PAML (Phylogenetic Analysis by Maximum Likelihood)

A program package by Ziheng Yang (Demonstration by Joseph Bielawski) 1. Three inference tasks

3 analytical tasks

task 1. parameter estimation (e.g., ω)

task 2. hypothesis testing

task 3. make predictions (e.g., sites having $\omega > 1$)





InL = -2399

3 analytical tasks

task 1. parameter estimation (e.g., ω)

task 2. hypothesis testing

task 3. make predictions (e.g., sites having $\omega > 1$)

H₀: variable selective pressure but NO positive selection (M1a)H₁: variable selective pressure with positive selection (M2a)

Model 1a (M1a)



Model 2a (**M2a**)



Likelihood ratio test:									
test stat:	2 ΔI = 2($I_{\rm H1}$ - $I_{\rm H0}$)								
distribution:	X ²								
d.f.	4 - 2 = 2								

(NP = 2)

(NP = 4)

3 analytical tasks

task 1. parameter estimation (e.g., ω)

task 2. hypothesis testing

task 3. make predictions (e.g., sites having $\omega > 1$)



task 3: which sites have dN/dS > 1



review the mixture likelihood (model M3)



Bayes' rule for identifying selected sites





task 3: Bayes rule for which sites have dN/dS > 1



NOTE: The posterior probability should NOT be interpreted as a "*P*-value"; it can be interpreted as a measure of relative support, although there is rarely any attempt at "calibration".

task 3: Bayes rule for which sites have dN/dS > 1



tasks 1-3...



Software: both PAML and HyPhy are great choices for model-based inference!



This document is about downloading and compiling PAML and getting started. See the manual (pamlDOC.pdf) for more information about running programs in the package.

Downloading and Setting up PAML

http://abacus.gene.ucl.ac.uk/software/paml.html



https://veg.github.io/hyphy-site/



http://www.datamonkey.org/

2. Brief introduction to PAML

programs in the package...

baseml	for nucleotide data (bases)
basemlg	continuous-gamma for nucleotides
codeml	for amino acid & codons data
evolver	simulation, tree distances
yn00	$d_{\rm N}$ and $d_{\rm S}$ by YN00
chi2	chi square table
pamp	parsimony (Yang and Kumar 1996)
mcmctree	Bayes MCMC tree (Yang & Rannala 1997). SLOW

Running PAML programs

- 1. Sequence data file
- 2. Tree file
- 3. Control file (*.ctl)

0.002510 1.4	20014			
0.000010 0.4	00000			
50 000000 000 0	00000			
30.00000 777.0	00000			
erating by ming2				
nitial: fx= 790.04	8189			
0.08351 1.42901				
1 h-m-p 0.0008 1.5	892 53.4319 +0	CYCYYCYY		
			-	
0.002851 0.	002852 0.00	2853 0.00285	2	
/86./14/52 /86.	/146/1 /86./1	4928 /86./1481	5	
2.8509876-03	0.173050	1.552250	700.714752	
2.8510/76-03	0.173059	1 552254	786 71/072	
2.851257e-03	0.173064	1.552261	786 714775	
2.851347e-03	0.173067	1.552265	786.715034	
2.851437e-03	0.173070	1.552269	786.714792	
2.851527e-03	0.173073	1.552273	786.714784	
2.851617e-03	0.173076	1.552277	786.714819	
2.851707e-03	0.173079	1.552281	786.714959	
2.851797e-03	0.173081	1.552285	786.714638	
2.851887e-03	0.173084	1.552289	786.714695	
2.851977e-03	0.173087	1.552292	786.714803	
2.852067e-03	0.173090	1.552296	786.714769	
2.852157e-03	0.173093	1.552300	786.714804	
2.852247e-03	0.173095	1.552304	786.714764	
2.852337e-03	0.173098	1.552308	786.715002	
2.852427e-03	0.173101	1.552312	/86./14815	
2.85251/e-03	0.1/3104	1.552316	/86./14900	
2.852607e-03	0.1/310/	1.552320	/80./14/54	
2.8526970-03	0.1/3110	1.552324	/80./14922	
796 71/671 10 0 0	pre oprimar ago /1 a/g	,		
2 h-m-n 0 0050 0 2	387 30 7213		9/2	
3 h-m-p 0.0000 0.2	081 142.5083	0/2	V/ L	
4 h-m-p 0.0002 0.1	084 2.2204 ++	-C 786.707806	0 0.0035 76 0/2	
p 010002 011		- ,001,0/000		

1. sequence file (modified "PHYLIP" format)

