Dear colleagues,

We our submitting our Research Article, “Potential survival of some, but not all, diversification methods.” Methods for understanding diversification rates through time have long been popular in evolutionary biology, despite concerns raised just a year after they appeared; those concerns were amplified by a paper by Louca and Pennell in 2020. In our manuscript, we examine best practices in the field in the light of such concerns and point out some additional problems and, in some cases, potential solutions. One thing we emphasize is the need for examining uncertainty in parameter estimates.

This has been a preprint on EcoRxiv since 2021 (<https://ecoevorxiv.org/repository/view/3912/>). It has gone through two rounds of peer review at *Evolution*, where it took seven months in total. We modified the document, including additional analyses, due to suggestions from the associate editor, Dan Rabosky, and two anonymous reviewers. We would like to have this paper finally formally published so as to better contribute to the discussion on diversification methods, especially given some journals’ reluctance to cite preprints properly. The new eLife format is perfect for this.

One other note: we discuss in the manuscript work by Louca and Pennell (2020) and Condamine et al. (2020). We always worry about handling others’ work unfairly, so one thing we try to do is reach out to authors for their feedback (disagreeing on points can be healthy, but not if it is due to us misunderstanding or misinterpreting others’ work). Pennell has praised our manuscript and has clearly looked through it. We emailed Condamine in November 2021 with a preprint and a brief but not substantive email exchange – it is not clear that he or the rest of the authors on that paper have read through our preprint in detail (and of course they could have been some of the anonymous reviewers).