

DateLife Workflows

Luna L. Sanchez Reyes

2019-05-06

Taxon Fringilidae

1. Query source data

There are 475 species in the Open Tree of Life Taxonomy for the taxon Fringilidae. Information on time of divergence is available for 286 of these species across 13 published and peer-reviewed chronograms. Original study citations as well as number of Fringilidae species found across those source chronograms is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Fringilidae source chronogram studies information.

	<i>Citation</i>	<i>Source N</i>	<i>Taxon N</i>
1.	Barker, F. K., K. J. Burns, J. Klicka, S. M. Lanyon, I. J. Lovette. 2013. Going to extremes: contrasting rates of diversification in a recent radiation of New World passerine birds. <i>Systematic Biology</i> 62 (2): 298-320.	1	29/475
2.	Barker, F. Keith, Kevin J. Burns, John Klicka, Scott M. Lanyon, Irby J. Lovette. 2015. New insights into New World biogeography: An integrated view from the phylogeny of blackbirds, cardinals, sparrows, tanagers, warblers, and allies. <i>The Auk</i> 132 (2): 333-348.	2	102/475
3.	Burns, Kevin J., Allison J. Shultz, Pascal O. Title, Nicholas A. Mason, F. Keith Barker, John Klicka, Scott M. Lanyon, Irby J. Lovette. 2014. Phylogenetics and diversification of tanagers (Passeriformes: Thraupidae), the largest radiation of Neotropical songbirds. <i>Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution</i> 75: 41-77.	1	27/475
4.	Claramunt, Santiago, Joel Cracraft. 2015. A new time tree reveals Earth history's imprint on the evolution of modern birds. <i>Science Advances</i> 1 (11): e1501005-e1501005	1	3/475
5.	Gibb, Gillian C., Ryan England, Gerrit Hartig, P.A. (Trish) McLenachan, Briar L. Taylor Smith, Bennet J. McComish, Alan Cooper, David Penny. 2015. New Zealand passerines help clarify the diversification of major songbird lineages during the Oligocene. <i>Genome Biology and Evolution</i> 7 (11): 2983-2995.	1	7/475
6.	Hedges, S. Blair, Julie Marin, Michael Suleski, Madeline Paymer, Sudhir Kumar. 2015. Tree of life reveals clock-like speciation and diversification. <i>Molecular Biology and Evolution</i> 32 (4): 835-845	2	250/475
7.	Hooper, Daniel M., Trevor D. Price. 2017. Chromosomal inversion differences correlate with range overlap in passerine birds. <i>Nature Ecology & Evolution</i> 1 (10): 1526-1534	1	47/475
8.	Jetz, W., G. H. Thomas, J. B. Joy, K. Hartmann, A. O. Mooers. 2012. The global diversity of birds in space and time. <i>Nature</i> 491 (7424): 444-448	2	215/475
9.	Price, Trevor D., Daniel M. Hooper, Caitlyn D. Buchanan, Ulf S. Johansson, D. Thomas Tietze, Per Alström, Urban Olsson, Mousumi Ghosh-Harihar, Farah Ishtiaq, Sandeep K. Gupta, Jochen Martens, Bettina Harr, Pratap Singh, Dhananjai Mohan. 2014. Niche filling slows the diversification of Himalayan songbirds. <i>Nature</i> 509: 222-225.	2	2/475

Source N: Number of source chronograms reported in study.

Taxon N: Number of queried taxa found in source chronograms.

All source chronograms are fully ultrametric and their maximum ages range from 16.057 to 44.296 million years ago (MYA). As a means for comparison, lineage through time plots of all source chronograms available in data base are shown in Fig. 1




Figure 1: Lineage through time (LTT) plots of source chronograms available in data base for species in the Fringilidae. Numbers correspond to original studies in Table 1. Arrows indicate maximum age of each chronogram.

2. Summarize results

LTT plots are a nice way to visually compare several trees. But what if you want to summarize information from all source chronograms into a single summary chronogram?

The first step is to identify the degree of species overlap among your source chornograms: if each source chronogram has a unique sample of species, it will not be possible to combine them into a single summary chronogram. To identify the set of trees or *grove* with the most source chronograms that have at least two overlapping taxa, we followed Ané et al. 2016. In this case, not all source chronograms found for the Fringilidae have at least two overlapping species. The largest grove has 2 chronograms (out of 13 total source chronograms).