4 20 sequence_1 TCATT CTATC TATCG TGATG sequence_2 TCATT CTATC TATCG TGATG sequence_3 TCATT CTATC TATCG TGATG sequence_4 TCATT CTATC TATCG TGATG



4 20

sequence_1TCATTCTATCTATCGTGATG
sequence_2TCATTCTATCTATCGTGATG
sequence_3TCATTCTATCTATCGTGATG
sequence_4TCATTCTATCTATCGTGATG



2. tree file ("Newick" format)





This is a rooted tree (root is degree = 2)

2. tree file ("Newick" format)





This is an **<u>unrooted</u>** tree (basal node is degree = 3)

Running PAML programs

- 1. Sequence data file
- 2. Tree file
- 3. Control file (*.ctl)

	🟦 jpbielawski — -ba	ash — 98×39	
0.083510 1.429014			
0.000010 0.400000			
50.000000 999.000000			
terating by ming2			
[nitial: fx= 790.048189			
<= 0.08351 1.42901			
1 0 0000 1 5000 50 /01	0.000000000		
1 n-m-p 0.0008 1.5892 53.431	9 +001011011		
0.002851 0.002852	0.002853 0.00285	2	
786.714752 786.714671 78	6.714928 786.71481	5	
2.850987e-03 0.173056	1.552250	786.714752	
2.851077e-03 0.173059	1.552254	786.715025	
2.851167e-03 0.173062	1.552257	786.714972	
2.851257e-03 0.173064	1.552261	786.714775	
2.851347e-03 0.173067	1.552265	786.715034	
2.851437e-03 0.173070	1.552269	786.714792	
2.851527e-03 0.173073	1.552273	786.714784	
2.851617e-03 0.173076	1.552277	786.714819	
2.851707e-03 0.173079	1.552281	786.714959	
2.851797e-03 0.173081	1.552285	786.714638	
2.851887e-03 0.173084	1.552289	786.714695	
2.851977e-03 0.173087	1.552292	786.714803	
2.852067e-03 0.173090	1.552296	/86./14/69	
2.85215/6-03 0.1/3093	1.552300	/80./14804	
2.65224/0-03 0.173095	1 552304	706.714704	
2.6525576-03 0.173090	1 552300	786 71/815	
2 852517e-03 0 173104	1 552312	786 714909	
2 852607e-03 0 173107	1 552320	786 714754	
2.852697e-03 0.17310	1.552324	786.714922	
inesearch2 a4: multiple optima?	11002024	,	
2 786.714671 10 0.0029 41	0/2		
2 h-m-p 0.0050 0.2387 30.721	3	0/2	
3 h-m-p 0.0000 0.0081 142.508	3 0/2	-	
4 h-m-p 0.0002 0.1084 2.220	4 ++C 786.707806	0 0.0035 76 0/2	

3. codeml.ctl (the infamous "control file")

seqfile treefile outfile	=	seqfile. tree.txt results.	<pre>txt * sequence data filename * tree structure file name txt * main result file name</pre>	b
noisy verbose runmode	=	9 * 1 * 0 *	0,1,2,3,9: how much rubbish on the screen 1:detailed output 0:user defined tree	2. fc
seqtype CodonFreq	=	1 * 2 *	1:codons 0:equal, 1:F1X4, 2:F3X4, 3:F61	cl
model	=	0 *	0:one omega ratio for all branches	
NSsites	=	0 * * * *	0:one omega ratio (M0 in Tables 2 and 4) 1:neutral (M1 in Tables 2 and 4) 2:selection (M2 in Tables 2 and 4) 3:discrete (M3 in Tables 2 and 4) 7:beta (M7 in Tables 2 and 4) 8:beta&w (M8 in Tables 2 and 4)	
icode	=	0 *	0:universal code	
fix_kappa kappa	=	0 * 2 *	1:kappa fixed, 0:kappa to be estimated initial or fixed kappa	
fix_omega omega	=	0 * 5 *	1:omega fixed, 0:omega to be estimated initial omega	
*ncatG *ncatG	=	* 3 * 10 *	set ncatG for models M3, M7, and M8!!! # of site categories for M3 in Table 4 # of site categories for M7 and M8 in Table	е 4

IMPORTANT NOTES:

1. Don't use exercise .ctl files for real data analysis (*they have been modified a little*).

2. Don't use your friends .ctl file for your analysis (*even if he claims it's set up correctly*)

3. The PAML lab

Statistics for Biology and Health

Rasmus Nielsen Editor

Statistical Methods in Molecular Evolution

Description Springer

 $\mathbf{5}$

Maximum Likelihood Methods for Detecting Adaptive Protein Evolution

Joseph P. Bielawski¹ and Ziheng Yang²

 ¹ Department of Biology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 4J1, Canada, j. bielawski@dal.ca
 ² Department of Biology, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom, z. yang@ucl.ac.uk

