Anchored Phylogenomics of Angiosperms I:

Assessing the Robustness of Phylogenetic Estimates

Chris Buddenhagen*[1,16], Alan R. Lemmon*[2,17], Emily Moriarty Lemmon[1,18], Jeremy Bruhl[3,19],

Jennifer Cappa[4,20], Wendy L. Clement[5,21], Michael J. Donoghue[6,22], Erika J. Edwards[7,23], Andrew

L. Hipp[8,24], Michelle Kortyna[1,25], Nora Mitchell[9,26], Abigail Moore[10,27], Christina J. Prychid[3,11,28],

Maria C. Segovia-Salcedo[12,29], Mark P. Simmons[13,30], Pamela S. Soltis[14,31], Stefan Wanke[15,32],

and Austin Mast[1,33]

*Co-first authors

[1] *Department of Biological Science, Florida State University, 319 Stadium Dr., P.O. Box*
3064295, Tallahassee, FL, 32306-4295;
[2] *Department of Scientific Computing, Florida State University, Dirac Science Library,*
Tallahassee, FL, 32306-4102;
[3] *School of Environmental & Rural Science, University of New England, Armidale, NSW,*
Australia, 2351;
[4] *Department of Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1878;*
[5] *The College of New Jersey, 200 Pennington rd, Ewing, NJ 08628*
[6] *Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Yale University, PO Box 208105, New*
Haven, CT 06520
[7] *Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912*
[8] *The Morton Arboretum, 4100 Illinois Rte 53, Lisle, IL 60532*
[9] *Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Connecticut, 75 North*
Eagleville Rd, U-3043, Storrs, CT 06269-3043
[10] *Oklahoma Biological Survey and Department of Microbial and Plant Biology, University of*
Oklahoma, 770 Van Vleet Oval, Norman, OK 73019-6131
[11] *Comparative Plant and Fungal Biology, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Richmond, Surrey,*
United Kingdom, TW9 3DS
[12] *Departamento de Ciencias de la vida y Agricultura, Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas*
ESPE. Av. General Rumiñahui s/n. Sangolquí, Ecuador. PO-BOX 171-5-231B
[13] *Department of Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1878*
[14] *Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Dickinson Hall, Gainesville, FL*
32611
[15] *Institut für Botanik, Technische Universität Dresden, D-01062 Dresden, Germany*

36
[16] cbuddenhagen@gmail.com, [17] alemmon@fsu.edu,
[18] chorusfrog@bio.fsu.edu, [19] jbruhl@une.edu.au, [20] jjlarson@rams.colostate.edu, [21]
clementw@tcnj.edu
[22] michael.donoghue@yale.edu, [23] erika_edwards@brown.edu, [24] ahipp@mortonarb.org, [25]
mk09g@my.fsu.edu, [26] nora.mitchell@uconn.edu, [27] abigail.j.morre@ou.edu, [28]
C.Prychid@kew.org, [29] mcsegovia@espe.edu.ec, [30] Mark.Simmons@colostate.edu, [31]
psoltis@flmnh.ufl.edu, [32] stefan.wanke@tu-dresden.de
[33] amast@bio.fsu.edu
45
Corresponding Author:
Alan R. Lemmon
Department of Scientific Computing
Florida State University
Dirac Science Library
Tallahassee, FL, 32306-4102
Email: alemmon@fsu.edu
Phone: (850)-445-8946
54

ABSTRACT

An important goal of the angiosperm systematics community has been to develop a shared

approach to molecular data collection, such that phylogenomic data sets from different focal

clades can be combined for meta-studies across the entire group. Although significant progress

has been made through efforts such as DNA barcoding, transcriptome sequencing, and whole-

plastid sequencing, the community current lacks a cost efficient methodology for collecting

nuclear phylogenomic data across all angiosperms. Here, we leverage genomic resources from

43 angiosperm species to develop enrichment probes useful for collecting ~500 loci from non-

model taxa across the diversity of angiosperms. By taking an anchored phylogenomics approach,

in which probes are designed to represent sequence diversity across the group, we are able to

efficiently target loci with sufficient phylogenetic signal to resolve deep, intermediate, and

shallow angiosperm relationships. After demonstrating the utility of this resource, we present a

method that generates a heat map for each node on a phylogeny that reveals the sensitivity of

support for the node across analysis conditions, as well as different locus, site, and taxon

schemes. Focusing on the effect of locus and site sampling, we use this approach to statistically

evaluate relative support for the alternative relationships among eudicots, monocots, and

magnoliids. Although the results from supermatrix and coalescent analyses are largely consistent

across the tree, we find support for this deep relationship to be more sensitive to the particular

choice of sites and loci when a supermatrix approach as employed. Averaged across analysis

approaches and data subsampling schemes, our data support a eudicot-monocot sister

relationship, which is supported by a number of recent angiosperm studies.

KEYWORDS: hybrid enrichment, probe set, phylogenetic informativeness, nuclear loci, eudicots,

monocots, magnoliids

78   A longstanding aim of angiosperm systematists has been to develop a unified approach to

79 data collection across the entire clade. Previous efforts have demonstrated the importance of

80 community coordination (e.g., *rbcL* sequencing; Chase et al. 1993). As the systematics

81 community moves into the genomics era, however, new technologies are enabling researchers to

82 transition from targeting a small number of primarily organellar loci, to targeting hundreds or

83 thousands of loci that are both broadly distributed across the genome and broadly homologous

84 across deep clades (Mamanova et al. 2010; Griffin et al. 2011; Crawford et al. 2012; Cronn et al.

85 2012; Lemmon and Lemmon 2013; Davis et al. 2014; Wickett et al. 2014; Prum et al. 2015;

86 Wicke and Schneeweiss 2015). Although progress has been made in plants recently using other

87 approaches such as whole genome sequencing, whole-plastid sequencing (Ruhfel et al. 2014),

88 and transcriptome sequencing (Burleigh et al. 2011; Lee et al. 2011; Wickett et al. 2014; Zeng et

89 al. 2014), perhaps the most promising methodology to date is hybrid enrichment, which is

90 rapidly resolving many previously intractable branches across the Tree of Life (Stull et al. 2013;

91 Pyron et al. 2014; Brandley et al. 2015; Crawford et al. 2015; Eytan et al. 2015; Prum et al. 2015;

92 Bryson et al. 2016; Meiklejohn et al. 2016; Tucker et al. 2016; Young et al. 2016). This method

93 has the advantages of cost-effectiveness, high-throughput data production, and success with

94 historical specimens, such as herbarium samples (Bi et al. 2013; Stull et al. 2013; Bakker 2015;

95 Beck and Semple 2015). Hybrid enrichment is a method wherein short oligonucleotides (termed

96 "probes" or "baits") are designed to complement target loci across the genomes of a clade (e.g.,

97 vertebrates, angiosperms, etc.). The researcher can choose the number, length, and type of loci to

98 be targeted. In the laboratory, probes hybridize to genomic DNA libraries, facilitating

99 enrichment of target loci relative to the remainder of the genome. The enriched DNA libraries

100 are then sequenced on a high-throughput sequencing platform. Because of the flexible and

customizable nature of the method, hybrid enrichment has the potential to unify data collection

for many different types of research questions across angiosperms.

Some versions of hybrid enrichment are generally less appropriate than others for

phylogenetic studies in plants. For example, the "UCE" method, as originally defined (Faircloth

et al. 2012), utilizes thousands of relatively-short ultraconserved elements scattered across the

genome as target regions. The use of UCEs in plants may be limited because appear to be scarce

in plants compared to other systems (6 non-repetitive, invariant UCEs in plants vs. 1120 in

animals; Reneker et al. 2012). An alternative method, Anchored Hybrid Enrichment (AHE;

Lemmon et al. 2012; Lemmon and Lemmon 2013), ensures high enrichment efficiency by

leveraging genomic and transcriptomic resources to develop probe sets that reflect the natural

sequence variation occurring across a clade. By incorporating probes reflecting this phylogenetic

diversity, regions with moderate levels of sequence variation can be efficiently enriched.

Following recommendations from simulation studies (Leaché and Rannala 2011), this method

incorporates a moderate number (~500-1000) of moderately-conserved target loci. Thus, the

phylogenetic information content of the data sets generated is high, and the reasonable

sequencing effort required makes it affordable for researchers to collect data from hundreds to

thousands of species across evolutionary timescales. This method has been applied to diverse

taxa across the Tree of Life, leading to complete or nearly complete resolution of many clades of

different taxonomic depth, including birds (Prum et al. 2015; Morales et al. 2016), snakes (Pyron

et al. 2014; Ruane et al. 2015), flies (Young et al. 2016), lizards (Brandley et al. 2015; Tucker et

al. 2016), teleost fish (Eytan et al. 2015), frogs (Peloso et al. 2016). Given the success of AHE in

many other systems, and the success to date of hybrid enrichment efforts targeting individual

angiosperm clades (Table 1; e.g., Asteraceae, Mandel et al. 2014), the time seems ripe to extend

AHE to angiosperm phylogenetics though development and implementation of a general

angiosperm-wide enrichment resource.

Despite tremendous efforts to reconstruct the phylogeny of angiosperms, several deep

nodes continue to be debated (Soltis et al. 2011; Burleigh et al. 2011; Wickett et al. 2014;

Magallón et al. 2013). One reason for this difficulty is the large diversity in angiosperms—

estimates suggest approximately 400,000 extant species (~300,000 described; Pimm and Joppa

2015). A second reason is the limitation of many previous studies to a small number of plastid

and nuclear ribosomal markers available at the time, which do not always contain sufficient

information for resolving challenging nodes (e.g., Zimmer and Wen 2012), due to processes such

as incomplete lineage sorting and hybridization. A third reason is that many previous studies

have only presented results from a narrow set of data subsampling and methodological

conditions (e.g., Wickett et al. 2014). An especially intractable node that may be influenced by

these problems is the relationship among eudicots, monocots, and magnoliids at the base of the

angiosperms. Previous work has suggested all possible alternative resolutions of these three

clades depending upon type of data or taxa included and analysis method (eudicots-monocots

sister: Soltis et al. 2011; eudicots-magnoliids sister: Burleigh et al. 2011, Lee et al. 2011;

magnoliids-monocots sister: Wickett et al. 2014). Elucidating the true history of this group and

other difficult clades will require a more comprehensive approach that accounts for effects of

both taxa and data inclusion.

