

Resolution and accuracy in Congreve & Lamsdell matrices

Martin R. Smith martin.smith@durham.ac.uk


2019-11-20

Contents


0.1	Summary	1
0.2	Trees 1–10	2
0.3	Trees 11–20	5
0.4	Trees 21–30	8
0.5	Trees 31–40	11
0.6	Trees 41–50	14
0.7	Trees 51–60	17
0.8	Trees 61–70	20
0.9	Trees 71–80	23
0.10	Trees 81–90	26
0.11	Trees 91–100	29
	References	31


This page depicts the analytical results of all 100 matrices generated by Congreve & Lamsdell [1] using a ternary plotting approach [2], with quartets and partitions used as distance metrics.

0.1 Summary





0.2 Trees 1–10









Dataset 5: CI=0.26





Dataset 6: CI=0.26




Dataset 7: CI=0.27






Dataset 8: CI=0.25








Dataset 9: CI=0.24




Dataset 10: CI=0.29





0.3 Trees 11–20









Dataset 15: CI=0.25




Dataset 16: CI=0.25









Dataset 17: CI=0.27





Dataset 18: CI=0.28







0.4 Trees 21–30









Dataset 25: CI=0.28




Dataset 26: CI=0.27




Dataset 27: CI=0.26





Dataset 28: CI=0.27








Dataset 29: CI=0.29




Dataset 30: CI=0.25





0.5 Trees 31–40









Dataset 35: CI=0.25




Dataset 36: CI=0.24




Dataset 37: CI=0.26




Dataset 38: CI=0.29









Dataset 39: CI=0.25




Dataset 40: CI=0.24





0.6 Trees 41–50









Dataset 45: CI=0.27




Dataset 46: CI=0.24




Dataset 47: CI=0.29






Dataset 48: CI=0.27








Dataset 49: CI=0.28






Dataset 50: CI=0.25






0.7 Trees 51–60






Dataset 51: CI=0.3





Dataset 52: CI=0.25




Dataset 53: CI=0.25






Dataset 54: CI=0.28











Dataset 55: CI=0.28





Dataset 56: CI=0.31




Dataset 57: CI=0.25






Dataset 58: CI=0.25








Dataset 59: CI=0.26




Dataset 60: CI=0.24






0.8 Trees 61–70











Dataset 65: CI=0.25





Dataset 66: CI=0.27









Dataset 67: CI=0.26





Dataset 68: CI=0.31







0.9 Trees 71–80









Dataset 75: CI=0.24




Dataset 76: CI=0.26




Dataset 77: CI=0.28






Dataset 78: CI=0.24








Dataset 79: CI=0.24




Dataset 80: CI=0.27






0.10 Trees 81–90











Dataset 85: CI=0.27





Dataset 86: CI=0.27









Dataset 87: CI=0.23





Dataset 88: CI=0.25







0.11 Trees 91–100









Dataset 95: CI=0.24




Dataset 96: CI=0.26




Dataset 97: CI=0.27



Dataset 98: CI=0.26





References

1. Congreve CR, Lamsdell JC. 2016 Implied weighting and its utility in palaeontological datasets: a study using modelled phylogenetic matrices. *Palaeontology* **59**, 447–465. (doi:10.1111/pala.12236)
2. Smith MR. 2019 Bayesian and parsimony approaches reconstruct informative trees from simulated morphological datasets. *Biology Letters* **15**, 20180632. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2018.0632)