Distance-Based Approaches to Inferring Phylogenetic Trees

BMI/CS 576 www.biostat.wisc.edu/bmi576.html Mark Craven craven@biostat.wisc.edu

Representing distances in rooted and unrooted trees

dist(A,C) = 8dist(A,D) = 5



distances represented by summed <u>height</u> of edges to reach common ancestor



distances represented by summed <u>length</u> of edges to reach common ancestor

Distance-based approaches

- **given**: an $n \times n$ matrix M where M_{ij} is the distance between taxa *i* and *j*
- do: build an edge-weighted tree such that the distances between leaves *i* and *j* correspond to M_{ii}



Where do we get distances?

commonly obtained from sequence alignments

 $f_{ij} = \frac{\text{#mismatches}}{\text{#matches} + \text{#mismatches}}$

in alignment of sequence *i* with sequence *j*

 $dist(i, j) = f_{ij}$

• to correct for multiple substitutions at a single position:

$$\operatorname{dist}_{\operatorname{Jukes-Cantor}}(i,j) = -\frac{3}{4}\ln\left(1 - \frac{4}{3}f_{ij}\right)$$

Distance metrics

properties of a distance metric

 $dist(x_i, x_j) \ge 0$ $dist(x_i, x_i) = 0$ $dist(x_i, x_j) = dist(x_j, x_i)$ $dist(x_i, x_j) \le dist(x_i, x_k) + dist(x_k, x_j)$

The molecular clock hypothesis

- In the 1960s, sequence data were accumulated for small, abundant proteins such as globins, cytochromes c, and fibrinopeptides. Some proteins appeared to evolve slowly, while others evolved rapidly.
- Linus Pauling, Emanuel Margoliash and others proposed the hypothesis of a molecular clock: For every given protein, the rate of molecular evolution is approximately constant in all evolutionary lineages



The molecular clock assumption & ultrametric data

- the molecular clock assumption is not generally true: selection pressures vary across time periods, organisms, genes within an organism, regions within a gene
- if it does hold, then the data is said to be *ultrametric*

The molecular clock assumption & ultrametric data

 ultrametric data: for any triplet of sequences, *i*, *j*, *k*, the distances are either all equal, or two are equal and the remaining one is smaller



The UPGMA method

(Unweighted Pair Group Method using Arithmetic Averages)

- given ultrametric data, UPGMA will reconstruct the tree T that is consistent with the data
- basic idea:
 - iteratively pick two taxa/clusters and merge them
 - create new node in tree for merged cluster
- distance d_{ij} between clusters C_i and C_j of taxa is defined as

$$d_{ij} = \frac{1}{|C_i || C_j |} \sum_{p \in C_i, q \in C_j} d_{pq}$$

(avg. distance between pairs of taxa from each cluster)

UPGMA algorithm

assign each taxon to its own cluster define one leaf for each taxon; place it at height 0 while more than two clusters determine two clusters i, j with smallest d_{ij} define a new cluster $C_k = C_i \cup C_j$ define a node k with children i and j; place it at height $d_{ij}/2$ replace clusters i and j with kcompute distance between k and other clusters join last two clusters, i and j, by root at height $d_{ij}/2$

UPGMA

- given a new cluster C_k formed by merging C_i and C_j
- we can calculate the distance between C_k and any other cluster C_l as follows

$$d_{kl} = \frac{d_{il} |C_i| + d_{jl} |C_j|}{|C_i| + |C_j|}$$



0

merges

BC

final state



Neighbor joining

- unlike UPGMA
 - doesn't make molecular clock assumption
 - produces unrooted trees
- does assume additivity: distance between pair of leaves is sum of lengths of edges connecting them
- like UPGMA, constructs a tree by iteratively joining subtrees
- two key differences
 - how pair of subtrees to be merged is selected on each iteration
 - how distances are updated after each merge

Picking pairs of nodes to join in NJ

- at each step, we pick a pair of nodes to join; should we pick a pair with minimal d_{ii} ?
- suppose the real tree looks like this and we're picking the first pair of nodes to join?



$$d_{AB} = 0.3$$

$$d_{AC} = 0.5$$

 wrong decision to join A and B: need to consider distance of pair to other leaves

Picking pairs of nodes to join in NJ

• to avoid this, pick pair to join based on D_{ij} [Saitou & Nei '87; Studier & Keppler '88]

$$D_{ij} = d_{ij} - (r_i + r_j)$$

$$r_i = \frac{1}{|L| - 2} \sum_{k \in L} d_{ik}$$

where L is the set of leaves

Updating distances in neighbor joining

• given a new internal node *k*, the distance to another node *m* is given by:

Updating distances in neighbor joining

 can calculate the distance from a leaf to its parent node in the same way



Updating distances in neighbor joining

 we can generalize this so that we take into account the distance to <u>all</u> other leaves

$$d_{ik} = \frac{1}{2}(d_{ij} + r_i - r_j)$$

where

$$r_i = \frac{1}{|L| - 2} \sum_{m \in L} d_{im}$$

and L is the set of leaves

this is more robust if data aren't strictly additive

Neighbor joining algorithm

define the tree T = set of leaf nodes L = Twhile more than two subtrees in Tpick the pair *i*, *j* in *L* with minimal D_{ij}

add to T a new node k joining i and j determine new distances

$$d_{ik} = \frac{1}{2} \left(d_{ij} + r_i - r_j \right)$$

$$d_{jk} = d_{ij} - d_{ik}$$

$$d_{km} = \frac{1}{2} \left(d_{im} + d_{jm} - d_{ij} \right) \text{ for all other } m \text{ in } L$$

remove *i* and *j* from *L* and insert *k* (treat it like a leaf) join two remaining subtrees, *i* and *j* with edge of length d_{ii}

Testing for additivity

• for every set of four leaves, *i*, *j*, *k*, and *l*, two of the distances $d_{ij} + d_{kl}$, $d_{ik} + d_{jl}$ and $d_{il} + d_{jk}$ must be equal and not less than the third



Rooting trees

- finding a root in an unrooted tree is sometimes accomplished by using an *outgroup*
- outgroup: a species known to be more distantly related to remaining species than they are to each other
- edge joining the outgroup to the rest of the tree is best candidate for root position



Comments on distance-based methods

- if the given distance data is ultrametric (and these distances represent real distances), then UPGMA will identify the correct tree
- if the data is additive (and these distances represent real distances), then neighbor joining will identify the correct tree
- otherwise, the methods may not recover the correct tree, but they may still be reasonable heuristics
- neighbor joining is commonly used