results on synthetic data
$\square$ In addition, we currently have:
$\square$ a faster method for computing gene tree probabilities, and
$\square$ a method for inferring phylogenetic networks under the probabilistic method.

## A PARSIMONY APPROACH

$\square$ W. Maddison (Systematic Biology, 1997) proposed reconciling a gene tree with a species tree so as to minimize the "number of extra lineages" or "deep coalescences" (MDC).


0 extra lineages


1 extra lineage

## A PARSIMONY APPROACH

$\square$ Denote by XL( $\Psi, g t, h)$ the number of extra lineages assuming coalescent history h gave rise to gene tree gt within the branches of species tree $\Psi$.
$\square$ Then, W. Maddison's MDC cost for a given pair of species/gene tree is:

$$
X L(\Psi, g t)=\min _{h \in H_{\Psi}(g t)} X L(\Psi, g t, h)
$$

## A PARSIMONY APPROACH

$\square$ The reconciliation problem under MDC is easy:
$\square$ Map every clade in the gene tree to its MRCA in the species tree (the lca mapping)

## A PARSIMONY APPROACH

$\square$ The inference problem is hard

$$
\Psi^{*} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{\Psi} \sum_{g t \in \mathcal{G}} X L(\Psi, g t)
$$

## A PARSIMONY APPROACH

$\square$ Exact DP- and ILP-based solutions for inferring species trees:
$\square$ When all gene trees are rooted, binary, with single allele per locus per species (Than\&Nakhleh, PLoS Comp Bio 2009)
$\square$ When the gene trees may be unrooted, non-binary, and zero or more alleles sampled per locus per species (Yu, Warnow, and Nakhleh, RECOMB 11 and JCB 11)

## ILS + HYBRIDIZATION: A PARSIMONY APPROACH

$\square$ But, what about inference of species networks?
$\square$ Solution for special cases (Yu, Than, Degnan, Nakhleh, Syst Biol 2011)
$\square$ Solution for the general case (Yu, Barnett, Nakhleh, under review, 2012)

$\begin{array}{cccc}a_{1} & b_{1} b_{2} & & c_{1} \\ A & B & B & C\end{array}$
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Observe the decrease in XL as more reticulations are added!

## REANALYSIS OF THE YEAST DATA



Observe the decrease in XL as more reticulations are added!
Have to account for network complexity!

## ILS + HYBRIDIZATION: A PARSIMONY APPROACH

$\square$ The parsimony approach does surprisingly well at (1) inferring the phylogenetic network topology, and (2) estimating inheritance probabilities, on synthetic data
$\square$ Much faster than the probabilistic method
$\square$ Suffers from the "model selection" problem (the more hybridization, the merrier!)

## SUMMARY

$\square$ Dealing with ILS and hybridization simultaneously, we have methods for
$\square$ computing gene tree probabilities
$\square$ inferring phylogenetic networks
$\square$ parsimonious reconciliation of gene trees
$\square$ parsimonious inference of phylogenetic networks
$\square$ The most challenging task:
$\square$ how to achieve scalability of these methods to large data sets!

## PHYLONET

$\square$ All the Methods are implemented in PhyloNet:http://bioinfo.cs.rice.edu/phylonet
$\square$ Tutorial tomorrow, by Yun Yu

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

$\square$ People:
$\square$ R.M. Barnett (Rice), J.H. Degnan (Canterbury), Jianrong Dong (Rice), Kevin Liu (Rice), Y. Yu (Rice)
$\square$ Funding:
$\square$ NSF, NIH, The Sloan Foundation, The Guggenheim Foundation

## THANK YOU

HTTP://WWW.CS.RICE.EDU/~NAKHLEH

