



2020 WORKSHOP ON POPULATION AND SPECIATION GENOMICS, CESKY
KRUMLOV

The Multi-Species Coalescent (MSC) and its Application in Phylogenetics and Species Delimitation

L. Lacey Knowles

Dept. of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
University of Michigan

Software: *Delineate*

Jeet Sukumaran

Dept. of Biology, Evolutionary Biology Program
San Diego State University

Software: *Decrypt*

Arnaud Becheler

Dept. of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
University of Michigan



2020 WORKSHOP ON POPULATION AND SPECIATION GENOMICS, CESKY KRUMLOV

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

- Codon substitution and analysis of natural selection
- Adaptive molecular evolution
- Divergence time estimation and biogeographic analysis
- Phylogenetic inference
- Species delimitation
- Demographic inference

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

What I'll emphasize is the importance of recognizing:

- Decisions/choices we make about model formulation
- The subjectivity of model formulation itself when making inferences
- Decisions when applying to empirical study (e.g., the data type, subsets of data, what subset of data)
- All models are flawed..., but ...
models are **how we communicate our knowledge to a statistical apparatus**

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

- (i) Phylogenetic inference
- (ii) Species delimitation/infering species boundaries

With an emphasis on:

- Choices we make about model formulation
- Recognizing the subjectivity of model formulation itself when making inferences
- Decisions when applying to empirical data

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

- (i) Phylogenetic inference

- (ii) Species delimitation/infering species boundaries

- (iii) Phylogeography/Comparative Phylogeography

“Species delimitation” is a computational approach to identifying species units in nature. Identification of these units is critical to many areas in evolutionary biology — systematics, phylogeography, biogeography, ecology, conservation, etc. — as well as having impacts in a broader range of areas, such as human health and epidemiology, natural resource management, and so on.

Traditional approaches to species delimitation typically rely on models that identify structure in genomic data and identify “species” in nature by relating this structure to species boundaries.

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

(i) Phylogenetic inference


(ii) Species delimitation/infering species boundaries

(iii) Phylogeography/Comparative Phylogeography


With an emphasis on:

- Choices we make about model formulation
- Recognizing the subjectivity of model formulation itself when making inferences
- Decisions when applying to empirical data


Phylogenetic inference




Species tree versus gene trees




Probability of deep coalescence depends upon the divergence history itself



Probability of deep coalescence depends upon the divergence history itself, and is not restricted to the recent past




While there is a distribution of possible gene trees for a given species (or population) tree, the probabilities of gene trees differ.










high $P(G_{\text{tree}}|S_{\text{tree}})$

low $P(G_{\text{tree}}|S_{\text{tree}})$



Degnan & Salter (2005) Evolution

Gene tree distributions under the coalescent process



Degnan, J and L Salter. 2005.
Evolution 59: 24-37.

Directly estimating species trees (as opposed to equating a gene tree with the species' phylogenetic history)

Maddison (1997) Gene trees in species trees. *Syst. Biol.* 46:523-36.

Likelihood of a species tree


$$\prod_{\text{loci}} \sum_{\text{possible gene trees}} \left[\overbrace{P(\text{sequences} | \text{gene tree})}^{\text{the model of nucleotide evolution}} * \overbrace{P(\text{gene trees} | \text{species tree})}^{\text{coalescent theory}} \right]$$

- the species tree specifies the probabilities for various patterns of genetic descent (i.e., the distribution of gene trees)
- phylogeny as a composite, cloudlike nature of gene histories

Are gene trees that disagree with the species tree wrong?

Fundamental paradigm shift: instead of making inferences about species relationships from an estimated gene trees (or a tree based on a concatenated set of loci), we can **DIRECTLY** estimate the species tree.

$$L(ST) = \prod_{\text{loci}} \sum_{\substack{\text{possible} \\ \text{gene trees}}} [P(\text{sequences}|\text{gene tree}) * P(\text{gene tree}|\text{species tree})].$$

Maddison 1997

Proliferation of methods for species tree inference

- Computational considerations (# tips and # loci)
- Data type (SNP versus sequence data)

<https://github.com/smirarab/ASTRAL>

<https://taming-the-beast.org/tutorials/StarBeast-Tutorial/>

<https://github.com/genomescale/starbeast2>

<https://github.com/cecileane/iBPP/>

<https://www.beast2.org/snapp/>

DEMO 2-5pm

<http://www.phylosolutions.com/tutorials/ssb2018/svdquartets-tutorial.html>

Multiple processes produce discord among gene trees

<https://bioinfocs.rice.edu/phylonet>



<https://github.com/crsl4/PhyloNetworks.jl>

<https://www.asc.ohio-state.edu/kubatko.2/software/HyDe/>

**DON'T HAVE ANY APPROACHES FOR PHYLOGENETIC INFERENCE
THAT MODEL MULTIPLE CAUSES OF DISCORD**



Factors affecting species-tree accuracy:


- history of diversification itself
- total sampling effort of sequences
- sample design (# of individuals versus loci)
- method of analysis
- level of genetic variation (mutation rate)



Simulation approach: compare known with estimated species tree (i.e., the accuracy of species-tree estimate) to examine the affects of each factor and their relative importance.

Simulation approach for evaluating accuracy of species-tree estimates


Conceptual design: Maddison & Knowles 2006, *Syst Biol*



Discordant gene trees retain significant phylogenetic signal

1N = total tree depth of 80,000 years, with N_e of 80,000

1 species every 10,000 years!




McCormack et al. 2010

Total sampling effort? Loci versus individuals?


Sample multiple individuals? Only for recent divergence histories

Coalescent trees of gene copies within species (Kingman, 1982)


- Random collision of lineages as go back in time
- Collision is faster the smaller the effective population size



Total sampling effort? Loci versus individuals?




500 simulated species trees with 8 taxa



Genomic data

Resolved accurate phylogenetic relationships among species?

- NO – Recalcitrant nodes across the tree of life



Phylogenomics and Next-Generation Inferences: the Future of Phylogenetics in the Era of Big Data



The addition of potential information content for phylogenetic inference comes at the expense of increased data heterogeneity that can result in model misspecification, hindering accurate phylogenetic reconstruction.

“A flock of genomes”



(from Zhang et al. 2014)

A coalescent-based estimates of the avian species tree of life using a method based on the statistical binning of loci

Mirarab et al. 2014

Genomic datasets face more than just computational challenges!