Systematists are increasingly becoming aware of the fact that although sufficient genomic

and taxonomic samplings are necessary for accurate phylogeny estimation, proper data analysis

is also critical. Accurate reconstruction requires careful navigation of a phylogenetic workflow

that is becoming increasingly complex and sophisticated (reviewed by Lemmon and Lemmon

2013). For example, evolutionary processes must be modeled adequately or estimates of

topology and branch lengths may be biased (Posada and Crandall 1998; Lemmon and Moriarty

2004; Brown and Lemmon 2007; Lanfear et al. 2012; Hoff et al. 2016). Second, proper

orthology assessment is essential to avoid including paralogous sequences (Chen et al. 2007;

Lemmon and Lemmon 2013). Third, construction of complete or nearly-complete data matrices

can be important for minimizing the potential effects of missing data (Lemmon et al. 2009;

Roure et al. 2013; Hosner et al. 2015). Finally, a particularly difficult aspect of phylogenomic

analysis is how to accommodate multilocus data with different underlying histories. The

traditional approach has been to concatenate the loci into a single supermatrix in the hope that

the signal of the true underlying species history overwhelms any discrepancies among the

individual histories of the loci sampled (Kluge 1989; de Queiroz and Gatesy 2007). More

recently, however, theory and simulation studies have shown that explicitly accounting for

incongruent gene histories (e.g., using a coalescent model or networks) can be essential for

accurate estimation of species history (Edwards 2009; Morrison 2011; Mirarab and Warnow

2015; Edwards et al. 2016). Incongruence among loci has particular bearing on angiosperm

systematics because relationships among some of the key groups change depending upon

whether a supermatrix or coalescent (species-tree) approach is employed (e.g., Wickett et al.

2014; Edwards et al. 2016; Sun et al. 2016), although it is possible that increased taxon sampling

could mitigate these effects. What is currently lacking is a framework for systematically

comparing results from different analysis conditions, while also considering the sensitivity of

these results to particular combinations of taxa and loci within the data set.

Here, we develop and test an angiosperm-wide hybrid enrichment resource for general use

by the angiosperm systematics community in order to facilitate unification of data collection and

accelerate resolution within this clade. After identifying 499 target loci with appropriate

characteristics derived from Duarte et al. (2010), we develop a robust AHE probe kit that utilizes

genomic resources from 25 genomes distributed broadly across angiosperms. We demonstrate

the value of this resource for use at deep, intermediate, and shallow scales by carrying out hybrid

enrichment across six orders and 10 plant families, and we incorporate previously published data

to estimate a phylogenetic tree of 30 of the 79 angiosperm orders (APG IV 2016). Note that our

sampling is designed to provide sufficient taxonomic coverage to evaluate the effectiveness of

the enrichment probes, not to produce a comprehensive phylogeny of angiosperms. Independent

of the phylogenetic data collection, we illustrate the potential for collecting data from functional

loci by including probes for 18 selenium-tolerance loci (Freeman et al. 2010). Finally, we present

results from a sensitivity analysis that will allow for a more systematic distinction between

robust relationships that do not require further study versus tenuous relationships that require a

more thorough investigation. Our goals are to: (1) test the efficiency of the enrichment resource

and its effectiveness in resolving phylogenies and (2) provide a novel framework for evaluating

the robustness of phylogenetic estimates and testing alternative topological hypotheses. The

hybrid enrichment resource we present here is broad both genomically (loci are selected from

throughout the genome; Suppl. Fig. 1) and taxonomically (taxa represented are distributed across

the clade) in order to provide a useful tool for widespread application in angiosperm systematics

studies. A practical demonstration of the application of this methodology to resolving difficult

nodes below the family level is provided in another contribution (Léveillé-Bourret et al., in

review).

METHODS

The primary objective of this work is to develop an enrichment kit capable of efficiently

collecting a large number of informative nuclear loci across all of angiosperms. A summary of

previous efforts to develop enrichment tools for plants is given in Table 1. Although a handful of

previous researchers have developed enrichment kits for broad taxonomic groups (e.g., eudicots),

their aim has been plastid genomes (Stull et al. 2013). Other researchers have targeted nuclear

loci, but only for specific clades (e.g., *Asclepias*, Weitemier et al. 2014). Moreover, studies

targeting nuclear loci have incidentally recovered plastid genomes as a byproduct of nuclear

enrichment (e.g., Stephens et al. 2015b; Schmickl et al. 2016), suggesting that specifically

targeting plastid genomes may be unnecessary. Our effort builds upon the effort of previous

studies by developing a general angiosperm-wide enrichment resource that targets loci of

moderate conservation distributed across the nuclear genome; we achieve this goal by including

probes from divergent lineages representing the phylogenetic breadth of angiosperms.

Locus Selection and Probe Design

Based on previous experience in vertebrates (Lemmon et al. 2012), including birds (Prum

et al. 2015; Morales et al. 2016), snakes (Pyron et al. 2014; Ruane et al. 2015), lizards (Brandley

et al. 2015; Tucker et al. 2016), fish (Eytan et al. 2015), frogs (Peloso et al. 2016) and

invertebrates, including flies (Young et al. 2016), butterflies/moths (Breinholt et al. *in press*),

spiders (Hamilton et al. 2016), and other taxa, development of an efficient enrichment kit that is

useful across broad taxonomic scales requires careful selection of loci that are of sufficient

length for probe design, relatively free of indels and introns, and of moderate conservation across

the target group. In order to meet these requirements, we began with the 959 genes identified as

single-copy orthologs among *Populus*, *Vitis*, *Oryza,* and *Arabidopsis* by Duarte et al. (2010).

Since many of these genes contain introns, we divided these genes into exons using *Arabidopsis*

annotations and retained only those that were at least 150 bp, which is long enough to contain at

least two probes at 1.25 tiling density (i.e. 90 bp overlap; Fig. 1). This process yielded 3050

exons. In order to ensure we were not targeting loci that were too divergent for efficient

enrichment, we removed exons with <55% sequence similarity between *Arabidopsis* and *Oryza*.

The remaining 1721 exons served as our preliminary target loci.

In order to ensure that we developed enrichment probes that both represent the breadth of

angiosperm diversity and also ensure that the loci captured are low in copy number across

angiosperms, we leveraged a large set of published and unpublished genomic and transcriptomic

resources. Specifically, we utilized complete genomes from 33 species across angiosperms

(except magnoliids) together with newly obtained genomic data from nine non-model members

of Poales (Table 2; Suppl. Table 1). For each of these species, we identified homologous regions

following Prum et al. (2015), using *Arabidopsis* and *Oryza* as references (>55% similarity to one

of the references was required). We identified the final 499 target loci as those present in >85%

of the 41 references species and existing in ≤1.2 copies on average. These loci are distributed

across the *Arabidopsis* genome (Suppl. Fig. 1). After selecting homologous sequences with the

greatest sequence similarity to *Arabidopsis* and *Oryza* orthologs, we aligned sequences and

trimmed the resulting alignments to the exon ends using the *Arabidopsis* and *Oryza* sequences as

a guide. Prior to probe design, we subsampled the alignments to include only 25 species that

more evenly represented angiosperm diversity. The 25 references include *Amborella*, 6 monocot

families, 11 rosid families, 4 asterid families, and 4 non-rosid and non-asterid eudicot families

(Table 2). Inclusion of this large number of references was necessary because enrichment

success is inversely related to evolutionary distance of references and target species (Lemmon et

al. 2012; Bi et al. 2013; Sass et al. 2016).

In order to test the potential for simultaneously targeting loci of known function in

addition to anchor loci, we incorporated probes targeting 18 selenium-tolerance genes. The 18

genes are candidates for the selenium-tolerance phenotype obtained from a comparative

transcriptome analysis between selenium hyperaccumulator *S. pinnata* and selenium non-

hyperaccumulator *S. elata* (unpublished data) and a macroarray study between *S. pinnata* and *S.*

albescens (Freeman et al. 2010). Selenium is atomically similar to sulfur and can be assimilated

into selenocysteine via the sulfur assimilation pathway (Terry et al. 2000). These genes include

sulfur transporters and key enzymes in sulfur assimilation. Alignments for 18 of these genes

were obtained from TAIR (Berardini et al. 2015). Following the methods described above, we

scanned genomic resources for the 25 references species for selenium homologs using

Arabidopsis as a reference. Alignments of the homologs were then constructed using MAFFT

(v7.023b; Katoh and Standley 2013) and trimmed as described above.

After masking high-copy and repetitive regions, we tiled 120 bp probes across each of the

sequences at 2.8x coverage (neighboring probes overlap by approximately 48 bp). Probes were

synthesized by Agilent Technologies (Santa Clara, CA) to develop the kit hereafter referred to as

the Angiosperm v.1 design. The alignments and probe design are available as Supplemental

Material (Dryad accession XXXX).

Taxon Sampling

Data were collected from a total of 104 angiosperm species representing 30 orders and 48

families (Suppl. Table 2). For 53 of these species (representing six orders, 10 families, and 21

genera), the Angiosperm v.1 kit was used to enrich genomic DNA for the target regions prior to

sequencing. Sequences for the remaining 51 species were obtained from low-coverage genomic

reads (not enriched), assembled transcriptomes, and assembled genomes (Suppl. Table 2).