Now that we have identified a grove we can go on to summarize it by translating the source chronograms into patristic distance matrices and then averaging them into a single summary matrix; yes, this first step is *that* straightforward. We can average the source matrices by simply using the mean or median distances, or we can use methods that involve transforming the original distance matrices –such as the super distance matrix (SDM) approach of Criscuolo et al. 2006– by minimizing the distances across source matrices. As a result of such transformation, an SDM summary matrix can contain negative values. In this case, the SDM summary matrix has some negative values in the following taxa: *Carduelis uropygialis*, *Spinus crassirostris*.

Because our summary matrix is basically a distance matrix, a distance-based clustering algorithm could be used to reconstruct the tree. Algorithms such as neighbour joining (NJ) and unweighted pair group method with arithmetic mean (UPGMA) are fast and work very well when there are no missing values in the matrices. However, summary matrices coming from source chronograms usually have several NAs and missing rows. When this happens, variants of traditional clustering algorithms have been developed to deal with missing values. However, even these methods do not work well with our summary matrices, as shown in the following section. We should note that these clustering methods are usually applied to distance matrices representing substitution rates and not absolute time.

2.1. Clustering a summary matrix

NJ, UPGMA, BIONJ, minimum variance reduction (MVR) and the triangle method (TM) algorithms were used to cluster median and SDM summary distance matrices. All clustering algorithms returned very similar trees with both types of summary matrices (Fig. 2, Appendix Fig. 5). UPGMA is the only algorithm that returns ultrametric trees, but they are considerably older than expected from source chronograms. The other methods returned trees with reasonable ages, but that are not ultrametric.




Figure 2: Lineage Through Time plots of Fringilidae median summary chronograms obtained with different clustering algorithms. Not all algorithms worked with this summary matrix and we are only showing here the ones that worked. Chronograms obtained from the SDM summary matrix are very similar to the ones from the median summary matrix with all clustering algorithms (Appendix Fig. 5).

An alternative to clustering algorithms is to use all data available in the summary matrix as calibrations over a consensus tree. The advantage of this is that we can get a distribution of ages for the nodes and that we can essentially use this summary matrix to date any topology containing at least some of the nodes, as shown in the **Create new data** section.

2.2. Calibrating a consensus tree

Even if the branch lengths coming from the clustered chronograms are not adequate, the topology can still be used as a consensus tree of the taxa with time data available. Then, a list of divergence times available for each node can be constructed from the summary matrix, simply by matching it to the node that corresponds to each pair of taxa in any given tree. Finally, the list and consensus tree can be fed to any dating software that does not require data. The branch length aduster (BLADJ) algorithm [Webb2000] is really fast and does not make any evolutionary assumptions on age distribution. Other software such as MrBayes, r8s, and PATHd8 can be used instead of BLADJ by running them without data. In here, we show summary chronograms obtained using minimum, mean and maximum distances from summary matrices available for each node on the consensus tree and using them as fixed ages in BLADJ (Fig. 3).

Chronograms from both types of summary matrices are quite similar. As expected, SDM chronograms using minimum, mean and maximum distances do not vary much in their maximum age, because ages are transformed to minimize variance across them. In contrast, median chronogram obtained with minimum, mean and maximum distances have wider variation in their maximum ages, as can be observed in the distance between the green arrows in Fig. 3.




Figure 3: Fringilidae lineage through time (LTT) plots from source chronograms (gray), median (green) and SDM (blue) summary chronograms obtained by calibrating a consensus tree topology with distance data from respective summary matrices and then adjusting branch lengths with BLADJ.

III. Create new data

Another way to use information from source chronograms is to use the node ages as calibration points to date any given tree containing at least two of the taxa in source chronograms. To do this, we need the target tree

As an example, we're gonna date the Open Tree Synthetic tree (mainly because the taxonomic tree is usually less well resolved.)

Now, let's say you like the Open Tree of Life Taxonomy and you want to stick to that tree. Dates from available studies were tested over the Open Tree of Life Synthetic tree of Fringilidae and a tree was constructed, but all branch lengths are NA. We also tried each source chronogram independently, with the Dated OToL and with each other, as a form of cross validation in Table 2. This is not working perfectly yet, but we are developing new ways to use all calibrations efficiently.