- There is an inherent increase in data heterogeneity as shift to transcriptomes/genomes and more taxa

PROBLEM?


Discord not due to just ILS

Multiple processes contribute to gene tree discord

- highly elevated levels of strongly supported conflict




Caryophyllales



Multiple processes contribute to gene tree discord

- highly elevated levels of strongly supported conflict that cannot be explained by ILS alone at some nodes




Caryophyllales




Proportion homologs
addressing node

Conflicting alternative topologies




Smith et al. 2015 BMC Evolutionary Biology

Different phylogenetic estimates with inclusion/exclusion of loci




Systematic errors in phylogenetic inference caused by model misspecification



69 analyses of 92 taxa

hypothesized relationships
among major clades of plants

Wickett et al. 2014 PNAS



What is the empiricists to do to improve phylogenetic accuracy?

- Gene tree discord (per se) is not problematic
- Check alignment, paralogs, etc are not contributing to discord

Data problem versus model problem?

- Filter data (criteria?)?
 - Subsets of data?
 - More data?
 - Heterogeneity of processes underlying discord across loci?

Species tree inference:

a guide to the theoretical and empirical challenges of today and tomorrow

L. S. Kubatko and L. L. Knowles eds.



EVOLUTION AND GENOMICS

Intensive and immersive training opportunities



SPECIES-TREE INFERENCE

Species-tree inference with BEAST 2 and SNAPP

Michael Matschiner, 28 January 2020

[Practical today 2-5pm](#)

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

- Codon substitution and analysis of natural selection
- Adaptive molecular evolution
- Divergence time estimation and biogeographic analysis
- Phylogenetic inference
- Species delimitation
- Demographic inference

....models are how we communicate
our knowledge to a statistical apparatus

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:


- Codon substitution and analysis of natural selection
 - Adaptive molecular evolution
 - Divergence time estimation and biogeographic analysis
 - Phylogenetic inference
 - Species delimitation
 - Demographic inference
-
- All models are flawed..., some are more or less useful
....models are how we communicate
our knowledge to a statistical apparatus

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

- Codon substitution and analysis of natural selection
- Adaptive molecular evolution
- Divergence time estimation and biogeographic analysis
- Phylogenetic inference
- Species delimitation

- Demographic inference
(e.g., time of divergence)


- Divergence time under model to account for gene lineage sorting process (i.e., a coalescent model) to account for gene divergence that predates population divergence to obtain accurate diverge time estimate



- All models are flawed..., some are more or less useful

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

- Codon substitution and analysis of natural selection
- Adaptive molecular evolution
- Divergence time estimation and biogeographic analysis
- Phylogenetic inference
- Species delimitation
- Demographic inference
(e.g., time of divergence)



- All models are flawed..., some are more or less useful
....depending upon how effectively they represent
evolutionary processes


Genetic model-based species delimitation

- History of inference about species boundaries using genetic data
- Conceptual issues surrounding species delimitation
- Future of delimitation models
- Practical training (tonight 7-10pm)
Software: *Delineate*
Software: *Decrypt*




Isolation is the property that allows species to be recognized genetically

- Transition towards species monophyly with time




- Transition towards species monophyly with time




- Ancestry immediately after origin of a barrier is mixed

polyphyly

- Transition towards species monophyly with time




- Transition towards species monophyly with time



Isolation is the property that allows species to be recognized genetically


- Transition towards species monophyly with time



Isolation is the property that allows species to be recognized genetically

- Exclusivity criteria (e.g., monophyly)

“A group of organisms is exclusive if their loci coalesce more recently within the group than between any member of the group and any organisms outside the group”
(Baum & Shaw 1995, p. 296).



- Disconnect between the time of speciation and when taxa become monophyletic

FIG. 1. Probabilities of observing monophyly with time for populations that are genetically isolated. Curves are shown for a single mitochondrial locus and for samples of different numbers of nuclear loci.

Delimiting Species without Monophyletic Gene Trees

L. LACEY KNOWLES AND BRYAN C. CARSTENS


*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Museum of Zoology, 1109 Geddes Avenue, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1079, USA; E-mail: knowlesl@umich.edu (L.L.K.)*

Abstract.—Genetic data are frequently used to delimit species, where species status is determined on the basis of an exclusivity criterium, such as reciprocal monophyly. Not only are there numerous empirical examples of incongruence between the boundaries inferred from such data compared to other sources like morphology—especially with recently derived species, but population genetic theory also clearly shows that an inevitable bias in species status results because genetic thresholds do not explicitly take into account how the timing of speciation influences patterns of genetic differentiation. **This study represents a fundamental shift in how genetic data might be used to delimit species. Rather than equating gene trees with a species tree or basing species status on some genetic threshold, the relationship between the gene trees and the species history is modeled probabilistically.** Here we show that the same theory that is used to calculate the probability of reciprocal monophyly can also be used to delimit species despite widespread incomplete lineage sorting. The results from a preliminary simulation study suggest that very recently derived species can be accurately identified long before the requisite time for reciprocal monophyly to be achieved following speciation. The study also indicates the importance of sampling, both with regards to loci and individuals. Withstanding a thorough investigation into the conditions under which the coalescent-based approach will be effective, namely how the timing of divergence relative to the effective population size of species affects accurate species delimitation, the results are nevertheless consistent with other recent studies (aimed at inferring species relationships), showing that despite the lack of monophyletic gene trees, a signal of species divergence persists and can be extracted. Using an explicit model-based approach also avoids two primary problems with species delimitation that result when genetic thresholds are applied with genetic data—the inherent biases in species detection arising from when and how speciation occurred, and failure to take into account the high stochastic variance of genetic processes. Both the utility and sensitivities of the coalescent-based approach outlined here are discussed; most notably, a model-based approach is essential for determining whether incompletely sorted gene lineages are (or are not) consistent with separate species lineages, and such inferences require accurate model parameterization (i.e., a range of realistic effective population sizes relative to potential times of divergence for the purported species). It is the goal (and motivation of this study) that genetic data might be used effectively as a source of complementation to other sources of data for diagnosing species, as opposed to the exclusion of other evidence for species delimitation, which will require an explicit consideration of the effects of the temporal dynamic of lineage splitting on genetic data. [Coalescence; genealogical discord; genealogical species concept; gene trees; incomplete lineage sorting.]