Hybrid Enrichment Data Collection

In order to test the efficiency and utility of the AHE resource described above, we

enriched 53 samples from across the phylogenetic breadth of angiosperms following the general

methods of Lemmon et al. (2012), with adaptations made for plant samples. Genomic DNA was

extracted using the DNEasy Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen, Valencia, California, USA). The protocol

was modified following suggestions (Costa and Roberts 2014) to compensate for frequent low

yields obtained with the standard protocol. After extraction, genomic DNA was sonicated to a

fragment size of ~300-800 bp using a Covaris E220 Focused-ultrasonicator with Covaris

microTUBES. Subsequently, library preparation and indexing were performed on a Beckman-

Coulter Biomek FXp liquid-handling robot following a protocol modified from Meyer and

Kircher (2010). A size-selection step was also applied after blunt-end repair using SPRI select

beads (Beckman-Coulter Inc.; 0.9x ratio of bead to sample volume). Indexed samples were then

pooled at approximately equal quantities (typically 16-18 samples per pool), and then each pool

was enriched using the Angiosperm v.1 kit (Agilent Technologies Custom SureSelect XT kit

ELID 623181). After enrichment, 3–4 enrichment reactions were pooled in equal quantities for

each sequencing lane and sequenced on PE150 Illumina HiSeq 2500 lanes at the Translational

Science Laboratory in the College of Medicine at Florida State University.

Paired-Read Merging

In order to increase read accuracy and length, paired reads were merged prior to assembly

following Rokyta et al. (2012). In short, for each degree of overlap each read pair was evaluated

with respect to the probability of obtaining the observed number of matches by chance. The

overlap with the lowest probability was chosen if the p-value was less than 10^{-10}. This low p-

value avoids chance matches in repetitive regions. Read pairs with a p-value below the threshold

were merged and quality scores were recomputed for overlapping bases (see Rokyta et al. [2012]

for details). Read pairs failing to merge were utilized but left unmerged during the assembly.

Read Assembly

Divergent reference assembly was used to map reads to the probe regions and extend the

assembly into the flanking regions (Fig. 2; Prum et al. 2015). More specifically, a subset of the

taxa used during probe design were chosen as references for the assembly: *Arabidopsis thaliana*,

Billbergia nutans, and *Carex lurida*. Matches were called if 17 bases matched a library of spaced

20-mers derived from the conserved reference regions (i.e., those used for probe design).

Preliminary reads were then considered mapped if 55 matches were found over 100 consecutive

bases in the reference sequences (all possible gap-free alignments between the read and the

reference were considered). The approximate alignment position of mapped reads were estimated

using the position of the spaced 20-mer, and all 60-mers existing in the read were stored in a

hash table used by the de-novo assembler. Simultaneously using the two levels of assembly

described above, the three read files were traversed repeatedly until a pass through the reads

produced no additional mapped reads. For each locus, a list of all 60-mers found in the mapped

reads was compiled and 60-mers were clustered if found together in at least two reads. Contigs

were estimated from 60-mer clusters. In the absence of contamination, low coverage, and gene

duplication each locus should produce one assembly cluster. Consensus bases were called from

assembly clusters as unambiguous base calls if polymorphisms could be explained as sequencing

error (assuming a binomial probability model with the probability of error equal to 0.1 and alpha

equal to 0.05). Otherwise ambiguous bases were called (e.g., 'R' was used if 'A' and 'G' were

observed). Called bases were soft-masked (made lowercase) for sites with coverage lower than

five. Assembly contigs derived from less than 10 reads were removed in order to reduce the

effects of cross contamination and rare sequencing errors in index reads. Scripts used in the

assembly process are available on Dryad (accession XXXX).

Orthology Estimation

After grouping homologous sequences obtained by enrichment and whole genomes,

putative orthologs were identified for each locus following Prum et al. (2015). For each locus,

pairwise distances among homologs were computed using an alignment-free approach based on

percent overlap of continuous and spaced 20-mers. Using the distance matrix, sequences were

clustered using the neighbor-joining algorithm, but allowing at most one sequence per species to

be present in a given cluster. Note that flanks recovered through extension assembly contain

more variable regions and allow gene copies to be sorted efficiently. Gene duplication before the

ancestor of the clade results in two distinct clusters that are easily separated. Duplication within

the clade typically results in two clusters, one containing all of the taxa and a second containing a

subset of the taxa (missing data). Gene loss also results in missing data. In order to reduce the

effects of missing data, clusters containing fewer than 50% of the species in the taxon set were

removed from downstream processing.

Alignment and Trimming

Putatively orthologous sequences were processed using a combination of automated and

manual steps in order to generate high quality alignments in a reasonable amount of time.

Sequences in each orthologous cluster were aligned using MAFFT v7.023b (Katoh and Standley

2013), with --genafpair and --maxiterate 1000 flags utilized. The alignment for each locus was

then trimmed/masked using the steps from Prum et al. (2015). First, each alignment site was

identified as "conserved" if the most commonly observed character state was present in > 40% of

the sequences. Second, using a 20 bp window, each sequence was scanned for regions that did

not contain at least 10 characters matching to the common state at the corresponding conserved

site. Characters from regions not meeting this requirement were masked. Third, sites with fewer

than 12 unmasked bases were removed from the alignment. A visual inspection of each masked

alignment was carried out in Geneious version 7 (www.geneious.com; Kearse et al. 2012).

Regions of sequences identified as obviously misaligned or non-homologous were removed.

Phylogeny Estimation

Adequate modeling of sequence evolution is an important prerequisite for accurate

phylogenetic estimation (Hillis et al. 1994; Yang 1994; Posada and Crandall 1998; Lemmon and

Moriarty 2004; Ripplinger and Sullivan 2008; Lanfear et al. 2012; Hoff et al. 2016). Site

partitioning is one aspect of modeling that has recently gained appreciation (Brown and Lemmon

2007; Lanfear et al. 2012; Darriba and Posada 2015; Frandsen et al. 2015). When the loci being

modeled are from protein coding regions, some authors choose to partition by codon position and

remove third codon positions in order to reduce the effects of substitutional saturation (e.g.,

Breinholt and Kawahara 2013; Wickett et al. 2014; Frandsen et al. 2015). Although the anchored

loci we target here were derived from protein-coding exonic regions, partitioning by coding

position would not be sufficient because captured flanks could contain intronic and intergenic

regions that are also likely to vary both by model and rate of evolution. Moreover, the degree of

saturation and its effects on downstream analyses depend heavily on the phylogenetic breadth

and depth of sampling. Consequently, we used an agnostic approach to site partitioning that does

not rely on a prior knowledge of possible site partitions. More specifically, we used

PartitionFinder v2.0.0-pre14 (Frandsen et al. 2015), which utilizes a k-means approach to

partition sites into clusters based on similarity with respect to model of sequence evolution

(including rate). This approach produces partitioning schemes that fit alignments better than

schemes determined by methods requiring definition of *a priori* partitions (e.g., by codon

positions and locus boundaries; Frandsen et al. 2015). An added benefit to using this approach is

that it produces estimates of site-specific rates of evolution.

In order to allow for estimation of trees under both coalescent and supermatrix

approaches, RAxML v8.1.21 (Stamatakis 2014) was used to estimate gene trees from individual

locus alignments and also the concatenated supermatrix (GTRGAMMA model, partitioned as

described above, with -f -a flags). In each case, *Amborella* was specified as the outgroup, and

100 rapid bootstrap replicates were collected in order to measure support for the maximum

likelihood estimate. All other parameters remained at default settings. Species trees were

estimated in ASTRAL-II v.4.9.7 (Mirarab and Warnow 2015) using bootstrap replicates from the

RAxML-estimated gene trees.

Evaluating the Size and Variability of Flanking Regions for Family- and Genus-Level Clades

One feature of AHE is that data collected by the approach can be useful at both deep,

intermediate, and shallow timescales. Recall that in order to ensure efficient enrichment across

deep time scales, regions targeted by the enrichment kit described above consist of moderately

conserved exons. Consequently, flanking regions are expected to contain intronic and intergenic

sites that may only be accurately aligned at shallower taxonomic scales. We expect, therefore,

that the majority of flanking bases would be filtered out when the angiosperm-wide alignment is

trimmed. In order to study the effect of phylogenetic depth on the size of usable flanks, we also

performed the post-assembly analysis steps on subsamples of the taxa. More specifically, we

performed orthology assessment and constructed trimmed alignments specific to the following

clades: Cyperaceae (21 samples), Caryophyllales (5 samples), Dipsacales (6 samples), *Magnolia*

(7 samples), *Protea* (4 samples), and *Stanleya* (5 samples). The size and variation of flanking

regions for these alignments was compared to corresponding sections of the angiosperm-wide

alignment.

Assessing Robustness of Phylogenetic Estimates

Phylogenetic estimates can be highly sensitive to not only the model of evolution

assumed, but also the choice of data being analyzed (Ripplinger and Sullivan 2008; Wickett et al.

2014; Hosner et al. 2015; Simmons et al. 2016). Inclusion of saturated sites and/or outlier loci,

for example, can have particularly profound effects on phylogenetic estimates (Breinholt and

Kawahara 2013; Simmons et al. 2016). These effects can result in conflict among studies,

especially for phylogenetic relationships that are particularly difficult (e.g., the relationships

among eudicots, monocots, and magnoliids). Given this difficulty, it is surprising that more

authors do not present results from a more exhaustive exploration of the effects of their data

selection on their estimates of phylogeny.

Here, we present an approach to evaluate the robustness of phylogenetic estimates to

differential character and taxon sampling (Fig. 3; all scripts available in Dryad). Although we

focus on the effects of variation in sampled loci included, other aspects of the data set and

analysis could also be incorporated (e.g., taxon sampling). The approach begins by

independently varying two or more aspects of the data set or analysis. In this case we varied both

the sites included at each locus and also the loci included. We ordered the sites based on

evolutionary rate and the loci based on similarity to other loci estimated via gene tree distances;

then we analyzed the data with successively less variable and less distant loci included (see

details below). Data sets generated under each of these conditions were then used to estimate the

phylogeny and support values inferred using both supermatrix and coalescent approaches. The

novel aspect of this approach is the representation of the resulting support values for particular

nodes as heat maps in the parameter space defined by the aspects of the data set or analysis that

we varied.