5.1 Introduction

Proteins evolve; the genes encoding them undergo mutation, and the evolutionary fate of the new mutation is determined by random genetic drift as well as purifying or positive (Darwinian) selection. The ability to analyze this process was realized in the late 1970s when techniques to measure genetic variation at the sequence level were developed. The arrival of molecular sequence data also intensified the debate concerning the relative importance of neutral drift and positive selection to the process of molecular evolution [17]. Ever since, there has been considerable interest in documenting cases of molecular adaptation. Despite a spectacular increase in the amount of available nucleotide sequence data since the 1970s, the number of such well-established cases is still relatively small [9, 38]. This is largely due to the difficulty in developing powerful tests for nonneutral evolution have been developed [33], significant results under such tests do not necessarily indicate evolution by positive selection.

A powerful approach to detecting molecular evolution by positive selection derives from comparison of the relative rates of synonymous and nonsynonymous substitutions [22]. Synonymous mutations do not change the amino acid sequence; hence their substitution rate (d_S) is neutral with respect to selective pressure on the protein product of a gene. Nonsynonymous mutations do change the amino acid sequence, so their substitution rate (d_N) is a function of selective pressure on the protein. The ratio of these rates $(\omega = d_N/d_S)$ is a measure of selective pressure. For example, if nonsynonymous mutations are deleterious, purifying selection will reduce their fixation rate and d_N/d_S will be less than 1, whereas if nonsynonymous mutations are advantageous, they will be fixed at a higher rate than synonymous mutations, and d_N/d_S will be greater than 1. A d_N/d_S ratio equal to one is consistent with neutral evolution.

●●● < > □ ■

awarnach.mathstat.dal.ca

0 1 0

C

Accessing the files

1. If you are doing the lab AT THE WORKSHOP: On the virtual machines we will be using in the 2022 workshop, there will be a symlink in your home directory named "moledata" that takes you to the course data files. There you will find directories for the various labs (e.g., MSAlab, revbayes, PamlLab, etc.).

To view the list of labs type:

ls ~/moledata

To view the contents of the Paml Lab type:

ls -1 ~/moledata/PamlLab

This will reveal the directories for each excercise:

ex1 ex2

ex3

ex4

The files are already on the virtual machine you are using. *However, you will want to run each exercise in a separate directory that you will create.* So, create a new directory. The name of the new directory is up to you, but pick something informative (e.g., ~/PAML_ex1).

To *copy* the files required for exercise 1 just type:

cp ~/moledata/PamlLab/ex1/* ~/PAML_ex1

Now you are ready to do exercise 1 within ~/PAML_ex1

2. If you are doing the lab INDEPNDENTLY of the workshop: You can do this lab by downloading all the necessary files from an archive <u>here</u>, or you can download the files individually for each exercise as you need them <u>here</u>.

Either way, it is still "best practice" to run each exercise in a separate working directory that you will create (e.g., PAML_ex1), and work with copies of the required files within that directory.

Step-by-step protocols

results "help-files"

Exercise 1 help file: This file contains an annotated <u>portion</u> of the results output by codeml for a maximum likelihood analysis of a pair of sequences. The box contains the portion of the results file that is most relevant to completing exercise 1. These lines of the output can be found at the end of the results file.



●●● < > □ □ ≡ awarnach.mathstat.dal.ca C • • • •

Exercise 1

The objective of this activity is to use CODEML to evaluate the likelihood of the *GstD1* sequences for a variety of ω values. Plot log-likelihood scores against the values of ω and determine the maximum likelihood estimate of ω . Check your finding by running CODEML's hill-climbing algorithm.



- Find the input files for Exercise 1 (ex1_codeml.ctl, seqfile.txt) and familiarize yourself with them. Pay close attention to the contents of the modified control file called ex1_codeml.ctl.
- Remember to create a directory where you want your results to go, and place all your files within it. Now
 open a terminal, move to the directory that contains your files. When you are ready to run CODEML,
 delete the ex1_ prefix (the control file must be called codeml.ctl). Now you can run CODEML.
- Familiarize yourself with the results (see annotations in <u>ex1_HelpFile.pdf</u>). If you have not edited the control file the results will be written to a file called **results.txt**. Identify the line within the results file that gives the likelihood score for the example dataset.
- 4. Now change and save the control file and re-run CODEML for a different fixed value of ω. The control file "quick guide" might be helpful here (<u>quick guide</u>). The objective is to compute the likelihood of the example dataset given a fixed value of ω. Change the control file as follows:
 - Change the name of your result file (via outfile= in the control file) or you will overwrite your previous results!