Coalescent Theory Applications in a Nutshell


- Makes predictions about the *waiting time* between coalescence events based on population size and sample size.
- Predictions are based on assumptions of particular properties of the population that the genes (or individuals having those genes) are evolving.
- Deviances in observed waiting times from that predicted can be used to make inferences about deviances in actual population properties from assumed.

How Does Structuring Change the Coalescent Times?




- Recall that the coalescent makes predictions about the timings to coalescence for genes sampled at random from a panmictic population.

How Does Structuring Change the Coalescent Times?




- Recall that the coalescent makes predictions about the timings to coalescence for genes sampled at random from a panmictic population.
- What happens if there are restrictions to panmixia?

How Does Structuring Change the Coalescent Times?



- Recall that the coalescent makes predictions about the timings to coalescence for genes sampled at random from a panmictic population.
- What happens if there are restrictions to panmixia?
- Then the timings to coalescence get *extended*

How Does Structuring Change the Coalescent Times?



- Recall that the coalescent makes predictions about the timings to coalescence for genes sampled at random from a panmictic population.
- What happens if there are restrictions to panmixia?
- Then the timings to coalescent get *extended*
- This is the basis of the censored coalescent (aka: multispecies coalescent, MSC)


Delimiting Species without Monophyletic Gene Trees

L. LACEY KNOWLES AND BRYAN C. CARSTENS

*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Museum of Zoology, 1109 Geddes Avenue, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1079, USA; E-mail: knowlesl@umich.edu (L.L.K.)*

Abstract.—Genetic data are frequently used to delimit species, where species status is determined on the basis of an exclusivity criterium, such as reciprocal monophyly. Not only are there numerous empirical examples of incongruence between the boundaries inferred from such data compared to other sources like morphology—especially with recently derived species, but population genetic theory also clearly shows that an inevitable bias in species status results because genetic thresholds do not explicitly take into account how the timing of speciation influences patterns of genetic differentiation. This study represents a fundamental shift in how genetic data might be used to delimit species. Rather than equating gene trees with a species tree or basing species status on some genetic threshold, the relationship between the gene trees and the species history is modeled probabilistically. Here we show that the same theory that is used to calculate the probability of reciprocal monophyly can also be used to delimit species despite widespread incomplete lineage sorting. The results from a preliminary simulation study suggest that very recently derived species can be accurately identified long before the requisite time for reciprocal monophyly to be achieved following speciation. The study also indicates the importance of sampling, both with regards to loci and individuals. Withstanding a thorough investigation into the conditions under which the coalescent-based approach will be effective, namely how the timing of divergence relative to the effective population size of species affects accurate species delimitation, the results are nevertheless consistent with other recent studies (aimed at inferring species relationships), showing that despite the lack of monophyletic gene trees, a signal of species divergence persists and can be extracted. Using an explicit model-based approach also avoids two primary problems with species delimitation that result when genetic thresholds are applied with genetic data—the inherent biases in species detection arising from when and how speciation occurred, and failure to take into account the high stochastic variance of genetic processes. Both the utility and sensitivities of the coalescent-based approach outlined here are discussed; most notably, a model-based approach is essential for determining whether incompletely sorted gene lineages are (or are not) consistent with separate species lineages, and such inferences require accurate model parameterization (i.e., a range of realistic effective population sizes relative to potential times of divergence for the purported species). It is the goal (and motivation of this study) that genetic data might be used effectively as a source of complementation to other sources of data for diagnosing species, as opposed to the exclusion of other evidence for species delimitation, which will require an explicit consideration of the effects of the temporal dynamic of lineage splitting on genetic data. [Coalescence; genealogical discord; genealogical species concept; gene trees; incomplete lineage sorting.]

Probabilistic approach to evaluate different species delimitation hypotheses under multispecies coalescent (MSC)



Different species delimitation hypotheses are formulated as competing statistical models and inferred from the genetic data through Bayesian model selection (i.e., through calculation of posterior model probabilities) in bpp program. Yang and Rannala (2010) *PNAS*

That was then and this is now...

- Proliferation of available programs
- Vast amounts of data available
- Empiricists' suspicions about delimited “species”

Explosion of applications of the MSC for species delimitation

Bayesian species delimitation using sequence data

Ziheng Yang, Molecular Ecology (2013) 22, 4369–4383

*Center for
University of
Davis, CA 95616

INVITED REVIEWS AND META-ANALYSES

How to fail at species delimitation

SPECIAL
COLLECTION
ACCURATE

BRYAN C. CARSTENS*, TARA A. PELLETIER*, NOAH M. REID† and JORDAN D. SATLER*

*Department of Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology, The Ohio State University, 318 W. 12th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210-1293, USA, †Department of Biological Sciences, Louisiana State University, Life Sciences Building, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA

EMPIRICAL EXAMPLE WITH LIZARDS OF THE *LIOLAEMUS DARWINII* COMPLEX (SQUAMATA: LIOLAEMIDAE)

Arley Camargo^{1,2}, Mariana Morando³, Luciano J. Avila³ and Jack W. Sites, Jr.¹

¹Department of Biology & Monte L. Bean Museum, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602

²E-mail: arley.camargo@gmail.com

³CONICET-CENPAT, Boulevard Almirante Brown 2915, U9120ACD, Puerto Madryn, Chubut, Argentina
Syst. Biol. 00(0):1–13, 2018

© The Author(s) 2018. Published by Oxford University Press, on behalf of the Society of Systematic Biologists.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For Permissions, please email: journals.permissions@oup.com

DOI:10.1093/sysbio/syy001

Received: 15 September 2017 | Revised: 30 March 2018 | Accepted: 3 April 2018

DOI: 10.1111/1755-0998.12887

doi: 10.1111/mec.12413

WILEY MOLECULAR ECOLOGY
RESOURCES

Bayesian species identification under the multispecies coalescent provides significant improvements to DNA barcoding analyses

¹ | Bin Lu³ | Yufeng Wu¹

ZIHENG YANG*† and BRUCE RANNALA†‡

*Department of Genetics, Evolution and Environment, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK,

†College of Life Sciences, Beihai Normal University, Beihai 536007, China, ‡Department of Evolution and Ecology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616

998

770

Advance Access Publication Date: 23 November 2014

Original Paper

Comparison of Methods for Molecular Species Delimitation Across a Range of Speciation Scenarios

ARONG LUO^{1,2,*}, CHENG LING³, SIMON Y. W. HO², AND CHAO-DONG ZHU^{1,4}

¹Key Laboratory of Zoological Systematics and Evolution, Institute of Zoology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China;

²School of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales 2006, Australia; ³Department of Computer Science and Technology, College of Information Science and Technology, Beijing University of Chemical Technology, Beijing 100029, China; and

⁴College of Life Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

*Correspondence to be sent to: Key Laboratory of Zoological Systematics and Evolution, Institute of Zoology,

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China;

E-mail: luor@ioz.ac.cn

Simon Y. W. Ho and Chao-Dong Zhu contributed equally to this article.