High evolutionary rate estimates can result from alignment error, substitutional

saturation, and convergent evolution of base composition. Removal of the sites with highest

estimated rates can improve the support for the topology by removing noise from the data set

(Castresana 2000; Talavera and Castresana 2007; Xia and Lemey 2009). Removing too many

sites, however, will eventually result in loss of signal and subsequently in poorly supported

topologies. In some cases, conversely, the most rapidly evolving sites contain strong

phylogenetic signal, and so removing these sites may actually reduce branch support values.

Given the difficulty in knowing *a priori* which rate threshold optimizes this tradeoff for a

particular data set, a useful approach is to test several thresholds along a continuum. We utilized

site-specific rates estimated by PartitionFinder v2.0.0-pre14 from a concatenated matrix

containing all loci using the kmeans option (default settings otherwise; Frandsen et al. 2015).

Fourteen site inclusion thresholds along the observed distribution were then chosen based on the

following percentiles: 100%, 99%, 97%, 95%, 92%, 89%, 86%, 82%, 76%, 70%, 63%, 54%,

43%, and 31%. These thresholds progressively remove sites such that our test would be more

sensitive to high levels of site inclusion. Based on preliminary tests with this data set, we

expected phylogenetic support to deteriorate rapidly when less than 63% of sites were included.

New locus-specific alignments were then constructed based on each of these site inclusion levels,

and gene trees were estimated for each of these data sets using RAxML as described above (14

estimated gene trees per locus; Fig. 4a).

Inclusion of loci with insufficient signal can result in imprecise or inaccurate estimates of

species trees (Hosner et al. 2015; Simmons et al. 2016). Moreover, inclusion of loci with

estimated gene-tree-histories that are substantially different than the underlying species history

can also result in imprecise or inaccurate estimates of species trees (Meredith et al. 2011;

Townsend et al. 2011; Simmons and Gatesy 2015; Simmons et al. 2016; Springer and Gatesy

2016). Therefore, removal of outlier gene trees may result in more accurate and precise species

trees. As with inclusion of sites, however, inclusion of too many loci will eventually result in

reduced accuracy, precision, and support. In order to identify the level of locus inclusion that

maximizes accuracy and precision, we tested several thresholds along a continuum. For each of

the 14 sets of gene trees described above, pairwise tree distances were estimated using treeCmp

(v1.0-b29; Bogdanowicz et al. 2012), via the triple metric for rooted trees (tt option; Critchlow et

al. 1996). The resulting matrix of pairwise tree distances was visualized using multidimensional

scaling using the R package plotrix version 3.6-2 (Fig. 4b; Fig. 3; from Lemon [2006]).

Euclidian distance from each tree to the center of the trees was then used to rank the loci, with

the greatest distance (i.e., greatest outlier) having the highest rank. Fourteen locus-inclusion

thresholds were then applied: 384, 381, 374, 363, 348, 329, 306, 279, 248, 213, 174, 131, 84, and

33 loci. These thresholds were chosen to cover a broad range of locus inclusion levels, but still

allow the effects of removing small numbers of outliers to be studied. These 14 locus-inclusion

thresholds were applied to each of 14 site-inclusion thresholds described above (Fig. 4d).

Phylogenies were then inferred using each of the 196 combinations in RAxML and ASTRAL-II,

using corresponding concatenated matrices and gene trees sets, respectively.

The primary goal of the extensive analyses described above is to produce a mechanism

for visualizing the sensitivity of phylogenetic estimates to variation in site and locus inclusion.

To this aim, nodal support for trees at each filter level were estimated using the R package ape

(Paradis et al. 2004) with the "prop.clades" command, which counts the number of times the

bipartitions present in a reference tree are present in a list of trees. After selecting a reference tree

(the best tree from the full unfiltered data set), the occurrence of a clade in the bootstrap trees

was assessed for each of the 196 ASTRAL-II and 196 RAxML concatenated analyses. This step

produced support values for each combination of thresholds at each node in the reference tree.

Heat maps were then constructed for each internal node in the reference tree (Fig. 4c). Note that

alternate reference trees can be used to generate heat maps representing support for alternative

hypotheses.

Testing Alternative Hypotheses

The large number of estimates produced by the above procedure provides an opportunity

to test alternative phylogenetic hypotheses and alternative phylogeny estimation approaches

across a broad range of conditions. To demonstrate the potential for testing alternative

phylogenetic hypotheses, we focused on the relationship between eudicots, monocots, and

magnoliids that has been debated in the literature (Lee et al. 2011; Soltis et al. 2011; Burleigh et

al. 2011; Wickett et al. 2014). Specifically, support values represented by heat maps

corresponding to support for the three alternative relationships among these clades (magnoliids-

monocots sister, eudicots-monocots sister, and magnoliids-eudicots sister) were compared using

randomization tests as follows. Average support across all analysis conditions (a heat map) was

computed for each of the three relationships. A test statistic was then computed as the difference

between the mean support (across analysis conditions) for two alternative relationships. To

generate a null distribution with which to compare the test statistic, support values found in heat

map matrices were then randomized the relevant pair of matrices, while keeping the analysis

condition constant. In other words, the two support values (one for each relationship) for a given

analysis condition were randomized with respect to the matrix in which they were placed. After

randomizing, the difference between the means of the two randomized matrices was computed as

a value in the null distribution. This process was repeated 10,000 times to generate the null

distribution. To demonstrate the potential for testing support given by alternative analysis

methods, we used the randomization test described above, but instead used matrices derived

from the supermatrix (RAxML concatenated) and species tree (ASTRAL-II) analyses.

We also tested the hypothesis that support produced by the species tree approach is more

robust to variation in data sets than the support produced under the supermatrix approach (Song

et al. 2012; Edwards et al. 2016). In particular, we compared the overall sensitivity as the

variance in support values across analysis conditions, averaging the variance across nodes (a

value of zero indicates high robustness). We then computed the test statistic as the difference

between the sensitivity measure for the coalescent and supermatrix (with supermatrix -

coalescent > 0 indicating support that the coalescent approach is more sensitive to changes in

analysis conditions). Ten thousand points from the null distribution were computed by shuffling

corresponding support values between coalescent- and supertree-derived matrices, before

recomputing the test statistic.

In addition to the randomization tests described above, we performed more traditional

hypothesis tests using point estimates of phylogeny from the analyses of the full data set. The

best-constrained trees for each topology were estimated in RAxML using the -g option under a

GTRGAMMA model. The per-site log likelihoods for the three best constrained trees were

written to file and loaded in the CONSEL (v0.1i) program (Shimodaira and Hasegawa 2001).

This program ranks alternative hypotheses in order of the likelihood via p-value calculated from

the multi-scale bootstrap using several tests including the widely used Shimodaira–Hasegawa

(SH) and the approximately unbiased (AU) test (Shimodaira and Hasegawa 2001; Shimodaira

2002).

RESULTS

Locus Selection and Probe Design

The procedure followed for locus selection (Fig. 1) yielded a large number of target loci,

with minimal missing data and optimal levels of sequence variation for hybrid-enrichment-based

phylogenomics. Target probes were designed for 499 anchor loci and 18 functional loci (517 loci

in total). Alignments of sequences for the 25 reference species averaged 343 sites per target locus

(range: 124 to 2176 sites) and contained only 10% missing characters. Sequence variation in

target regions was moderate: 62% of the sites were variable, 51% of the sites were parsimony

informative, pairwise sequence divergence averaged 27%, and maximum pairwise sequence

divergence within loci averaged 39%. The probe design contained a total of 56,862 probes (~4.4

probes per species per locus; See Supplemental Materials).

Hybrid Enrichment

The probe kit developed above performed well on the 53 test samples taken from across

angiosperms; >90% of target loci were obtained for 90% of the samples (Table 3). Over 91

billion nucleotides were sequenced on the two PE150 Illumina lanes. Assemblies resulted in

recovery of an average of 470 loci (91%) with contigs longer than 250 bp. The average

consensus sequence recovered was 764 bp, more than twice the length of average probe region

(343 bp). On average, 14% of reads mapped to target plus flanking regions (i.e., were

incorporated in the assemblies). As expected, capture efficiency was lower for taxa more

evolutionary divergent from reference sequences (Fig. 5). For example, an average of only 329

loci were recovered for members of Piperales, which shares an ancestor with the closest

reference 124 million years ago (Magallón et al. 2013). In contrast, for members of Brassicales

(sharing a common ancestor with the closest reference 24 million years ago), an average of 512

loci were recovered.

Alignments

For the angiosperm taxon set, a large number of loci were retained through the post-

assembly pipeline. More specifically, 384 alignments containing orthologous sequences were

obtained (available as Supplemental Material). The final concatenated angiosperm alignment

contained 138,616 bases. In general, alignments contained a modest amount of missing data (7%

if missing taxa were excluded, 22% if missing taxa were included). The number of missing taxa

varied among loci (mean=15, range=2-40). Note for the angiosperm-wide alignments, flanks

were typically trimmed off because they contained non-homologous or unalignable bases at this

deep scale (see below for intermediate- and shallow-clade alignments). As these alignments

contain primarily probe regions, it is not surprising that final, trimmed alignments were only

slightly longer than the alignments used to design probes (360 vs. 343, respectively). Also note

that none of the 18 functional loci were retained for the angiosperm-wide taxon set.