Exercise 1:

ML estimation of the $d_N/d_S(\omega)$ "by hand" for GstD1



seqfile =	seqfile	txt * sequence data filename	
outfile =	results	0.001.txt * main result file name [CHANGE THIS]
noisy =	9 ,	0,1,2,3,9: how much rubbish on the screen	
verbose =	1 ,	1:detailed output	
runmode =	-2 ,	-2:pairwise	
seqtype =	1 ,	1:codons	
CodonFreq =	3 ,	0:equal, 1:F1X4, 2:F3X4, 3:F61	
model =	0 ,	c i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
NSsites =	0 ,	c i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
icode =	0 ,	0:universal code	
fix_kappa =	0 ,	1:kappa fixed, 0:kappa to be estimated	
kappa =	2 ,	initial or fixed kappa	
fix_omega =	1,	f 1:omega fixed, 0:omega to be estimated	
omega =	0.001	¹ 1 st fixed omega value [CHANGE THIS]	
		J	
*NOTEs: a	alternate	e fixed omega values	
*omega =	0.005	⁷ 2 nd fixed value	
*omega =	0.01	3 rd fixed value	
*omega =			
	0.05	4 th fixed value	
*omega =	0.05 0.10	4 th fixed value 5 th fixed value	
*omega = *omega =	0.05 0.10 0.20	<pre>4th fixed value 5th fixed value 6th fixed value</pre>	
*omega = *omega = *omega =	0.05 0.10 0.20 0.40	<pre>4 4th fixed value 5 5th fixed value 6 6th fixed value 7 7th fixed value</pre>	
*omega = *omega = *omega = *omega =	0.05 0.10 0.20 0.40 0.80	<pre>4 th fixed value 5 th fixed value 6 6th fixed value 7 th fixed value 8 8th fixed value</pre>	

*omega = 2.00 * 10th fixed value

When you are done...

set...

fix_omega = 0 omega = 10

... now codeml will estimate the MLE for omega

plot: likelihood score vs. omega (log scale)



Investigating the sensitivity of the d_N/d_S ratio to assumptions in the *GstD1* gene

transitions vs. transversions:



preferred vs. un-preferred codons:

pai	rt	ial	codor	1	usa	g	e tab	le f	0	r t	he	Gsti	D ge	ne	e of	E	Droso	phila
Phe	F	TTT	0	1	Ser	s	TCT	0	1	Tyr	Y	TAT	1	1	Cys	c	TGT	0
		TTC	27	1			TCC	15	I			TAC	22	1			TGC	6
Leu	L	TTA	0	1)		TCA	0	I	***	*	TAA	0	I	***	*	TGA	0
		TTG	1	I	L		TCG	1	I			TAG	0	I	Trp	W	TGG	8
Leu	L	CTT	2	1	Pro	P	OCT	1	1	His	н	CAT	0	1	Arg	R	CGT	1
		CTC	2	I			CCC	15	1			CAC	4	I			CGC	7
		CTA	0	١			CCA	3	I	Gln	Q	CAA	0	1			CGA	0
		CTG	29	1			CCG	1	1			CAG	14	1			CGG	0

How to model frequencies?

example: $A \rightarrow C$

 $AAA \rightarrow CAA$ $AAA \rightarrow ACA$ $AAA \rightarrow AAC$

	Δat			
] st	2 nd	3rd	Either these
GY (F61)	π_{CAA}	π_{ACA}	π_{AAC}	empii estim
MG	π_{c}^{1}	π_c^2	$\pi_{c}{}^{3}$	

Either way, these are **empirically** estimated.