E-mail: jackson.N@jhsfhealth.org

Bayesian species delimitation using the multispecies coalescent

Lin^{1,2} and Bengt Oxelman^{1,*}

¹Department of Botany, University of Gothenburg, Box 461, SE 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden; ²Department of Biology, University of Dicle, 21280 Diyarbakir, Turkey

Pros of species delimitation under MSC

- Can delimit species before monophyly

Knowles & Carstens (2007) *Syst. Biol.*

- Still detects lineages under low gene flow


Zhang et al. (2011) *Syst. Biol.*

- Accuracy of species delimitation to sampling can be evaluated (i.e., will more data change status)
- De facto standardization for objectively delimiting taxa (i.e., data treated equally among all living things and avoid subjectivness of what characters to measure)


Fujita et al. (2012) *TREE*

- Can take into account uncertainty in gene trees

Yang & Rannala 2010




Model-based inference: probability of different hypotheses about species boundaries **based on genetic data alone!**



Leache & Fujita (2010) *Proc. R. Soc. B*.

Data-informed summary suggests problems.....

Carstens et al. 2013



Most newly discovered species go undescribed.


Subjective interpretation of results!

- Less than 30% of researchers applying MSC models made taxonomic recommendations!
- Less than 25% of researchers applying MSC models actually use results to describe new species!


Why not name every “species”???

- Lack of differentiation in other phenotypic traits
- No characters to diagnose “species”
- Seems like a lot of new “species”
- More data and more “species”


Measures of evolutionary independence: no distinct boundary between species and populations



Eventually all species concepts agree...so
no big deal right?!?



* Not all lineages become species!



Speciation is a protracted process


Splitting events such as this are the initiation of speciation through, e.g., population isolation

duration of speciation τ

Color change indicates completion of speciation and development of true species from incipient species (i.e., lineage conversion)

Protracted speciation model (PSM)


Modified from Rosindell et al. (2010) Ecol. Lett. 13:716





the multispecies COALESCENT

Current model-based genetic species delimitation



THE COALESCENT


Sukumaran & Knowles (2017) *PNAS*

Simulate data to account for differences in speciation duration (i.e., speciation is not instantaneous)



Sukumaran & Knowles (2017) *PNAS*

Splitting events such as this are initiation of speciation through, e.g., **population isolation**

Color change indicates completion of speciation and development of true species from incipient species (i.e., **lineage conversion**)



speciation duration




Does the MSC accurately delimit species?

Most probable delimitation model?

Performance of species delimitation under the MSC for data simulated under different speciation durations

Sukumaran & Knowles (2017) *PNAS*



The MSC does not track species, but rather tracks *structure* of any sort, whether population or true species

Multispecies coalescent delimits structure, not species

Jeet Sukumaran^{a,1,2} and L. Lacey Knowles^{a,1}

^aDepartment of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI 48109-1079

Edited by David M. Hillis, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, and approved December 29, 2016 (received for review May 23, 2016)

Your reaction to the paper?

Distrust the theoretical demonstration
(maybe specialized scenarios used)?

MSC is incredibly popular, so how could this happen?

Multispecies coalescent delimits structure, not species

Jeet Sukumaran^{a,1,2} and L. Lacey Knowles^{a,1}

^aDepartment of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI 48109-1079


Edited by David M. Hillis, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, and approved December 29, 2016 (received for review May 23, 2016)

Reactions to paper:

- theoretical demonstration, but not practically relevant since we don't know how long it takes for speciation

Protracted speciation model (PSM)

duration of speciation



- the protracted model of speciation doesn't fit my empirical system and/or not consistent with any taxonomist views

- everyone recognizes the MSC doesn't delimit species per se

- the MSC doesn't make assumptions about the speciation process


Species delimitation

Why are species boundaries NOT accurately delimited under the objective model (the MSC)?





Species delimitation: Subjective + Objective

- Choices during model formulation



Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

- Choices during model formulation
- All models are flawed..., some are more or less useful
....models are how we communicate
our knowledge to a statistical apparatus



Need more complex models

Knowles & Sukumaran (2018) in review


Current state of genetic model-based species delimitation

- MSC detects structure – not species

Sukumaran & Knowles (2017) *PNAS*


(seeking consensus across MSC-based methods is not a good way to fail)

see Rannala (2015) *Current Zoology* 61, 846-853



- “Robustness” to lineage detection with low levels of gene flow is not the same as accurate species delimitation
- Sensitivity to sampling (i.e., more data change status)
- In practice, MSC is not a de facto standardization for objectively delimiting taxa: degree of over estimation varies depending on speciation process


Degree of over-estimation depends upon the speciation process



- In practice, MSC is not a de facto standardization for objectively delimiting taxa: degree of over estimation varies depending on speciation process

Current state of genetic model-based species delimitation:

Accurate species delimitation cannot be achieved with current models based on MSC



- Don't run MSC and add a caveat – what's the point!
- STOP reporting on all the “cryptic” species diversity

Explosion of applications of the MSC for species delimitation

Bayesian species delimitation using sequence data

Ziheng Yang^{a,b} and Bruce Rannala^{a,c,1}

^aCenter for Computational and Evolutionary Biology, Institute of Zoology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, University College London, University College London, Davis, CA 95616

Received: 15 September 2017 | Revised: 30 March 2018 | Accepted: 3 April 2018

DOI: 10.1111/1755-0998.12887

RESOURCE ARTICLE

WILEY **MOLECULAR ECOLOGY**
RESOURCES

CLADES: A classification-based machine learning method for species delimitation using genetic data