For the intermediate and shallow-clade taxon sets, an even larger number of loci was

retained through the post-assembly pipeline (Table 3). An average of 410 alignments containing

orthologous sequences were obtained (range 189 to 540). Because they contained flanking

regions, alignments for these genus-level taxon sets were substantially longer (68% longer on

average) than those of the angiosperm-level taxon set (Table 4). Concatenated alignments

averaged 233,993 bases (107,918 to 365,941), and locus-specific alignments averaged 577 bases

(375 to 670). Remarkably, all taxa were present for each of the final locus sets, indicating that

missing data/taxa in the angiosperm-wide alignments resulted from differences in locus recovery

across families. One indication of this cause is the consistent absence of some target loci in

Piperales and Proteales, in which only 189 and 159 orthologous loci were retained, respectively.

As a result of the increased length and variability of the loci, support for the intermediate and

shallow-scale clades improved (Suppl. Figs. 2-6). Although the estimated topologies remained

unchanged, half of the nodes that did not receive full support (100% bootstrap) in the

Angiosperm-wide alignment became fully supported by the intermediate and shallow-scale

alignments.

One reason why a greater number of orthologous loci were retained for the intermediate

and shallow taxon sets is that orthology could more easily be established for duplicated genes.

For example, most of the functional locus targets contained multiple copies (average 2.16; Table

3). At one functional target locus in Proteaceae, in fact, 14 orthologs were identified. Multi-copy

loci such as these were removed from the angiosperm-wide taxon set during the

orthology/trimming process because copy number for these loci varied wildly across genera (i.e.,

multiple independent duplications resulting in these copies occurred within angiosperms).

Brassicales, in which many species have high selenium tolerance (likely due to the propensity for

sulfur accumulation and assimilation into unique sulfur-containing compounds), produced the

greater number of orthologous alignments (n=574).

Robustness of Phylogenetic Estimates

Although the majority of the angiosperm relationships were unequivocally supported

across the majority of analysis conditions, some relationships were less robust to variation in

levels of data filtering and/or method of phylogeny estimation. The robustness of each estimated

node is shown as a heat map in Figure 6, which provides not only a comprehensive view of

support across many angiosperms orders, but also a clear indication of which relationships are

only supported under specific conditions. Many nodes were well supported in all but the most

extreme thresholds for site and locus removal (i.e., >60% of sites removed and/or >60% loci

removed). Overall, support values were consistent between coalescent and supermatrix

approaches as long as more than ~100 loci were included. Nonetheless, support for several nodes

varied wildly across analysis conditions, with highest support occurring when a moderate to

large numbers of sites or loci were removed.

For the relationship of particular interest, that between monocots, eudicots and

magnoliids, support for alternative arrangements were highly dependent upon the level of site

filtering, the level of locus filtering, and also the approach to phylogeny estimation (Fig. 7).

Coalescent-based analyses supported the eudicots-monocots sister hypothesis with moderate to

high support for the majority of site- and locus-filtering conditions. Support for the other two

arrangements was almost entirely lacking, regardless of the level of site- and locus-filtering.

Conversely, supermatrix-based analyses strongly supported the eudicots-magnoliids sister

relationship when all data were included, but strongly supported the eudicots-monocots sister

relationship when 54–76% of the most rapidly evolving sites were removed.

Testing Alternative Hypotheses

Statistical tests indicated that the eudicots and monocots sister relationship was the best-

supported alternative (compared to eudicots-magnoliids sister and compared to monocots-

magnoliids sister) when results were averaged across all site- and locus-filtering levels. This

result was obtained regardless of whether a coalescent (test statistic eudicots-monocots vs.

eudicots-magnoliids = 25.09; eudicots-monocots vs. monocots-magnoliids = 52.88; $p < 0.0001$,

both tests) or supermatrix (test statistic eudicots-monocots vs. eudicots-magnoliids = 42.63

eudicots-monocots vs. monocots-magnoliids = 24.83; p < 0.0001, both tests) approach was

applied. This result may seem somewhat surprising given the inconsistent support generated by

the supermatrix and coalescent approaches for this node (Fig. 7). Recall, however, that strong

support for the eudicots-magnoliids sister hypothesis was only found in the narrow condition in

which >95% of the sites were included in the supermatrix analysis. Support for alternative

relationships of these taxa was found to be more sensitive to data filtering when the supermatrix

instead of the coalescent approach was employed (test statistic = 38.69, p < 0.0001). The

approximately unbiased (AU) test (Shimodaira and Hasegawa 2001) rejected the monocots-

magnoliids sister hypothesis (p = 0.015), but failed to reject the eudicots-magnoliids sister

hypothesis (p = 0.119).

Although estimates based on supermatrix and coalescent approaches were found to be at

odds for some of the difficult nodes for some data-filtration levels, estimates based on the two

approaches were quite consistent overall as long as ~150 or more loci were included. For

example, analysis of the full dataset under the supermatrix and coalescent approaches yielded

identical topologies within monocots and magnoliids (some topological differences were evident

within eudicots, however). Interestingly, inclusion of more than 150 loci did not appear to

improve the consistency of estimates between supermatrix and coalescent approaches.

DISCUSSION

The anchored hybrid enrichment resource developed here provides systematists with the

means to collect hundreds of phylogenomic loci for resolving species relationships across

angiosperms. By leveraging available genomic resources we have developed an enrichment

resource containing probes that represent much of the ordinal-level diversity within angiosperms,

which facilitates efficient enrichment of up to 499 anchor loci. The targeted anchor loci are

sufficiently conserved to allow enrichment in most groups within the clade, yet are still contain

enough variation to robust resolution of the large majority of nodes at a broad range of

phylogenetic scales. For instance, Léveillé-Bourret et al. (in review) demonstrate the success of

the methodology in resolving the most difficult nodes of a rapid Cyperaceae radiation involving

thousands of species. Our data indicate that resolution at intermediate and shallow scales is

improved by including sequence data from flanking regions around the probe region because the

flanks contain a greater degree of variation. Given the broad taxonomic span, this resource has

the potential to unify the field of angiosperm systematics by providing a common set of nuclear

loci that have a high level of phylogenetic information across evolutionary scales. In fact, the

angiosperm probe v.1 kit has already been widely adopted through 21 ongoing collaborations to

collect data from 87 angiosperm families for more than 2000 taxa (as of October 2016) at the

Center for Anchored Phylogenomics (www.anchoredphylogeny.com).

Our results indicate that the anchor loci targeted by the angiosperm enrichment probes

contain a sufficient amount of data to resolve relationships at a broad set of taxonomic scales.

More than 75% of the nodes in this angiosperm-wide test were strongly supported under a broad

range of conditions as long as at least 60% of the sites and 25% of the loci were included. Of the

remaining nodes, only a small minority required hundreds of loci to achieve strong support.

Léveillé-Bourret et al. (in review) found highly similar results in a tribal-level study, with the

backbone topology stabilizing and support peaking with 100–200 loci in both concatenation and

coalescent-based analyses. This pattern is not surprising given results from simulations

indicating that only a few informative loci are needed to resolve easy nodes and a few hundred

informative loci are sufficient to resolve more difficult nodes (Leaché and Rannala 2011).

Despite the robustness of support for the majority of nodes, support values for some nodes were

quite sensitive to the number of loci included, the number of sites included, and/or the analysis

approach employed (supermatrix or coalescent). In most of these cases, the support peaked when

an intermediate number of loci were included, suggesting that increasing the number of targeted

loci beyond 499 may have a small effect on the accuracy or precision of estimates. Focusing

resources on other aspects of study design, such as density of taxon sampling or increasing locus

lengths, may prove to be more fruitful (Zwickl and Hillis 2002; Betancur-R. et al. 2014; Peloso

et al. 2016; Simmons et al. 2016). For very shallow and/or rapidly-radiating groups, for example,

robust estimates may require increased locus lengths in order to ensure well-resolved and well-

supported gene trees. One approach to improve gene tree resolution for shallow-scale studies is

to extend probe regions into flanks using low-coverage genome data; based on our experience,

>15x coverage is typically necessary. We have had good success with this approach in orchids

(Gravendeel, et al., *in prep*), lobelias (Givnish et al., *in prep*), lilies (Givnish et al., *in prep*), and

goldenrods (Beck et al. *in prep*). The extended loci contain more variable regions and yield more

strongly supported gene and species trees. Extending anchor loci is often preferable to targeting

anonymous loci because inclusion of the anchor regions allows the data to also be useful for

broad-scale meta-studies.

Despite our efforts to incorporate genomic resources from across angiosperms, enrichment

efficiency could be improved further in underrepresented regions of the tree (e.g., magnoliids

and basal eudicots). Fortunately, it is fairly straightforward to improve the resource by

incorporating additional probes representing additional taxa as genomic resources become

available. For example, as part of the orchid, lobelia, and lily projects described above, we have

added probes to improve the Angiosperm v.1 kit. In each of these cases, inclusion of the

additional probes substantially increased enrichment efficiency for samples from those groups

(Lemmon et al., unpub. data).

The heat map approach representing robustness of phylogenetic estimates is useful in

several contexts. First and foremost, it is a useful means to separate nodes with tenuous support

from those with robust support. As seen with several difficult nodes in the angiosperm tree, high

support values occurring under a narrow range of conditions (e.g., no site or locus filtering) has

the potential to be misleading, since alternative hypotheses can be supported across a broader

range of conditions. Second, the approach provides a framework for testing the robustness and

consistency of alternative methods of data analysis (e.g., supermatrix and coalescent). For the

monocot-eudicot-magnoliid split, for example, our results support the claim of Edwards et al.

(2016) that the supermatrix approach has the tendency to produce confident yet conflicting

results in different regions of parameter space, although other interpretation are possible

(Simmons and Gatesy, 2016). In contrast, while the coalescent approach tends to require more

data to attain high support for a hypothesis, it has a much lower tendency to produce conflicting

results under different conditions. Given the potential for obtaining strong but unstable support

under some conditions, we recommend utilization of the heat map approach we develop here to

ensure more thorough analyses in difficult regions of the tree. Adoption of the heat-map

approach may temper the claims of systematists favoring relationships that appear to be strongly

supported yet are sensitive to analysis conditions or the particular choice of sites and loci to

include in their dataset.