Example: $A \rightarrow C$ AAA \rightarrow CAA AAA \rightarrow ACA

$$AAA \rightarrow AAC$$

	Target			
-	CAA	ACA	AAC	NP
No bias	1/61	1/61	1/61	0
F3×4 (GY)	$\pi_C^1\pi_A^2\pi_A^3$	$\pi^1_A\pi^2_C\pi^3_A$	$\pi^1_A\pi^2_A\pi^3_C$	9
F61 (GY)	π_{CAA}	π_{ACA}	π_{AAC}	61

NOTE: There are **even more ways** to model frequencies; but these are the only one we will deal with in this lab.

```
seqfile = seqfile.txt  * sequence data filename
outfile = results.txt  * main result file name
```

```
noisy = 9 * 0,1,2,3,9: how much rubbish on the screen
 verbose = 1  * 1:detailed output
 runmode = -2 * -2:pairwise
             * 1:codons
 seqtype = 1
CodonFreq = 0
                 * 0:equal, 1:F1X4, 2:F3X4, 3:F61 [CHANGE THIS]
   model = 0
                 *
 NSsites = 0
                 *
   icode = 0
                 * 0:universal code
fix kappa = 1
                 * 1:kappa fixed, 0:kappa to be estimated [CHANGE THIS]
   kappa = 1
                 * fixed or initial value
```

fix_omega = 0 * 1:omega fixed, 0:omega to be estimated
 omega = 0.5 * initial omega value

You will evaluate 6 sets of assumptions:

Assumption set 1:	Codon bias = none;	Ts/Tv bias = none				
Control file	CodonFreq=0;	<pre>kappa=1; fix_kappa=1</pre>				
Assumption set 2:	Codon bias = none;	Ts/Tv bias = Yes				
Control file	CodonFreq=0;	<pre>kappa=1; fix_kappa=0</pre>				
Assumption set 3:	Codon bias = yes [F3x4];	Ts/Tv bias = none				
Control file	CodonFreq=2;	<pre>kappa=1; fix_kappa=1</pre>				
Assumption set 4:	Codon bias = yes [F3x4];	Ts/Tv bias = Yes				
Control file	CodonFreq=2;	<pre>kappa=1; fix_kappa=0</pre>				
Assumption set 5:	Codon bias = yes [F61];	Ts/Tv bias = none				
Control file	CodonFreq=3;	<pre>kappa=1; fix_kappa=1</pre>				
Assumption set 6:	Codon bias = yes [F61];	Ts/Tv bias = Yes				
Control file	CodonFreq=3;	kappa=1; fix_kappa=0				

Complete this table **AND Interpret your findings**

Tuble 12 . Estimation of us and u _N between <i>Drosophila</i> metaloguster and <i>D</i> , simulates OstD1 genes										
Assum	otions	К	S	Ν	$d_{\rm S}$	$d_{ m N}$	ω	ℓ		
Fequal	+ $\kappa = 1$	1.0	?	?	?	?	?	?		
Fequal	+ κ = estimated	?	?	?	?	?	?	?		
$F3 \times 4$	+ $\kappa = 1$	1.0	?	?	?	?	?	?		
$F3 \times 4$	+ κ = estimated	?	?	?	?	?	?	?		
F61	+ $\kappa = 1$	1.0	?	?	?	?	?	?		
F61	+ κ = estimated	?	?	?	?	?	?	?		

Table E2: Estimation of $d_{\rm S}$ and $d_{\rm N}$ between *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. simulans GstD1* genes

 κ = transition/transversion rate ratio

- *S* = number of synonymous sites
- *N* = number of nonsynonymous sites
- $\omega = d_{\rm N}/d_{\rm S}$
- ℓ = log likelihood score

Test hypotheses about molecular evolution of *Ldh* gene family



Each one represents a different "branch model" $H_1: \omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} \neq \omega_{C0}$ $H_2: \omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$ $H_3: \omega_{A0} \neq \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$



H₀: $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$ Null model

H₁: $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} \neq \omega_{C0}$ H₂: $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$ H₃: $\omega_{A0} \neq \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$





exercise 3:





Long-term shift: 1-clade model

exercise 3:



H₀: $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$ H₁: $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} \neq \omega_{C0}$ H₂: $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$ H₃: $\omega_{A0} \neq \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$

Long-term shift: 2-clade model

```
seqfile = seqfile.txt * sequence data filename
 treefile = tree.H0.txt * tree structure file name [CHANGE THIS]
 outfile = results.txt  * main result file name
   noisv = 9
                  * 0,1,2,3,9: how much rubbish on the screen
 verbose = 1
                  * 1:detailed output
                  * 0:user defined tree
 runmode = 0
 seqtype = 1
                  * 1:codons
CodonFreq = 2
                  * 0:equal, 1:F1X4, 2:F3X4, 3:F61
   model = 0
                  * 0:one omega ratio for all branches [FOR MODEL H0]
                  * 1:separate omega for each branch
                  * 2:user specified dN/dS ratios for branches [FOR MODELS H1-H3]
                  *
 NSsites = 0
                  * 0:universal code
   icode = 0
fix kappa = 0
                  * 1:kappa fixed, 0:kappa to be estimated
   kappa = 2
                  * initial or fixed kappa
fix omega = 0
                  * 1:omega fixed, 0:omega to be estimated
   omega = 0.2
                  * initial omega
```

