



**Bold** symbols denote vector quantities. That is, *t* represents a vector of ancestral node times.

**Marginalize** over rates *r*: we are only interested in the distribution of times.

You must have known that Bayes' rule was coming sooner or later...





Rates are **conditionally independent** - any correlation between rates is due only to the fact that they all share the same lognormal prior distribution.





Full uncorrelated lognormal relaxed clock model

 $= \frac{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{t},\mathbf{r}) \ p(\mathbf{r}|\mu,\sigma) \ p(\mu) \ p(\sigma) \ p(\mathbf{t}|\lambda) \ p(\lambda)}{p(\mathbf{y})}$ 

This uses the JC69 model (the likelihood involves only branch lengths).

Is this a hierarchical model?

 $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r}, (\mu, \sigma, \lambda) \mathbf{y}$ 

## Bayesian correlated relaxed clock model

Thorne et al. (1998); Kishino et al. (2001)

#### Thorne/Kishino model

Each node in the tree has its own rate.



Both log  $r_1$  and log  $r_2$  are normally distributed with: mean = log  $r_0$ variance = vt

#### Thorne/Kishino model



by a parameter of the model that determines how correlated descendant rates are with their parental rates.

v = 0 corresponds to a strict molecular clock

large values of *v* mean less constrained rates (and correspondingly less certainty about divergence times)



## Correlated Rates

Almost all rates in this tree are predicted well by the rate of their parent, so a correlated rates or local clock model would work well.

# Bayesian random local clocks model

Drummond and Suchard (2010)





#### Random Local Clocks

Definitely not a strict clock

May be a strict clock



#### Calibrating the clock





Tip dating uses morphology to place the fossils in the tree. The morphological data thus determines the length of the edge leading to the fossil.

Ronquist et al. (2012)

#### Yule model: pure birth process





Assumes only that fossil is a descendant of the *calibrated node* 



Assume for a moment that you know the age of the fossil and the time at which the fossil's lineage attached to the tree...

Heath et al. (2014); Zhang et al. (2016) <sup>34</sup>

Given the tree, the calibrated node, the fossil age, and the attachment time, there are only **2 places** the fossil could attach to the tree



In this case, there are 3 possible attachment points





The birth-death prior model provides the probability density of each of these alternatives

Direct ancestry and ghost lineages are also possible.

**Direct ancestry** means fossil is a direct ancestor of a sampled taxon (not at the end of an unsampled lineage) **Ghost lineages** are fossil lineages that attach to other fossil lineages





MCMC is used to propose many different values of  $\cancel{1}$  and attachment points (conditional on attachment time) for each available fossil. This is in addition to proposed changes to edge-specific rates and divergence times.

The marginal posterior distribution of divergence times thus accounts, in principle, for all possible fossil placements consistent with the assumption that fossils descend from their calibrated nodes.