We made a substantial effort to target only low-copy loci when developing the AHE

resource. Use of low-copy loci in hybrid enrichment-based phylogenomics is especially

important because probes enrich not only the target regions, but also regions with moderate to

high sequence similarity to the target regions. Paralogous gene regions will be enriched to a

degree inversely proportional to their evolutionary divergence from the target region (Lemmon et

al. 2012). In order to minimize potential error arising when enriched sequences are assessed for

orthology, we estimated copy number in 45 divergent angiosperms species prior to selecting

target loci for the Angiosperm v.1 design. Use of a much smaller set of taxa tends to result in an

over-fitting problem wherein the taxa happen by chance to each have a single copy for some

portion of loci (e.g., due to coincidental gene loss). Unsurprisingly, many of the loci previously

identified as low copy based on only four taxa (*Arabidopsis, Populus, Vitis,* and *Oryza*; Duarte et

al. 2010) were found to have a moderate to high number of copies in other angiosperm species

(Table 3). This finding largely explains why many of the initial 959 loci identified by Duarte et

al. (2010) were removed from our locus list as we refined our target set to 499 loci. The potential

for over-fitting is especially likely in taxa with a history of whole genome duplications and

subsequent gene loss (Glasauer and Neuhauss 2014) . In teleost fishes, for example,

identification of a substantial number of single-copy hybrid enrichment targets proved to be

impossible despite work by Li et al. (2007), who identified 154 putatively single copy loci. In

this case, Stout et al. (*in press*) circumvented this problem by developing a teleost-wide

enrichment kit that targets up to six homologous copies per locus and then sorting out the gene

copies into orthologs bioinformatically after sequencing. Analysis of enriched loci in teleosts and

other taxa with extensive gene duplications/losses may require simultaneous estimation of

speciation and duplication history (Cui et al. 2006; De Smet et al. 2013).

Many of the published studies utilizing hybrid enrichment in angiosperms have targeted

the plastome, either exclusively or in combination with nuclear loci (Table 1). One challenge

with simultaneously targeting the plastome and nuclear genome is overcoming the unequal

coverage resulting from the large disparity in copy number between the two genomes. Some

researchers desiring data from both genomes have mitigated the coverage disparity by

performing two separate enrichments using kits designed separately for the two genomes

(Heyduk et al. 2016; Sass et al. 2016). While this approach can be successful, it is more

expensive and time consuming than AHE, and it also requires some knowledge of approximate

plastid copy number. An alternative approach that has only recently been discovered is to take

advantage of the fact that enrichment of nuclear targets is not perfectly efficient. Since some

fraction of the sequenced library fragments are from off-target regions, it is reasonable to expect

that some portion of this by-catch will be derived from the plastid genome. Indeed, one can often

assemble whole plastid genomes from the enrichment by-catch (Weitemierx x et al. 2014;

Stephens et al. 2015a, 2015b; Schmickl et al. 2016). Although the success of this approach

depends on plastome copy number and enrichment efficiency of targeted nuclear loci, the levels

of enrichment we obtained across angiosperms (2%-22% on target; Table 3) suggest that the by-

catch of AHE in angiosperms is likely to contain sufficient plastome sequence reads to enable

reliable reconstruction of whole plastid genomes. Note, however, that this expectation may not

be met when target taxa are very closely related to one of the 25 references used to develop the

probes, since enrichment efficiency in these taxa is expected to be highest. Although

reconstruction of plastid genomes is not a focus of this study, the raw reads generated during

enrichment of the 53 taxa used in this study could be mined for plastid genomes. For example,

using a reference species from the clade as a guide, assemblies were easily constructed for the

plastid genome in Cyperaceae (Buddenhagen, unpubl. data).

The diversification of angiosperm lineages continues to be debated despite the

application of large genomic data sets and sophisticated phylogenetic models, leading some to

wonder if we are closer to resolving Darwin's (1903) "abominable mystery". Our study

demonstrates that despite the conflict in recent studies of deep angiosperm relationships (e.g.,

Duarte et al. 2010; Lee et al. 2011; Wickett et al. 2014), one hypothesis predominates (eudicots-

monocots sister) over the majority of parameter space under both supermatrix and species tree

methods of inference. This relationship is supported by the most recent studies focusing on the

plastid genome (Moore et al. 2007; Soltis et al. 2011; Ruhfel et al. 2014) and the Angiosperm

Phylogeny Group's recent synthesis (APG IV 2016). The predominance of one hypothesis is not

obvious at first glance, however, because an alternative hypothesis (i.e., eudicots-magnoliids

sister) is strongly supported under a narrow but commonly chosen set of conditions (supermatrix

with < 5% of sites removed). The placement of Malpighiales within the Malvids has also been

debated (APG IV 2016). Despite support for alternative placement of Malpighiales by the

Angiosperm Phylogeny Group, our analysis suggests robust support for Malpighiales within

Malvids across a broad range of conditions. Our heat map-based analyses of robustness

indicates that the differences between alternative studies of these and other deep angiosperm

relationships could be reconciled through more detailed exploration of the sensitivity of each

study's findings to the particular conditions under which these studies were conducted. One

especially interesting extension to the study presented herein would be to incorporate the degree

of taxon sampling into the analysis of robustness, especially with respect to inclusion of the early

branching taxa that were admittedly under-sampled in this study.

The taxa sampled in this study were chosen to allow the enrichment efficiency of the

probe kit and the phylogenomic signal to be assessed at deep, intermediate, and shallow scales.

Data from additional taxa were obtained from available genomic resources in order to increase

the coverage across the angiosperm clade. The phylogeny estimated using these samples was

useful for demonstrating the utility of the heat map approach at identifying robust phylogenetic

estimates and for testing alternative hypotheses. Nonetheless, the taxon sampling could certainly

be improved especially for basal lineages. Although the sensitivity of the phylogenetic estimates

to differential taxon sampling could be assessed using the heat map approach, such an analysis is

outside the scope of this paper, and so we leave this effort for future studies.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The anchored enrichment resource we developed provides an efficient way of obtaining a

sufficient amount of phylogenomic data for deep, intermediate, and shallow angiosperm studies.

Although most angiosperm relationships could be robustly resolved, support for a small minority

of relationships varied substantially depending on the particular subset of sites and loci analyzed,

suggesting that the sensitivity approach we developed here may helpful for avoiding false

confidence in hypotheses that supported under only a narrow set of conditions. Use of this

holistic approach may enable systematists to reconcile differences across studies as they work

towards a unified understanding the history of angiosperm diversification.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Alyssa Bigelow, Kirby Birch, Ameer Jalal, and Sean Holland at FSU's

Center for Anchored Phylogenomics for assistance with molecular data collection and

bioinformatics analysis. We are also grateful to Roger Mercer and Yanming Yang at FSU's

College of Medicine for sequencing services. This research was partially funded by NSF DDIG

(DEB-1311150) to CEB and by a FSU Planning Grant awarded to ARM. EML acknowledges

support from NSF DEB-1120516. ARL and EML were supported by NSF IIP-1313554. CP

would like to acknowledge the generous support of the Hermon Slade Foundation, Emily

Holmes Memorial Scholarship; Hansjörg Eichler Scientific Research Fund; Systematics

Research Fund, without which research material used in this publication would not have been

collected. NM was supported by NSF DEB-1046328. SW thanks the TU Dresden and especially

Christoph Neinhuis for continuous support. AM was supported by NSF DEB-1252901 to EJE.

PSS is grateful for support from iDigBio (NSF grant EF-1115210) and a Dimensions of

Biodiversity grant (DEB-1442280).

LITERATURE CITED

APG IV 2016. An update of the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group classification for the orders and

families of flowering plants: APG IV. Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 181:1–20.

Bakker F.T. 2015. DNA sequences from plant herbarium tissue. In: Appelhans M.S., Hörandl E.,

editors. Next-Generation Sequencing in Plant Systematics. International Association for

Plant Taxonomy.

Beck J.B., Semple J.C. 2015. Next-generation sampling: Pairing genomics with herbarium

specimens provides species-level signal in *Solidago* (Asteraceae). Appl. Plant Sci.

3:apps.1500014.

Betancur-R. R., Naylor G.J.P., Ortí G. 2014. Conserved Genes, Sampling Error, and

Phylogenomic Inference. Syst. Biol. 63:257–262.

Bi K., Linderoth T., Vanderpool D., Good J.M., Nielsen R., Moritz C. 2013. Unlocking the vault:

next‑generation museum population genomics. Mol. Ecol. 22:6018–6032.

Bogdanowicz D., Giaro K., Wróbel B. 2012. TreeCmp: Comparison of trees in polynomial time.

Evol. Bioinform. 8:475–487.

Brandley M.C., Bragg J.G., Singhal S., Chapple D.G., Jennings C.K., Lemmon A.R., Lemmon

E.Moriarty, Thompson M.B., Moritz C. 2015. Evaluating the performance of anchored

hybrid enrichment at the tips of the tree of life: a phylogenetic analysis of Australian

Eugongylus group scincid lizards. BMC Evol. Biol. 15:1–14.

Breinholt J.W., Kawahara A.Y. 2013. Phylotranscriptomics: Saturated Third Codon Positions

Radically Influence the Estimation of Trees Based on Next-Gen Data. Genome Biol. Evol.

5:2082–2092.

Breinholt, J.W., Lemmon A.R., Lemmon E.M., Xiao L., and Kawahara A.Y. Anchored hybrid
enrichment in Lepidoptera: Leveraging genomic data for studies on the megadiverse
butterflies and moths. Syst. Biol. *Accepted.*

Brown J.M., Lemmon A.R. 2007. The importance of data partitioning and the utility of Bayes

factors in Bayesian phylogenetics. Syst. Biol. 56:643–655.

