* O’Reilly et al. 2016 [5] acknowledge that accuracy comes at the expense of precision, but strongly imply that accuracy is the principle criterion by which methods should be evaluated
* Puttick et al. 2017 [7]
  + Define accuracy as “lowest RF distance” – even though RF distance reflects both accuracy and resolution.
  + Find that ‘accurate’ models accomplish less resolution.
  + Equate “best” with “most accurate” (= lowest RF distance)
  + Implicitly contend that models should be selected based only on their accuracy (= RF distance)
* Brown et al [10]
  + Use RF as a proxy for accuracy. (It is not.)
  + Show that collapsing edges with bootstrap support of < 50% reduces the resolution of the MLE tree and increase its ‘accuracy’, and contend that the same issue affects PEA’s treatment of parsimony
* Puttick et al [12] response to Brown et al continues to equate “more accurate” with “better”.
* O’Reilly et al. 2017 [9]
  + “incorporate measures of clade support”
  + Note that accuracy (RF distance) can be increased by collapsing poorly supported nodes
  + persist in using accuracy as the criterion for model selection
* Puttick et al. 2018 [6]
  + Performance is equated with accuracy (RF distance), once again
  + Nodes with support of < 0.95 and 0.5 (even though this number measns different things if it’s a bootstrap or a post prob) were collapsed
* Goloboff et al. 2018 [2]
  + Use alternatives to the Rf distance, though still partition-based
  + Points out that collapsing the weakest nodes improves accuracy