 $*H_0$ in Table 3:

*model = 0

*(X02152Hom, U07178Sus, (M22585rab, ((NM017025Rat, U13687Mus),

*(((AF070995C,(X04752Mus,U07177Rat)),(U95378Sus,U13680Hom)),(X53828OG1, * U284100G2)))));

 $^{\star}\textbf{H}_{1}$ in Table 3:

*model = 2

* (X02152Hom,U07178Sus,(M22585rab,((NM017025Rat,U13687Mus),(((AF070995C, *(X04752Mus,U07177Rat)),(U95378Sus,U13680Hom))#1,(X538280G1,U284100G2)) *)));

 $^{\star}H_{2}$ in Table 3:

*model = 2

* (X02152Hom, U07178Sus, (M22585rab, ((NM017025Rat, U13687Mus), (((AF070995C

- * **#1**, (X04752Mus **#1**, U07177Rat **#1**) **#1**, (U95378Sus **#1**, U13680Hom **#1**)
- * **#1**)**#1**, (X538280G1, U284100G2)))));

 $^{*}H_{3}$ in Table 3:

*model = 2

- * (X02152Hom,U07178Sus,(M22585rab,((NM017025Rat,U13687Mus),(((AF070995C
- * **#1**, (X04752Mus **#1**, U07177Rat **#1**) **#1**, (U95378Sus **#1**, U13680Hom **#1**)
- * **#1) #1,** (X538280G1 **#2,** U284100G2 **#2) #2))));**



 $H_0: \omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$ $H_1: \omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} \neq \omega_{C0}$ $H_2: \omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$ $H_3: \omega_{A0} \neq \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$

Complete this table **AND Interpret your findings**

Table E3: Parameter estimates under models of variable *ω* ratios among lineages and LRTs of their fit to the *Ldh-A* and *Ldh-C* gene family.

Models	$\omega_{\rm A0}$	ω_{A1}	<i>W</i> C1	ω _{C0}	ł	LRT
H ₀ : $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$?	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	?	na
H ₁ : $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} \neq \omega_{C0}$?	$= \omega_{A.0}$	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	?	?	?
H ₂ : $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$?	$= \omega_{A.0}$?	$= \omega_{\text{C.1}}$?	?
H ₃ : $\omega_{A0} \neq \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$?	?	?	= <i>w</i> _{C.1}	?	?

The topology and branch specific ω ratios are presented in Figure 5. H₀ v H₁: df = 1 H₀ v H₂: df = 1 H₂ v H₃: df = 1

When you interpret your results, THINK about why these involved models are nested.

Exercise 4:

Testing for adaptive evolution in the *nef* gene of human HIV-2



LRT

1: M0 vs. M3 test for variable selection pressure among sites

2: M1a vs. M2a tests for sites subject to positive selection

3: M7 vs. M8 tests for sites subject to positive selection

<pre>seqfile = seqfile.txt</pre>	* sequence data filename			
<pre>* treefile = treefile_M0.txt * treefile = treefile_M1.txt * treefile = treefile_M2.txt * treefile = treefile_M3.txt * treefile = treefile_M7.txt * treefile = treefile_M8.txt</pre>	<pre>* SET THIS for tree file with ML branch lengt * SET THIS for tree file with ML branch lengt * SET THIS for tree file with ML branch lengt * SET THIS for tree file with ML branch lengt * SET THIS for tree file with ML branch lengt * SET THIS for tree file with ML branch lengt</pre>	hs under M0 hs under M1 hs under M2 hs under M3 hs under M7 hs under M8		
outfile = results.txt	* main result file name			
no1sv = 9	^ LOLS OF RUDDISH ON THE Screen	These trees cont	ain pre-	
verbose = 1	* detailed output	computed MLEs	for branch	
runmode = 0	* user defined tree	lengths to speed	I the	
seqtype = 1	* codons	analyses.		
CodonFreq = 2	* F3X4 for codon ferguencies			
model = 0	* one omega ratio for all branches	You will want to	estimate paths via	
* NSsites = 0	* SET THIS for M0			
* NSsites = 1	* SET THIS for M1	wien you un		
* NSsites = 2	* SET THIS for M2	own data:		
* NSsites = 3	* SET THIS for M3			
* NSsites = 7	* SET THIS for M7			
* NSsites = 8	* SET THIS for M8			
			De careful e there is a latta	
icode = 0	* universal code		De caretui: there is a lot to	
fix kappa = 1	* kappa fixed		change in this codem. ctl file	
* kappa = 4.43491	* SET THIS to fix kappa at MLE under MO			
* kappa = 4.39117	* SET THIS to fix kappa at MLE under M1		for each model.	
* kappa = 5.08964	* SET THIS to fix kappa at MLE under M2			
* kappa = 4.89033	* SET THIS to fix kappa at MLE under M3			
* kappa = 4.22750	* SET THIS to fix kappa at MLE under M7		It is very easy to miss	
* kappa = 4.87827	* SET THIS to fix kappa at MLE under M8		something, or make a mistake	
fix omega = 0	* omega to be estimated			
omega = 5	* initial omega			
			The models will run quick, so	
* ncatG = 3	* SET THIS for 3 site categories under M3		it is also apply to aboal /five any	
* ncatG = 10	* SET THIS for 10 of site categories under M7	and M8	mistakes.	
$fix_blength = 2$	* fixed branch lengths from tree file			

