## Your perspective

The absence of a formal reporting standard for phylogenetic analyses is a major impediment for digital access and reuse of published gene trees and species trees. Efforts are underway to develop a standard for Minimal Information About Phylogenetic Analyses (MIAPA). An important part of this process is community input on metadata - what is important for use and evaluation, and what is reasonable to expect from producers of trees?

Results from this survey will inform two efforts: the collection of digital phylogenetic data for Open Tree of Life (http://opentreeoflife.org) and the development of a minimum information standard for reporting phylogenetic analyses (MIAPA, http://www.evoio.org/wiki/MIAPA). If you have any questions, please contact Karen Cranston, National Evolutionary Synthesis Center (karen.cranston@nescent.org).

<ul><li>Are you a producer of trees or a user of trees, or both</li><li>Producer of trees: you infer phylogenies, publish</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>User of trees: you view phylogenies, interpret the</li> <li>e.g., ancestral reconstruction</li> </ul>	em, or use them as inputs for computations,
Both producer and user of trees	
What is your career stage?	
Graduate student	
O Postdoctoral fellow	
○ Faculty	
Other	
Select 1-2 terms that best describe your field of study	У
☐ Systematics	☐ Biodiversity informatics
☐ Phylogenetic methods	□Taxonomy
☐ Biogeography	☐ Genomics / metagenomics
□ Ecology	Other

## INTERPRETING and EVALUATING TREES

Please order the following metadata by how important it is to interpret, evaluate, and use trees produced by others.

CRITICAL = without this information, you would not (or could not) use a tree IMPORTANT = it would make use much easier, or allow use with more confidence USEFUL = could think of uses for this data, but I would use a tree without it

	Critical	Important	Useful	
Informative text labels that identify the entity at the tips of the tree	0	0	0	
Identifiers that link a tip to an entity in some external taxonomy	0	0	0	

Comments about any of the above elements for evaluating trees? Are there elements missing from this list that you would want with a tree?

1	٦
1	-1
1	-1
1	-
1	-1
1	J

## **PUBLISHING and ARCHIVING TREES**

Thinking about archiving or databasing your trees to make them accessible to other scientists, please categorize the following metadata in terms of how difficult it would be for you to provide.

**EASY** = included in the standard input or output files for your analysis.

MEDIUM = data readily available, but you would need to enter this separately from the input / output files DIFFICULT = you would have to search for this information and / or would not generally be available for you data

Easy	Medium	Difficult
<b>,</b>		

Informative text labels that	Qualtrics Survey So	ntware	
identify the entity at the tips of the tree	0	0	0
Identifiers that link a tip to an entity in some external taxonomy or database	0	0	0
The source of biological material (tissue, specimen, etc) for data at the tips	0	0	0
Rooted vs unrooted topology	$\circ$	$\bigcirc$	$\circ$
Type of tree estimate: maximum- likelihood, majority-rule consensus, etc.	0	0	0
Geographic coordinates indicating where specimens were collected	0	0	0
Branch lengths	$\circ$	$\circ$	$\circ$
Units for branch lengths (time, expected # of substitutions, etc)	0	$\circ$	$\circ$
Data matrix used to infer the tree	$\circ$		$\bigcirc$
What method was used to infer the tree (likelihood, parsimony, distance, bayesian, etc)	0	0	0
Name and version of software used to infer the tree	0	0	$\circ$
Input parameters used to infer the tree	0	$\circ$	$\circ$
Support values	$\circ$		$\bigcirc$
Type of support values (bootstrap, bayesian, etc)	0	0	0
Full list of samples used to calculate support values	0	0	0
Alignment method (progressive, iterative, HMM, etc)	0	0	0
Name and version of software used to align sequences	0	0	0
Input parameters used to align the data	0	0	0
Was alignment manually adjusted?	$\circ$		