Table 2: Was it successful to use each source chronogram independently as calibration (CalibN) against the Dated Open Tree of Life (dOToL) and each other (ChronoN)?

	dOToL	Chr1	Chr2	Chr3	Chr4	Chr5	Chr6	Chr7	Chr8	Chr9	Chr10	Chr11	Chr12	Chr13
Calib1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib2	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib3	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib4	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib5	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib6	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib7	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib8	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib9	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib10	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib11	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib12	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Calib13	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

III. Simulate data

An alternative to generate a dated tree from a set of taxa is to take the available information and simulate into it the missing data. We will take the median and sdm summary chronograms to date the Synthetic tree of Life:

References

Appendix

The following species were completely absent from the chronogram data base: *Acanthis cabaret*, *Acanthis rostrata*, *Akialoa ellisiana*, *Akialoa lanaiensis*, *Akialoa obscura*, *Buarremon apertus*, *Bucanetes crassirostris*, *Calcarius coloratus*, *Cardinalis carneus*, *Cardinalis peninsulae*, *Carduelis ankoberensis*, *Carduelis elegans*, *Carduelis ultima*, *Carpodacus beicki*, *Carpodacus davidianus*, *Carpodacus deserticolor*, *Carpodacus dubius*, *Carpodacus formosanus*, *Carpodacus henrici*, *Carpodacus longirostris*, *Carpodacus lucifer*, *Carpodacus portenkoi*, *Carpodacus rhodopeplus*, *Carpodacus roseatus*, *Carpodacus rubicundus*, *Carpodacus stoliczkae*, *Carpodacus verreauxii*, *Carpodacus waltoni*, *Caryothraustes brasiliensis*, *Caryothraustes scapularis*, *Chaunoproctus ferreorostris*, *Chloridops kona*, *Chloris heinrichi*, *Chloris turkestanica*, *Chrysocorythus mindanensis*, *Ciridops anna*, *Coccothraustes japonicus*, *Coccothraustes migratorius*, *Corytus rhenana*, *Crithagra albifrons*, *Crithagra ankoberensis*, *Crithagra buehneri*, *Crithagra canicapilla*, *Crithagra capistrata*, *Crithagra concolor*, *Crithagra deserti*, *Crithagra doddsoni*, *Crithagra flavigula*, *Crithagra frontalis*, *Crithagra granti*, *Crithagra hewitti*, *Crithagra hildegardeae*, *Crithagra kikuyensis*, *Crithagra koliensis*, *Crithagra leucoptera*, *Crithagra marshalli*, *Crithagra menachensis*, *Crithagra montanorum*, *Crithagra mozambica*, *Crithagra reichenowi*, *Crithagra rothschildi*, *Crithagra rufobrunnea*, *Crithagra symonsi*, *Crithagra thomensis*, *Crithagra tristriata*, *Crithagra xantholaema*, *Crithagra xanthopygia*, *Cyanerpes holti*, *Cyanerpes isthmicus*, *Cyanerpes microrhynchus*, *Cyanocompsa argentina*, *Cyanocompsa rothschildi*, *Drepanis coccinea*, *Drepanis funerea*, *Drepanis pacifica*, *Dysmorodrepanis munroi*, *Emberiza buturlini*, *Emberiza ciodes*, *Emberiza ciopsis*, *Emberiza continentalis*, *Emberiza elegantula*, *Emberiza erythrogenys*, *Emberiza flemingorum*, *Emberiza fronto*, *Emberiza kuatunensis*, *Emberiza lydiae*, *Emberiza meridionalis*, *Emberiza militaris*, *Emberiza musica*, *Emberiza neobscura*, *Emberiza nivenorum*, *Emberiza omissa*, *Emberiza omoensis*, *Emberiza orientalis*, *Emberiza ornata*, *Emberiza pyrrhulinus*, *Emberiza rufibarba*, *Emberiza ruficularis*, *Emberiza sahari*, *Emberiza semenowi*, *Emberiza sloggetti*, *Emberiza sordida*, *Emberiza vincenti*, *Emberiza zaidamensis*, *Embernagra gossei*, *Eophonia magnirostris*, *Eophonia sowerbyi*, *Erythrospiza phaenicoptera*, *Euphonia aurantiicollis*, *Euphonia carnegiei*, *Euphonia flavifrons*, *Euphonia gnatho*, *Euphonia nitida*, *Euphonia olivacea*, *Euphonia praetermissa*, *Euphonia purpurascens*, *Euphonia rufivertex*, *Euphonia serrirostris*, *Euphonia tavarae*, *Fringilla albicollis*, *Fringilla bella*, *Fringilla brissonii*, *Fringilla nortoniensis*, *Fringilla palmarum*, *Fringilla polatzeki*, *Fringilla syriaca*, *Fringillaria goslingi*, *Fringillaria poliopleura*, *Haemorhous californicus*, *Haemorhous griscomi*, *Hemignathus affinis*, *Hemignathus hanapepe*, *Hemispingus castaneicollis*, *Hemispingus macrophrys*, *Hemispingus ochraceus*, *Hemispingus urubambae*, *Hesperiphona abeillei*, *Hesperiphona cobanensis*, *Hesperiphona montana*, *Himatione fraithii*, *Leucosticte brunneonucha*, *Leucosticte wallowa*, *Leucosticte walteri*, *Linaria harterti*, *Linaria johannis*, *Linaria rufostriata*, *Linaria yemenensis*, *Linurgus kilimensis*, *Loxia cardinalis*, *Loxia cyanea*, *Loxia dominica*, *Loxia mesamericana*, *Loxops ochraceus*, *Loxops wolstenholmei*, *Melopyrrha taylori*, *Mycerobas melanoanthos*, *Passerina lazula*, *Passerina pallidior*, *Passerina purpurascens*, *Peucaea cohaerens*, *Peucaea ibarborum*, *Peucaea vulcanica*, *Peucedramus micrus*, *Pheucticus aurantiacus*, *Pinicola eschata*, *Plectrophenax townsendi*, *Psittirostra psittacea*, *Pyrrhula cinerea*, *Pyrrhula owstoni*, *Pyrrhula rosacea*, *Pyrrhula steerei*, *Pyrrhula uchidai*, *Rhodacanthis flaviceps*, *Rhodacanthis palmeri*, *Rhodopechys alienus*, *Rhodopechys sanguineus*, *Rhynchostruthus louisae*, *Rhynchostruthus percivali*, *Rhynchostruthus socotranus*, *Serinus huillensis*, *Spinus atriceps*, *Spinus colombiana*, *Spinus dominicensis*, *Spinus longirostris*, *Spinus nigricauda*, *Spinus oleacea*, *Spinus perplexa*, *Spinus stejnegeri*, *Viridonia sagittirostris*