MOLECULAR ECOLOGY

Molecular Ecology (2013) 22, 4369–4383

doi: 10.1111/mec.12413

Lu³ | Yufeng Wu¹

**SPECIES DELIMITATION
COALESCENT
ACCURACY
EMPIRICAL
LIOLAEMU:
(SQUAMAT**

INVITED REVIEWS AND META-ANALYSES

How to fail at species delimitation

BRYAN C. CARSTENS*, TARA A. PELLETIER*, NOAH M. REID† and JORDAN N. BUTLER*

*Department of Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology, The Ohio State University, 318 W. 12th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210-1293, USA, †Department of Biological Sciences, Louisiana State University, Life Science Building, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA

Arley Camargo^{1,2}, Mariana Morando³, Luciano J. Avila³ and Jack W. Sites, Jr.¹

¹Department of Biology & Monte L. Bean Museum, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602

²E-mail: arley.camargo@gmail.com

³CONICET-CENPAT, Boulevard Almirante Brown 2915, U9120ACD, Puerto Madryn, Chubut, Argentina

ZIHENG YANG*† and BRUCE RANNALA*†‡

*Department of Genetics, Evolution and Environment, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK,

†College of Life Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China, ‡Department of Evolution and Ecology, University

of California at Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, USA

NATHAN D. JACKSON¹, ARIADNA E. MORALES², BRYAN C. CARSTENS* and BRIAN C. O'NEILL

¹Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, 442 Hesler Biology Building, Knoxville, TN

²Department of Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology, The Ohio State University, 318 W. 12th Avenue, Columbus,

Syst. Biol. 00(1):1–13, 2018

© The Author(s) 2018. Published by Oxford University Press, on behalf of the Society of Systematic Biologists. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For Permissions, please email: journals.permissions@oup.com
DOI: 10.1093/sysbio/syy011

Bioinformatics, 31(7), 2015, 991–998

doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btu770

Advance Access Publication Date: 23 November 2014

Original Paper

Phylogenetics

DISSECT: an assignment-free Bayesian discovery method for species delimitation under the multispecies coalescent

Graham Jones¹, Zeynep Aydin^{1,2} and Bengt Oxelman^{1,*}

¹Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Box 461, SE 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden and ²Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, University of Dicle, 21280 Diyarbakir, Turkey

Comparison of Methods for Molecular Species Delimitation Across Speciation Scenarios

ARONG LUO^{1,2,*}, CHENG LING³, SIMON Y. W. HO², AND CHAO-DONG ZHANG

¹Key Laboratory of Zoological Systematics and Evolution, Institute of Zoology, Chinese Academy of Sciences,

²School of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales 2006, Australia; ³Department of Information Science and Technology, Beijing University of Chemical Technology, Beijing

⁴College of Life Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

*Correspondence to be sent to: Key Laboratory of Zoological Systematics and Evolution, Institute of Zoology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China;
E-mail: luor@ibz.ac.cn

Potentially misleading!
OK, but what to do?

Current state of genetic model-based species delimitation

Ad hoc heuristics to interpret inferences under the MSC

*Jackson et al. (2018) *Syst. Biol.*

*Leache et al. (2018) *Syst. Biol.*

- Genealogical sorting index*: $2T/\theta$
(i.e., population divergence time relative to the population size)
Cummings et al. (2008) *Evolution*
 - ambiguity with gdi when the two populations have different sizes
 - gdi may lead to claims of species status even if populations diverged very recently if one population established by a few founder individuals




FIGURE 4. Accuracy of species delimitation using the gdi with parameters estimated from data of 50 loci using (a) PHRAPL and (b) BPP.

Current state of genetic model based species delimitation

Ad hoc heuristics to interpret inferences under the MSC *

* What constitutes a species is a decision based on applying a threshold index value (despite Bayesian framework to rework the old idea)




FIGURE 5. Species delimitation applying heuristic index *gdi* to parameter estimates from npp. a) Species tree used for simulation allows
Leache et al. (2018) *Syst. Biol.*

- Genealogical sorting index*: $2T/\theta$

(i.e., population divergence time relative to the population size)

Cummings et al. (2008) *Evolution*

- hierarchical procedure for applying *gdi* index
- Bayesian framework for calculating posterior distribution of *gdi*

Model-based delimitation: state of the field

- Erroneous species boundaries are inferred from current model-based genetic approaches under the MSC
- Relying on heuristics to interpret inferences under the MSC (e.g., from bpp) is not the answer
- Future of genetic-based species delimitation is with speciation-based MSC models




A new era of species delimitation models that brings speciation models to the multispecies coalescent



- Erroneous species boundaries are inferred from current model-based genetic approaches under the MSC
- Relying on heuristics to interpret inferences under the MSC (e.g., from bpp) is not the answer
- Future of genetic-based species delimitation is with speciation-based MSC models



Species delimitation under the MSC:



- genetic structure = species




Incorporating the Speciation Process into Species Delimitation

Jeet Sukumaran^{a,c,1,2}, Mark T. Holder^{b,1}, and L. Lacey Knowles^a


^aDepartment of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI, USA 41809-1079; ^bDepartment of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Kansas, Lawrence KS, USA 66045; ^cDepartment of Biology, San Diego State University, San Diego CA, USA 92182-4614

This manuscript was compiled on October 10, 2019



DELINEATE: a species delimitation method which makes probabilistic statements about whether population lineages are members of the same species

DELINEATE: a species delimitation method which makes probabilistic statements about whether population lineages are members of the same species



- probabilities of different *partitions* are calculated conditional on the lineage tree and **speciation dynamic parameters** (e.g., tempo of speciation)


Different speciation-based delimitation models might be used to represent various aspects of the speciation process

Splitting events; initiation of speciation through, e.g., population isolation

This process, as modeled here, is initiated by a stochastic lineage splitting process that extends over a duration of time that is determined stochastically by a speciation completion rate parameter

Color change indicates completion of speciation and development of “good” species from “incipient” species

Protracted speciation model (PSM)




Modified from Rosindell et al. (2010) Ecol. Lett.


- Transition of an incipient species lineage to full “good” species occurs independently on each branch at the species completion rate, λ_2

- Computational challenge of number of possible partitions


- BUT Affinities of some lineages well understood (i.e., include data from well described species) and focus on inferring those less studied



(each partition
represents a particular
model of delimited
species)




duration of
speciation




Modified from Rosindell et al. (2010) Ecol. Lett.