Bryson Jr R.W., Faircloth B.C., Tsai W.L., McCormack J.E., Klicka J. 2016. Target enrichment

of thousands of ultraconserved elements sheds new light on early relationships within New

World sparrows (Aves: Passerellidae). The Auk. 133:451–458.

Burleigh J.G., Bansal M.S., Eulenstein O., Hartmann S., Wehe A., Vision T.J. 2011. Genome-

Scale Phylogenetics: Inferring the Plant Tree of Life from 18,896 Gene Trees. Syst. Biol.

60:117–125.

Castresana J. 2000. Selection of Conserved Blocks from Multiple Alignments for Their Use in

Phylogenetic Analysis. Mol. Biol. Evol. 17:540–552.

Chase M.W., Soltis D.E., Olmstead R.G., Morgan D., Les D.H., Mishler B.D., Duvall M.R.,

Price R.A., Hills H.G., Qiu Y.-L., Kron K.A., Rettig J.H., Conti E., Palmer J.D., Manhart

J.R., Sytsma K.J., Michaels H.J., Kress W.J., Karol K.G., Clark W.D., Hedren M., Gaut B.S.,

Jansen R.K., Kim K-J., Wimpee C.F., Smith J.F., Furnier G.R., Strauss S.H., Xiang Q-Y,

Plunkett G.M., Soltis P.S., Swensen S.M., Williams S.E., Gadek P.A., Quinn C.J., Eguiarte

L.E., Golenberg E., Learn Jr. G.H., Graham S.W., Barrett S.C.H., Dayanandan S., Albert

V.A. 1993. Phylogenetics of seed plants: an analysis of nucleotide sequences from the plastid

gene rbcL. Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 80:528–580.

Chen F., Mackey A.J., Vermunt J.K., Roos D.S. 2007. Assessing performance of orthology

detection strategies applied to eukaryotic genomes. PloS One. 2:e383.

Costa C.M., Roberts R.P. 2014. Techniques for improving the quality and quantity of DNA

extracted from herbarium specimens. Phytoneuron. 48:1–8.

Crawford N.G., Faircloth B.C., McCormack J.E., Brumfield R.T., Winker K., Glenn T.C. 2012.

More than 1000 ultraconserved elements provide evidence that turtles are the sister group of

archosaurs. Biol. Lett. 8:783–786.

Crawford N.G., Parham J.F., Sellas A.B., Faircloth B.C., Glenn T.C., Papenfuss T.J., Henderson

J.B., Hansen M.H., Simison W.B. 2015. A phylogenomic analysis of turtles. Mol.

Phylogenet. Evol. 83:250–257.

Critchlow D.E., Pearl D.K., Qian C. 1996. The triples distance for rooted bifurcating

phylogenetic trees. Syst. Biol. 45:323–334.

Cronn R., Knaus B.J., Liston A., Maughan P.J., Parks M., Syring J.V., Udall J. 2012. Targeted

enrichment strategies for next-generation plant biology. Am. J. Bot. 99:291–311.

Cui L., Wall P.K., Leebens-Mack J.H., Lindsay B.G., Soltis D.E., Doyle J.J., Soltis P.S., Carlson

J.E., Arumuganathan K., Barakat A. 2006. Widespread genome duplications throughout the

history of flowering plants. Genome Res. 16:738–749.

Darriba D., Posada D. 2015. The impact of partitioning on phylogenomic accuracy. bioRxiv doi:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/023978.

Darwin C., Darwin F., and Seward A.C. 1903. More letters of Charles Darwin: a record of his

work in a series of hitherto unpublished letters. D. Appleton and Co., New York.

Davis C.C., Xi Z., Mathews S. 2014. Plastid phylogenomics and green plant phylogeny: almost

full circle but not quite there. BMC Biol. 12:1–4.

De Smet R., Adams K.L., Vandepoele K., Van Montagu M.C.E., Maere S., Van de Peer Y. 2013.

Convergent gene loss following gene and genome duplications creates single-copy families

in flowering plants. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 110:2898–2903.

Duarte J.M., Wall P.K., Edger P.P., Landherr L.L., Ma H., Pires J.C., Leebens-Mack J. 2010.

Identification of shared single copy nuclear genes in Arabidopsis, Populus, Vitis and Oryza

and their phylogenetic utility across various taxonomic levels. BMC Evol. Biol. 10:61.

Edwards S.V. 2009. Is a new and general theory of molecular systematics emerging? Evolution.

63:1–19.

Edwards S.V. 2016. Phylogenomic subsampling: a brief review. Zoologica Scripta 45: 63-74.

Edwards S.V., Xi Z., Janke A., Faircloth B.C., McCormack J.E., Glenn T.C., Zhong B., Wu S.,

Lemmon E.M., Lemmon A.R. 2016. Implementing and testing the multispecies coalescent

model: a valuable paradigm for phylogenomics. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 94:447–462.

Eytan R.I., Evans B.R., Dornburg A., Lemmon A.R., Lemmon E.M., Wainwright P.C., Near T.J.

2015. Are 100 enough? Inferring acanthomorph teleost phylogeny using Anchored Hybrid

Enrichment. BMC Evol. Biol. 15:1.

Faircloth B.C., McCormack J.E., Crawford N.G., Harvey M.G., Brumfield R.T., Glenn T.C.

2012. Ultraconserved elements anchor thousands of genetic markers spanning multiple

evolutionary timescales. Syst. Biol. 61:717–726.

Frandsen P.B., Calcott B., Mayer C., Lanfear R. 2015. Automatic selection of partitioning

schemes for phylogenetic analyses using iterative k-means clustering of site rates. BMC

Evol. Biol. 15:1–17.

Freeman J.L., Tamaoki M., Stushnoff C., Quinn C.F., Cappa J.J., Devonshire J., Fakra S.C.,

Marcus M.A., McGrath S.P., Van Hoewyk D., Pilon-Smits E.A.H. 2010. Molecular

mechanisms of selenium tolerance and hyperaccumulation in *Stanleya pinnata*. Plant Physiol.

153:1630–1652.

Glasauer S.M., Neuhauss S.C. 2014. Whole-genome duplication in teleost fishes and its

evolutionary consequences. Mol. Genet. Genomics. 289:1045–1060.

Griffin P., Robin C., Hoffmann A. 2011. A next-generation sequencing method for overcoming

the multiple gene copy problem in polyploid phylogenetics, applied to *Poa* grasses. BMC

Biol. 9:1–19.

Grover C.E., Gallagher J.P., Jareczek J.J., Page J.T., Udall J.A., Gore M.A., Wendel J.F. 2015.

Re-evaluating the phylogeny of allopolyploid *Gossypium* L. Molecular Phylogenetics and

Evolution. 92:45–52.

Hamilton C.A., Lemmon A.R., Lemmon E. Moriarty, Bond J.E. 2016. Expanding anchored

hybrid enrichment to resolve both deep and shallow relationships within the spider tree of

life. BMC Evolutionary Biology 16:212.

Heyduk K., Trapnell D.W., Barrett C.F., Leebens-Mack J. 2016. Phylogenomic analyses of

species relationships in the genus *Sabal* (Arecaceae) using targeted sequence capture. Biol. J.

Linn. Soc. 117:106–120.

Hillis D.M., Huelsenbeck J.P., Cunningham C.W. 1994. Application and accuracy of molecular

phylogenies. Science 264:671–677.

Hoff M., Orf S., Riehm B., Darriba D., Stamatakis A. 2016. Does the choice of nucleotide

substitution models matter topologically? BMC Bioinformatics 17:1–13.

Hosner P.A., Faircloth B.C., Glenn T.C., Braun E.L., Kimball R.T. 2015. Avoiding missing data

biases in phylogenomic inference: an empirical study in the landfowl (Aves: Galliformes).

Mol. Biol. Evol. 33:1110–1125.

Jiao Y., Wickett N.J., Ayyampalayam S., Chanderbali A.S., Landherr L., Ralph P.E., Tomsho

L.P., Hu Y., Liang H., Soltis P.S., Soltis D.E., Clifton S.W., Schlarbaum S.E., Schuster S.C.,

Ma H., Leebens-Mack J., dePamphilis C.W. 2011. Ancestral polyploidy in seed plants and

angiosperms. Nature. 473:97–100.

Katoh K., Standley D.M. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:

improvements in performance and usability. Mol. Biol. Evol. 30:772–780.

Kearse M., Moir R., Wilson A., Stones-Havas S., Cheung M., Sturrock S., Buxton S., Cooper A.,

Markowitz S., Duran C. 2012. Geneious Basic: an integrated and extendable desktop

software platform for the organization and analysis of sequence data. Bioinformatics.

28:1647–1649.

Kluge A.G. 1989. A concern for evidence and a phylogenetic hypothesis of relationships among

Epicrates (Boidae, Serpentes). Syst. Biol. 38:7–25.

Lanfear R., Calcott B., Ho S.Y., Guindon S. 2012. PartitionFinder: combined selection of

partitioning schemes and substitution models for phylogenetic analyses. Mol. Biol. Evol.

29:1695–1701.

Leaché A.D., Rannala B. 2011. The accuracy of species tree estimation under simulation: a

comparison of methods. Syst. Biol. 60:126–137.

Lee E.K., Cibrian-Jaramillo A., Kolokotronis S.-O., Katari M.S., Stamatakis A., Ott M., Chiu

J.C., Little D.P., Stevenson D.W., McCombie W.R. 2011a. A functional phylogenomic view

of the seed plants. PLoS Genet. 7:e1002411.

Lemmon A.R., Brown, J.M., Stanger-Hall, K., Lemmon, E. Moriarty. 2009. The effect of

ambiguous data on phylogenetic estimates obtained by maximum likelihood and Bayesian

inference. Syst. Biol. 58:130–145.

Lemmon A.R., Emme S.A., Lemmon E. Moriarty 2012. Anchored Hybrid Enrichment for

Massively High-Throughput Phylogenomics. Syst. Biol. 61:727–744.