Complete this table **AND Interpret your findings**

Nested model pairs	$d_{\rm N}/d_{\rm S}{}^b$	Parameter estimates ^c	\mathbf{PSS}^{d}	ł
M0: one-ratio $(1)^a$?	$\omega = ?$	N.A.	?
M3: discrete (5)	?	$p_{0,} = ?, p_{1,} = ?, (p_2 = ?)$? (?)	?
		$\omega_0 = ?, \ \omega_1 = ?, \ \omega_2 = ?$		
M1a: neutral (2)	?	$p_0 = ?(p_1 = ?)$	N.A.	?
		$\omega_0 = ?, (\omega_1 = 1)$		
M2a: selection (4)	?	$p_0 = ?, p_1 = ?, (p_2 = ?)$? (?)	?
		$\omega_0 = ?, (\omega_1 = 1), \omega_2 = ?$		
M7: beta (2)	?	p = ?, q = ?	N.A.	?
M8: beta& ω (4)	?	$p_0 = ? (p_1 = ?)$? (?)	?
		$p = ?, q = ?, \omega = ?$		

Table E4: Parameter estimates and likelihood scores under models of variable *ω* ratios among sites for HIV-2 *nef* genes.

^{*a*} The number after the model code, in parentheses, is the number of free parameters in the ω distribution.

^{*b*} This d_N/d_S ratio is an average over all sites in the HIV-2 *nef* gene alignment.

^c Parameters in parentheses are not free parameters.

^{*d*} PSS is the number of positive selection sites (NEB). The first number is the PSS with posterior probabilities > 50%. The second number (in parentheses) is the PSS with posterior probabilities > 95%.

Use the "**rst file**" for model **M3** to produce a plot like this for the *nef* gene



NOTE: This is **NOT** the distribution for the nef gene

Statistics for Biology and Health

Rasmus Nielsen Editor

Statistical Methods in Molecular Evolution

Description Springer

 $\mathbf{5}$

Maximum Likelihood Methods for Detecting Adaptive Protein Evolution

Joseph P. Bielawski¹ and Ziheng Yang²

 ¹ Department of Biology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 4J1, Canada, j. bielawski@dal.ca
 ² Department of Biology, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom, z. yang@ucl.ac.uk

5.1 Introduction

Proteins evolve; the genes encoding them undergo mutation, and the evolutionary fate of the new mutation is determined by random genetic drift as well as purifying or positive (Darwinian) selection. The ability to analyze this process was realized in the late 1970s when techniques to measure genetic variation at the sequence level were developed. The arrival of molecular sequence data also intensified the debate concerning the relative importance of neutral drift and positive selection to the process of molecular evolution [17]. Ever since, there has been considerable interest in documenting cases of molecular adaptation. Despite a spectacular increase in the amount of available nucleotide sequence data since the 1970s, the number of such well-established cases is still relatively small [9, 38]. This is largely due to the difficulty in developing powerful statistical tests for adaptive molecular evolution. Although several powerful tests for nonneutral evolution have been developed [33], significant results under such tests do not necessarily indicate evolution by positive selection.

A powerful approach to detecting molecular evolution by positive selection derives from comparison of the relative rates of synonymous and nonsynonymous substitutions [22]. Synonymous mutations do not change the amino acid sequence; hence their substitution rate (d_S) is neutral with respect to selective pressure on the protein product of a gene. Nonsynonymous mutations do change the amino acid sequence, so their substitution rate (d_N) is a function of selective pressure on the protein. The ratio of these rates $(\omega = d_N/d_S)$ is a measure of selective pressure. For example, if nonsynonymous mutations are deleterious, purifying selection will reduce their fixation rate and d_N/d_S will be less than 1, whereas if nonsynonymous mutations are advantageous, they will be fixed at a higher rate than synonymous mutations, and d_N/d_S will be greater than 1. A d_N/d_S ratio equal to one is consistent with neutral evolution.