Sukumaran J, Holder M, Knowles LL

Recovery of (a) true # of species, and (b) the correct partition for different sized trees with different numbers of undescribed lineages



(a)




(b)

*Note the speciation completion rate is estimated jointly (as long as some constraints on con- and hetero-specific status of some lineages are given)

*Pure-genomic uninformed species delimitation is not practical!

Recovery of the true speciation process from simulated data with different degrees of protracted speciation


ML estimates of the speciation completion rate, λ_2 , per replicate, and 95% CI



Speciation-based delimitation model


Other applications of DELINEATE:

- Summarize the information in other ways (e.g., probability the leftmost subtree of 5 lineages are conspecific by summing all the probabilities of all partitions in which those lineages occur together)



- Estimate the speciation completion rate given a sample of populations with known species assignments (i.e., focus on speciation dynamics (see Li, Huang, Sukumaran, Knowles (2018) *BMC Evol. Biol.* 18:123))

Using genetic data alone (i.e., without conditioning on prior knowledge about some lineages) is not sufficient for accurate inference of species boundaries.



Software: *Decrypt* <https://becheler.github.io/pages/applications.html>

- Model of the **geography of genetic divergence** under a spatially explicit coalescent to evaluate competing hypotheses about cryptic diversity (inferred under the MSC)

- Practical training (tonight 7-10pm)

Software: *Delineate*



Software: *Decrypt*



Analysis using DECRYPT




Figure 7: Spatial interpolation of p_x the probability to detect 2 species in a population expanding in an heterogeneous landscape under the MSC when the sequences sample is constructed at time t_s by two 2D gaussian sampling processes centered on (i) the population origin x_0 (red cross), and (ii) on a random coordinate x (with $N(x, t_s) > 30$ to avoid inconsistent sampling in very low density areas).

Transformative potential of model-based analyses:

- (i) Phylogenetic inference
- (ii) Species delimitation/infering species boundaries
- (iii) Phylogeography/Comparative Phylogeography

With an emphasis on:

- Choices we make about model formulation
- Recognizing the subjectivity of model formulation itself when making inferences
- Decisions when applying to empirical data

Model-based approaches for phylogeographic inference

Discussion points:

- Why models are important
- Generic versus informed models
- Species-specific expectations of genetic variation (e.g. iDDC; based on spatially explicit coalescent models)
- Concordance versus discord among species: lessons from comparative phylogeography


Why the transition from describing patterns of genetic variation to understanding process requires model-based approach

Classics in phylogeography

Concordance reflects a common vicariant history of population separation




Black Sea Bass





American Oyster



Seaside Sparrow



Horseshoe Crab




Avise 1992




A common vicariant history?

The data may be consistent with a common response to a specific geologic event, despite differing gene tree depths among taxa? Or maybe not?

By looking only at the gene trees,
it isn't clear how the differences in gene tree depths
should be interpreted!




American Oyster








To test for a common vicariant history need to:


Assess statistically how much of a difference in the depths of the gene trees would still be consistent with the same time of population divergence




A common vicariant history?



Concordance used in statistical phylogeography



Statistically evaluate a parameterized model of co-divergence among species using hierarchical Approximate Bayesian Computation (hABC)



How do we decide upon a model*:


- arbitrary/generic models
- informed from information independent of the genetic data itself
 - that is, a specific biological narrative motivates the model
 - models informed by independent genetic data

* All models are simplifications, and vary in their relative degree of abstraction


Model choice in phylogeography: generic versus informed

- arbitrary/generic models

Tests of 142 objectively identified models (e.g., program like PHRAPL)



Pelletier & Carstens (2014 Mol. Ecol.)




Nested Clade Analysis (NCA):
the data itself tell us what
history generated it
(Discredited in early 2000s)

Model choice in phylogeography: subjectivity versus objectivity

- arbitrary/generic models

Tests of 142 objectively identified models



Pelletier & Carstens (2014 Mol. Ecol.)

Statistical procedures themselves may seem to provide a legitimacy to an approach – the advocacy of objective models in phylogeography

Model choice

Tests of 142 c




- arbitrary/generic models

Table 3 List of all 143 models included in analyses. Model = r0m

Model	Parameters	Mean	SD	Median	Posterior probability
1030	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}$	0.792	1.124	0.000	0.024
1232	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	0.822	0.856	0.772	0.007
1200	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1$	0.826	0.985	0.499	0.004
1222	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{11}, \gamma_2$	0.846	0.982	0.542	0.006
1220	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{11}$	0.849	0.957	0.647	0.006
1231	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	0.863	0.877	0.859	0.006
1221	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{11}, \gamma_1$	0.870	0.878	0.862	0.011
1031	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	0.884	1.133	0.000	0.020
1230	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, m_{21}$	0.917	0.937	0.880	0.006
1033	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	0.923	1.179	0.000	0.018
0131	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	0.930	1.024	0.779	0.007
0130	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}$	0.949	0.881	1.055	0.010
1032	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	0.954	1.154	0.000	0.024
1201	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, \gamma_1$	0.975	1.026	0.966	0.006
0030	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}$	0.977	1.210	0.000	0.024
1211	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	0.990	1.042	0.927	0.007
0020	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}$	0.991	1.244	0.000	0.017
1132	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_2$	0.995	0.981	0.986	0.007
0031	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	0.996	1.300	0.000	0.020
0022	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_2$	1.003	1.241	0.000	0.025
1131	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	1.011	0.967	1.013	0.004
1032	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.013	1.212	0.000	0.031
1212	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, \gamma_2$	1.015	0.986	1.083	0.003
1233	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.021	0.946	1.121	0.010
1203	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.024	1.058	1.002	0.010
0233	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.026	0.985	1.118	0.004
1110	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	1.030	1.000	1.118	0.007
0222	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	1.031	1.112	0.921	0.008
1130	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, m_{21}$	1.031	0.976	1.084	0.006
0112	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_2$	1.032	0.991	1.121	0.007
0032	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_2$	1.033	1.212	0.000	0.020
0110	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	1.034	1.031	1.070	0.004
1020	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.035	1.196	0.000	0.015
0012	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_2$	1.038	1.272	0.000	0.018
1213	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.041	1.053	1.121	0.003
0220	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}$	1.041	0.965	1.121	0.010
1013	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.042	1.227	0.543	0.024
0231	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	1.048	1.104	0.997	0.007
1111	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	1.050	1.027	1.088	0.013
0013	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.056	1.254	0.000	0.021
0133	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.057	1.187	1.028	0.001
0033	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.059	1.288	0.000	0.031
1002	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, \gamma_2$	1.084	1.263	0.000	0.008
1331	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	1.098	1.093	1.081	0.000
0132	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_2$	1.101	0.991	1.129	0.007
0210	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}$	1.102	1.111	1.040	0.001
1321	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	1.108	1.012	1.124	0.000
1123	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.118	1.094	1.121	0.003
1021	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	1.119	1.325	0.000	0.034
1113	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.132	1.042	1.129	0.003
1010	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}$	1.135	1.284	0.558	0.013
1112	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	1.135	0.943	1.137	0.006
1111	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, \gamma_1$	1.136	1.048	1.129	0.006
1011	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	1.148	1.274	0.739	0.021
0023	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	1.154	1.311	0.900	0.020