This taxon's SDM matrix has some negative values in the following taxa: *Carduelis uropygialis*, *Spinus crassirostris*. This taxon's Median matrix has NO negative values.




Figure 4: Lineage Through Time plots of Fringilidae SDM summary chronograms obtained with different clustering algorithms. Not all algorithms worked with the SDM summary matrix and we are only showing here the ones that worked. Chronograms obtained from the median summary matrix are very similar to the ones shown here with all algorithms (mainFig. 2).




Figure 5: Fringilidae Species Dated Open Tree of Life Induced Subtree. This chronogram was obtained with `get_dated_otol_induced_subtree()` function.




Figure 6: Fringilidae lineage through time (LTT) plots from source chronograms and Median summary matrix converted to phylo with different methods (NJ and UPGMA). Clustering algorithms used often are returning non-ultrametric trees or with maximum ages that are just off (too old or too young). So we developed an alternative algorithm in `datelife` to go from a summary matrix to a fully ultrametric tree.




Figure 7: Fringilidae lineage through time (LTT) plots from source chronograms and SDM summary matrix converted to phylo with different methods (NJ and UPGMA). As you can note, dashed lines and solid lines from trees coming out from both types of clustering algorithms implemented are mostly overlapping. This means that removing negative values does not change results from clustering algorithms much. Clustering algorithms used often are returning non-ultrametric trees or with maximum ages that are just off (too old or too young). So we developed an alternative algorithm in `datelife` to go from a summary matrix to a fully ultrametric tree.




Figure 8: Fringilidae lineage through time (LTT) plots from source chronograms and Median summary matrix converted to phylo with `datelife` algorithm.




Figure 9: Fringilidae lineage through time (LTT) plots from source chronograms and SDM summary matrix converted to phylo with `datelife` algorithm.