MLE = 0.067



Asumptions	К	S	Ν	$d_{\rm S}$	$d_{ m N}$	ω	l
Fequal, $\kappa = 1$	1.0	152.9	447.1	0.0776	0.0213	0.274	-927.18
Fequal, κ = estimated	1.88	165.8	434.2	0.0221	0.0691	0.320	-926.28
$F3 \times 4$, $\kappa = 1$	1.0	70.6	529.4	0.1605	0.0189	0.118	-844.51
F3×4, κ = estimated	2.71	73.4	526.6	0.1526	0.0193	0.127	-842.21
F61, $\kappa = 1$	1.0	40.5	559.5	0.3198	0.0201	0.063	-758.55
F61, κ = estimated	2.53	45.2	554.8	0.3041	0.0204	0.067	-756.57

Table 1. Estimation of $d_{\rm S}$ and $d_{\rm N}$ between *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. simulans GstD1* genes



H ₀ : $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$	Null model
$H_1: \omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} \neq \omega_{C0}$	Episodic model
H ₂ : $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$	Long-term shift model (v1
H ₃ : $\omega_{A0} \neq \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$	Long-term shift model (v2

Parameter estimates under models of variable *ω* ratios among lineages and LRTs of their fit to the *Ldh-A* and *Ldh-C* gene family.

Models ^{<i>a</i>}	$\omega_{\rm A0}$	ω_{A1}	Ю _{C1}	$\omega_{\rm C0}$	l	LRT
H ₀ : $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$	0.14	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	$= \omega_{A.0}$	-6018.63	NA
H ₁ : $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} = \omega_{C1} \neq \omega_{C0}$	0.13	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	0.19	-6017.57	$P = 0.14^{b}$
H ₂ : $\omega_{A0} = \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$	0.07	= <i>w</i> _{A.0}	0.24	= <i>w</i> _{C.1}	-5985.63	P < 0.0001 °
H ₃ : $\omega_{A0} \neq \omega_{A1} \neq \omega_{C1} = \omega_{C0}$	0.09	0.06	0.24	= <i>w</i> _{C.1}	-5984.11	$P = 0.08^{d}$

^{*a*} The topology and branch specific ω ratios are presented in Figure 5.

 b H₀ v H₁: df = 1

 c H₀ v H₂: df = 1

 d H₂ v H₃: df = 1

Parameter estimates and likelihood scores under models of variable ω ratios among sites for HIV-2 *nef* genes.

Nested model pairs	$d_{ m N}/d_{ m S}{}^{b}$	Parameter estimates ^c	PSS ^d	l
M0: one-ratio $(1)^{a}$	0.505	$\omega = 0.505$	none	-9775.77
M3: discrete (5)	0.629	$p_{0_i} = 0.48, p_{1_i} = 0.39, (p_2 = 0.13)$	31 (24)	-9232.18
		$\omega_0 = 0.03, \ \omega_1 = 0.74, \ \omega_2 = 2.50$		
M1: neutral (1)	0.63	$p_0 = 0.37, (p_1 = 0.63)$	not allowed	-9428.75
M2: coloction (2)	0.03	$(\omega_0 = 0), (\omega_1 = 1)$ $n_2 = 0.37, n_3 = 0.51, (n_2 = 0.12)$	30(22)	0202 06
Wiz. selection (3)	0.95	$(\omega_0 = 0), (\omega_1 = 1), \omega_2 = 3.48$	30 (22)	-9392.90
M7: beta (2)	0.423	P = 0.18, q = 0.25	not allowed	-9292.53
M8: beta & $\omega(4)$	0.623	$p_0 = 0.89$, $(p_1 = 0.11)$	27 (15)	-9224.31
		$p = 0.20, q = 0.33, \omega = 2.62$		

^{*a*} The number after the model code, in parentheses, is the number of free parameters in the ω distribution.

^{*b*} This d_N/d_S ratio is an average over all sites in the HIV-2 *nef* gene alignment.

^c Parameters in parentheses are not free parameters.

^d PSS is the number of positive selection sites. The first number is the PSS with posterior probabilities > 50%. The second number, in parentheses, is the PSS with posterior probabilities > 95%.