Activity



& Carstens (2014 Mol. Ecol.)

Model choice in

activity

Tests of 142 ok




XOXO
PP = 0



2
1

Table 3 Continued

Model	Parameters	Mean	SD	Median	Posterior probability
0230	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{02}, m_{01}$	1.172	1.022	1.135	0.003
0321	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.173	1.106	1.129	0.003
1000*	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2$	1.178	1.261	0.971	0.015
1202	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, \tau_1$	1.180	1.163	1.124	0.004
0223	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{01}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.181	1.173	1.124	0.007
1001	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, \tau_1$	1.187	1.328	0.752	0.021
0011	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1$	1.198	1.298	0.931	0.022
0213	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{02}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.199	1.117	1.135	0.004
1102	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, \tau_2$	1.205	1.217	1.129	0.004
1121	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.211	1.141	1.137	0.010
1022	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{01}, \tau_2$	1.214	1.308	1.011	0.021
1012	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.270	1.324	1.129	0.021
1332	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_2$	1.271	1.159	1.179	0.003
1322	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_2$	1.280	1.087	1.233	0.000
0212	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.281	1.181	1.140	0.001
1312	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_2$	1.286	1.105	1.221	0.001
1323	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.312	1.075	1.239	0.001
0123	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{01}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.312	1.189	1.192	0.007
1003	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.321	1.443	1.122	0.007
0313	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.327	1.207	1.182	0.001
1433	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.327	0.998	1.269	0.000
0312	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1$	1.328	1.201	1.209	0.004
0211	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.333	1.195	1.256	0.006
1320	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}$	1.336	1.235	1.180	0.001
1403	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.350	1.011	1.298	0.000
1330*	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}$	1.351	1.274	1.225	0.006
0323	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{01}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.353	1.170	1.259	0.003
1333	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.357	1.127	1.277	0.003
1103	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.400	1.186	1.408	0.003
1423	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.408	1.502	1.182	0.001
0331	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.424	1.314	1.368	0.000
0311	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1$	1.475	1.353	1.353	0.003
1432	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_2$	1.500	1.297	1.360	0.000
1402	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, \tau_2$	1.543	1.101	1.545	0.003
0413	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.570	1.139	1.545	0.006
0412	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_2$	1.575	1.172	1.516	0.001
0322	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.591	1.490	1.481	0.001
1303	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.591	1.303	1.610	0.003
1301	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, \tau_1$	1.621	1.428	1.554	0.001
1300*	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2$	1.630	1.342	1.562	0.004
1313	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.676	3.419	1.164	0.007
0423	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.710	1.358	1.593	0.000
0430	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}$	1.715	1.294	1.620	0.000
0113	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.715	5.727	1.068	0.004
0411	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.717	1.259	1.665	0.003
0422	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_2$	1.759	1.417	1.614	0.000
1401	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, \tau_1$	1.781	1.835	1.505	0.001
0433	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	1.843	1.773	1.597	0.000
0021	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{02}, \tau_1$	1.867	4.813	0.673	0.014
0221	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{01}, \tau_1$	1.934	6.915	0.937	0.006
1400	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2$	2.088	1.697	1.999	0.000
0232	$\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_1$	2.186	7.859	1.121	0.007
1122	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{01}, \tau_1$	2.356	7.532	1.254	0.006
1123	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{01}, \tau_2$	2.551	8.798	1.283	0.003
1133	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}, m_{01}, \tau_1, \tau_2$	2.748	12.927	0.814	0.008
1430	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{02}$	2.790	7.890	1.673	0.003



Carstens (2014 Mol. Ecol.)

- arbitrary/generic models

Model choice


Table 3 Continued

Model	Parameters	Mean	SD	Median	Posterior probability
1420	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{21}$	2.819	9.142	1.557	0.001
0330	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}$	3.156	11.980	1.608	0.000
0431	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	3.388	12.338	1.687	0.001
0432	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_2$	3.769	15.818	1.606	0.003
1210	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{12}$	4.007	21.699	0.880	0.010
0310	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}$	4.405	20.648	1.670	0.001
0421	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	4.761	18.586	1.563	0.000
1223	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	4.813	27.942	0.880	0.007
0410	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}$	4.840	19.483	1.684	0.000
0333	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	4.841	24.764	1.304	0.004
1411	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	4.949	22.725	1.182	0.000
0320	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{21}$	5.184	25.275	1.771	0.000
1431	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	5.539	28.987	1.440	0.000
1421	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	5.618	22.805	1.418	0.001
1311	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	5.721	32.177	1.137	0.001
0111	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1$	5.804	32.950	1.143	0.008
0420	$\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{21}$	6.037	28.946	1.629	0.001
1412	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_2$	6.186	23.177	1.611	0.003
0010	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}$	6.223	36.293	0.000	0.017
1413	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	8.209	48.083	1.344	0.000
1430	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}$	8.661	50.499	1.516	0.001
1422	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{21}, \gamma_2$	9.269	45.089	1.344	0.006
0121	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{21}, \gamma_1$	9.369	56.607	1.327	0.004
1302	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, \gamma_2$	9.386	44.243	1.233	0.004
0120	$\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{21}$	9.466	57.924	1.189	0.004
1310	$\tau, \theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}$	9.812	60.333	1.206	0.000
1100	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2$	10.795	68.438	1.121	0.007
0332	$\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2, m_{12}, m_{21}, \gamma_2$	13.053	82.999	1.415	0.004
1120	$\tau, \theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2, m_{21}$	14.447	84.812	0.000	0.007
X0X1*	θ_A, γ_1				
X0X0*	θ_A				
0000	$\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2$				

