

# DateLife Workflows

Luna L. Sanchez Reyes

2019-05-01

## Taxon Phyllostomidae

### 1. Query source data

There are 223 species in the Open Tree of Life Taxonomy for the taxon Phyllostomidae. Information on time of divergence is available for 170 of these species across 7 published and peer-reviewed chronograms. Original study citations as well as number of Phyllostomidae species found across those source chronograms is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Phyllostomidae source chronogram studies information.

	<i>Citation</i>	<i>Source N</i>	<i>Taxon N</i>
1.	Bininda-Emonds, Olaf R. P., Marcel Cardillo, Kate E. Jones, Ross D. E. MacPhee, Robin M. D. Beck, Richard Grenyer, Samantha A. Price, Rutger A. Vos, John L. Gittleman, Andy Purvis. 2007. The delayed rise of present-day mammals. <i>Nature</i> 446 (7135): 507-512	3	138/223
2.	Dumont E.R., Davalos L.M., Goldberg A., Santana S.E., Rex K., & Voigt C.C. 2012. Morphological innovation, diversification and invasion of a new adaptive zone. <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 279: 1797-1805.	1	141/223
3.	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	1	141/223
4.	Lack J.B., & Van den bussche R.A. 2010. Identifying the Confounding Factors in Resolving Phylogenetic Relationships in Vespertilionidae. <i>Journal of Mammalogy</i> , .	1	46/223
5.	Shi, Jeff J., Daniel L. Rabosky. 2015. Speciation dynamics during the global radiation of extant bats. <i>Evolution</i> 69 (6): 1528-1545	1	157/223

*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 25.19 to 36.3 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 Phyllostomidae. 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 Phyllostomidae have at least two overlapping species. The largest grove has 2 chronograms (out of 7 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. But, the SDM summary matrix of this taxon has no negative values.

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 Phyllostomidae 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: Phyllostomidae 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

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 Phyllostomidae 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 developping 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	Chrono1	Chrono2	Chrono3	Chrono4	Chrono5	Chrono6	Chrono7
Calibrations1	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Calibrations2	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Calibrations3	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Calibrations4	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Calibrations5	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Calibrations6	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Calibrations7	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE

### 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: *Anoura aequatoris*, *Anoura cadenai*, *Anoura carishina*, *Anoura fistulata*, *Anoura luismanueli*, *Anoura peruana*, *Artibeus aequatorialis*, *Artibeus bogotensis*, *Artibeus cf. jamaicensis*, *Artibeus cf. obscurus*, *Carollia brevicauda PS1*, *Carollia brevicauda PS2*, *Carollia monohernandezi*, *Chiroderma vizottoi*, *Diphylla ecuadata*, *Dryadonycteris capixaba*, *Glyphonycteris behnii*, *Hsunnycteris cadenai*, *Hsunnycteris pattoni*, *Lonchophylla concava*, *Lonchophylla fornicata*, *Lonchophylla orcesi*, *Lonchophylla orienticollina*, *Lonchophylla peracchii*, *Lophostoma kalkoae*, *Lophostoma yasuni*, *Micronycteris sanborni*, *Micronycteris yatesi*, *Mimon koepckeae*, *Neonycteris pusilla*, *Phylloderma stenops PS1*, *Phylloderma stenops PS2*, *Phyllonycteris major*, *Platyrrhinus dorsalis*, *Platyrrhinus guianensis*, *Platyrrhinus helleri PS1*, *Platyrrhinus helleri PS2*, *Platyrrhinus helleri PS3*, *Sturnira angeli*, *Sturnira bakeri*, *Sturnira burtonlimi*, *Sturnira koopmanhilli*, *Sturnira mistratensis*, *Sturnira soriano*, *Trachops cirrhosus PS1*, *Trachops cirrhosus PS2*, *Trachops cirrhosus PS3*, *Uroderma bakeri*, *Uroderma convexum*, *Uroderma davisi*, *Uroderma magnirostrum*, *Vampyrodes caracoli*, *Xeronycteris vieirai*




Figure 4: Lineage Through Time plots of Phyllostomidae 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).

This taxon's SDM matrix has NO negative values. This taxon's Median matrix has NO negative values.




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






Figure 6: Phylostomidae 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: Phylostomidae lineage through time (LTT) plots from source chronograms and SDM 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 8: Phyllostomidae lineage through time (LTT) plots from source chronograms and Median summary matrix converted to phylo with `datelife` algorithm.




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