For each model: $\tau\theta m\gamma$

Divergence time (τ)	Theta (θ)	Migration (m)	Population expansion (γ)
0: island model 1: divergence at time (τ) X: panmixia Prior: 0.001–5 (4N generations)	0: $\theta_A = \theta_1 = \theta_2$ 1: $\theta_A = \theta_1, \theta_2$ 2: $\theta_A = \theta_2, \theta_1$ 3: $\theta_A, \theta_1 = \theta_2$ 4: $\theta_A, \theta_1, \theta_2$ Prior: 0.01–10 per locus	0: no migration 1: m_{12} 2: m_{21} 3: m_{12}, m_{21} X: na/panmixia Prior: 0–5 migrants per generation	0: no expansion 1: γ_1 2: γ_2 3: γ_1, γ_2 Prior: 0.1–9 (exponential)

The answer is model 1023!



- arbitrary/generic models


Biological insights depend on the questions we (the scientist) ask!

- We should expect (or want) or computer programs to define the questions we ask!

The answer is:

42

The answer is model 1023!




- PHRAPL can create hundreds of possible histories that have a mixture of gene flow, population subdivision, and/or population size differences and compare these models using AIC (O'Meara)

- Model formulation is a way of communicating our expert knowledge to statistical apparatus to test hypotheses

Geologic data indicate species were displaced by climate change and current distribution reflects recent expansion which can be tested genetically

ENMs do not provide precise location of Pleistocene refuge for hickory trees



Bemmels JB, Knowles LL, Dick CW (2019)





Fig. 1. Schematic overview of demographic simulations. (A) Simulations were initiated in the LGM landscape (shown here for *C. cordiformis*) from a central deme (see red dot as an example) plus an area extending three additional demes (black dots) in all directions. Different geographic sources of

Inferred geographic coordinates of source of expansion (based on allele frequency gradients), where the *geographic coordinate* is a parameter in the model (inferred using ABC; see

He et al. 2017. Inferring the geographic origin of a range expansion: latitudinal and longitudinal coordinates inferred from genomic data in an ABC framework with the program X-ORIGIN. *Mol. Ecol.* 26:6908-6920. DOI: 10.1111/mec.14380

Species-specific differences in the location of refugial populations .



Bemmels et al. 2019 PNAS 116:8431-8436

Bemmels JB, Knowles LL, Dick CW (2019) Genomic evidence of survival near ice sheet margins for some, but not all, North American trees. PNAS 116:8431-8436.

Inferred likelihood of geographic coordinates of ancestral refugia population – this location corresponds to a macrofossil of the bitternut hickory




Fig. 2. Estimated expansion origins (Ω ; red cross) in *C. cordiformis* (A) and *C. ovata* (B). The shading of pixels depicts a probability surface (kernel density) showing the likelihood that each pixel served as the expansion origin relative to the pixel with the highest likelihood (i.e., Ω). Glaciated regions are shown in blue. The results presented in A and B are based on retention of four and three PC axes of variation in genetic summary statistics, respectively. Results based on retaining additional PC axes are presented in [SI Appendix, Figs. S2 and S3](#).

Transformative potential of model-based analyses in evolutionary biology



- Accounting for species-specific differences
- Spatially explicit coalescent models
- Comparative phylogeographic analyses

All models are simplifications, but they vary in their relative degree of abstraction

Different ways to model population expansion:



- (i) Model as population size change with no spatial aspect of expansion (e.g., Brazilian Atlantic forest areas of instability associated with recent expansion; Carnaval et al. 2009)
- (ii) Model expansion process across landscape explicitly (He et al. 2013; Evolution)




- Start from LGM refugia
- Colonize with changing layers of ENM



Does microhabitat differences affect species responses to climate change?

- start with descriptive analysis to explore hypotheses
- follow-up with spatially explicit models to test hypotheses about why patterns of genetic variation differ among species (i.e., generate species-specific patterns of genetic variation)



Sky island community responses to climate change similarly (based on patterns of genetic differentiation)

Carex chalciolepis




Carex nova



Massatti & Knowles
(2014 Evolution)



Rocky Mountains



Sky island communities: responses to climate change

- co-distributed, abundant taxa with similar natural histories and dispersal abilities



Carex chalciolepis



C. nova



- so similar that ENMs project very similar past distributions




- taxa differ in microhabitats

inhabits slopes and
ridges

restricted to wetlands
a




Carex chalciolepis



Carex nova





Given that ecological niche models (ENMs) are similar between species (both present and during LGM)...
why would we predict discord in patterns of genetic variation between the plant species?



If microhabitat matters...

- glaciers in drainages would have displaced populations of wetland specialist

Why should microhabitat matter for sky island inhabitants?




If microhabitat matters...

- distances separating populations may have been considerable greater in the past – *but only in the wetland specialist*

1. Sky island communities: microhabitat differences and responses to climate change

- SNPs from over 22,000 loci (RADseq)
- sampled population pairs of *C. nova* and *C. chalciolepis* from different mountain ranges




Massatti and Knowles, Evolution (in press)




C. nova

restricted to wetlands



projected past distribution




- Structure analysis of SNPs from over 22,000 loci




C. nova

restricted to wetlands



projected past distribution




- Structure analysis of SNPs from over 22,000 loci




C. nova

restricted to wetlands



projected past distribution

Massatti and Knowles, Evolution (in press)




- STRUCTURE analysis of SNPs from over 22,000 loci

inhabits slopes and ridges




C. chalciolepis




projected past distribution

$K = 2$

$K = 4$




C. nova



Genomic patterns support predictions of an interaction
between microhabitat affinity and climate change
(glaciers are barrier for movement of wetland specialists only)





Carex chalciolepis
dry ridges



Carex nova

wetland specialists




Genomic patterns support prediction of an interaction between microhabitat affinity and climate change

Massatti & Knowles (2014) *Evolution*



Carex chalciolepis
dry ridges



Carex nova
wetland specialists



Test if observed discordant phylogeographic structure could be caused by differences in microhabitat affinity

- generate species-specific expectations for patterns of genetic variation (i.e., glaciers are barrier for movement of wetland specialists only)