Lemmon A.R., Moriarty E.C. 2004. The importance of proper model assumption in Bayesian

phylogenetics. Syst. Biol. 53:265–277.

Lemmon E.M., Lemmon A.R. 2013. High-Throughput Genomic Data in Systematics and

Phylogenetics. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 44:99–121.

Lemon J. 2006. Plotrix: a package in the red light district of R. R-News. 6:8–12.

Léveillé-Bourret E., Starr J.R., Ford B.A., Lemmon E.M., Lemmon A.R. *In review*. Anchored

phylogenomics for angiosperms II: Resolving rapid generic and tribal-level radiations. Syst.

Biol.

Li C., Ortí G., Zhang G., Lu G. 2007. A practical approach to phylogenomics: the phylogeny of

ray-finned fish (Actinopterygii) as a case study. BMC Evol. Biol. 7:44–44.

Magallón S., Hilu K.W., Quandt D. 2013. Land plant evolutionary timeline: Gene effects are

secondary to fossil constraints in relaxed clock estimation of age and substitution rates. Am.

J. Bot. 100: 556–573.

Mamanova L., Coffey A.J., Scott C.E., Kozarewa I., Turner E.H., Kumar A., Howard E.,

Shendure J., Turner D.J. 2010. Target-enrichment strategies for next-generation sequencing.

Nat. Methods. 7:111–118.

Mandel J.R., Dikow R.B., Funk V.A., Masalia R.R., Staton S.E., Kozik A., Michelmore R.W.,

Rieseberg L.H., Burke J.M. 2014. A Target Enrichment Method for Gathering Phylogenetic

Information from Hundreds of Loci: An Example from the Compositae. Appl. Plant Sci.

2:1300085.

McCormack J.E., Faircloth B.C., Crawford N.G., Gowaty P.A., Brumfield R.T., Glenn T.C.

2012. Ultraconserved elements are novel phylogenomic markers that resolve placental

mammal phylogeny when combined with species-tree analysis. Genome Res. 22:746–754.

Meiklejohn K.A., Faircloth B.C., Glenn T.C., Kimball R.T., Braun E.L. 2016. Analysis of a

Rapid Evolutionary Radiation Using Ultraconserved Elements: Evidence for a Bias in Some

Multispecies Coalescent Methods. Syst. Biol. 65:612-627.

Meredith R.W., Janecka J.E., Gatesy J., Ryder O.A., Fisher C.A., Teeling E.C., Goodbla A.,

Eizirik E., Simao T.L.L., Stadler T., Rabosky D.L., Honeycutt R.L., Flynn J.J., Ingram C.M.,

Steiner C., Williams T.L., Robinson T.J., Burk-Herrick A., Westerman M., Ayoub N.A.,

Springer M.S., Murphy W.J. 2011. Impacts of the Cretaceous terrestrial revolution and KPg

extinction on mammal diversification. Science 334:521–524.

Meyer M., Kircher M. 2010. Illumina sequencing library preparation for highly multiplexed

target capture and sequencing. Cold Spring Harb. Protoc. 2010; doi:10.1101/pdb.prot5448.

Mirarab S., Warnow T. 2015. ASTRAL-II: coalescent-based species tree estimation with many

hundreds of taxa and thousands of genes. Bioinformatics. 31:i44–i52.

Moore M.J., Bell C.D., Soltis P.S., Soltis D.E. 2007. Using plastid genome-scale data to resolve

enigmatic relationships among basal angiosperms. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 104:19363–19368.

Morales H.E., Pavlova A., Sunnucks P., Major R., Amos N., Joseph L., Lemmon A.R., Endler

J.A., Delhey K. Neutral and selective drivers of colour evolution in a widespread Australian

passerine. J. Biogeogr.; http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-001M-0000-002B-11FF-D *In review*

Morrison D. 2011. Introduction to Phylogenetic Networks. RJR Publications. Uppsala, Sweden.

Paradis E., Claude J., Strimmer K. 2004. APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R

language. Bioinformatics. 20:289–290.

Parks M., Cronn R., Liston A. 2012. Separating the wheat from the chaff: mitigating the effects

of noise in a plastome phylogenomic data set from *Pinus* L. (Pinaceae). BMC Evol. Biol.

12:1–17.

Peloso P.L.V., Frost D.R., Richards S.J., Rodrigues M.T., Donnellan S., Matsui M., Raxworthy

C.J., Biju S.D., Lemmon E.M., Lemmon A.R., Wheeler W.C. 2016. The impact of anchored

phylogenomics and taxon sampling on phylogenetic inference in narrow-mouthed frogs

(Anura, Microhylidae). Cladistics 32:113–140.

Pimm S.L., Joppa L.N. 2015. How many plant species are there, where are they, and at what rate

are they going extinct? Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 100:170–176.

Posada D., Crandall K.A. 1998. Modeltest: testing the model of DNA substitution.

Bioinformatics 14:817–818.

Prum R.O., Berv J.S., Dornburg A., Field D.J., Townsend J.P., Lemmon E.M., Lemmon A.R.

2015. A comprehensive phylogeny of birds (Aves) using targeted next-generation DNA

sequencing. Nature. 526:569–573.

Pyron R.A., Hendry C.R., Chou V.M., Lemmon E.M., Lemmon A.R., Burbrink F.T. 2014.

Effectiveness of phylogenomic data and coalescent species-tree methods for resolving

difficult nodes in the phylogeny of advanced snakes (Serpentes: Caenophidia). Mol.

Phylogenet. Evol. 81:221–231.

de Queiroz A., Gatesy J. 2007. The supermatrix approach to systematics. Trends Ecol. Evol.

22:34–41.

Reneker J., Lyons E., Conant G.C., Pires J.C., Freeling M., Shyu C.-R., Korkin D. 2012. Long

identical multispecies elements in plant and animal genomes. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.

109:E1183–E1191.

Ripplinger J., Sullivan J. 2008. Does choice in model selection affect maximum likelihood

analysis? Syst. Biol. 57:76–85.

Rokyta D.R., Lemmon A.R., Margres M.J., Aronow K. 2012. The venom-gland transcriptome of

the eastern diamondback rattlesnake (*Crotalus adamanteus*). BMC Genomics. 13:312.

Roure B., Baurain D., Philippe H. 2013. Impact of missing data on phylogenies inferred from

empirical phylogenomic data sets. Mol. Biol. Evol. 30:197–214.

Ruane S., Raxworthy C.J., Lemmon A.R., Lemmon E.M., Burbrink F.T. 2015. Comparing

species tree estimation with large anchored phylogenomic and small Sanger-sequenced

molecular datasets: an empirical study on Malagasy pseudoxyrhophiine snakes. BMC Evol.

Biol. 15:1.

Ruhfel B.R., Gitzendanner M.A., Soltis P.S., Soltis D.E., Burleigh J.G. 2014. From algae to

angiosperms-inferring the phylogeny of green plants (Viridiplantae) from 360 plastid

genomes. BMC Evol. Biol. 14:23.

Sass C., Iles W.J.D., Barrett C.F., Smith S.Y., Specht C.D. 2016. Revisiting the Zingiberales:

using multiplexed exon capture to resolve ancient and recent phylogenetic splits in a

charismatic plant lineage. Peerj. 4:e1584.

Schmickl R., Liston A., Zeisek V., Oberlander K., Weitemier K., Straub S.C., Cronn R.C.,

Dreyer L.L., Suda J. 2016. Phylogenetic marker development for target enrichment from

transcriptome and genome skim data: the pipeline and its application in southern African

Oxalis (Oxalidaceae). Mol. Ecol. Resour. 16:1124-1135.

Shimodaira H., Hasegawa M. 2001. CONSEL: for assessing the confidence of phylogenetic tree

selection. Bioinformatics. 17:1246–1247.

Shimodaira, H. 2002. An approximately unbiased test of phylogenetic tree selection. Syst. Biol.

51: 492-508.

Simmons, M. P., J. Gatesy. 2015. Coalescence vs. concatenation: sophisticated analyses vs. first

principles applied to rooting the angiosperms. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 91: 98-122.

Simmons, M. P., J. Gatesy. 2016. Biases of tree-independent-character-subsampling methods.

Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 100: 424-443.

Simmons M.P., Sloan D.B., Gatesy J. 2016. The effects of subsampling gene trees on coalescent

methods applied to ancient divergences. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 97:76–89.

Song S., Liu L., Edwards S.V., Wu S., 2012. Resolving conflict in eutherian mammal phylogeny

using phylogenomics and the multispecies coalescent model. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA

109:14942–14947.

Springer M. S., J. Gatesy. 2016. The gene tree delusion. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 94:1-33.

Soltis D.E., Smith S.A., Cellinese N., Wurdack K.J., Tank D.C., Brockington S.F., Refulio-

Rodriguez N.F., Walker J.B., Moore M.J., Carlsward B.S. 2011. Angiosperm phylogeny: 17

genes, 640 taxa. Am. J. Bot. 98:704–730.

de Sousa F., Bertand Y.J.K., Nylinder S., Oxelman B., Eriksson J.S., Pfeil B.E. 2014.

Phylogenetic properties of 50 nuclear loci in *Medicago* (Leguminosae) generated using

multiplexed sequence capture and next-generation sequencing. PLoS ONE 9:e109704. doi:

10.1371/journal.pone.0109704.

Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of

large phylogenies. Bioinformatics. 30:1312–1313.

Stephens J.D., Rogers W.L., Heyduk K., Cruse-Sanders J.M., Determann R.O., Glenn T.C.,

Malmberg R.L. 2015a. Resolving phylogenetic relationships of the recently radiated

carnivorous plant genus *Sarracenia* using target enrichment. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 85:76–

87.

Stephens J.D., Rogers W.L., Mason C.M., Donovan L.A., Malmberg R.L. 2015b. Species tree

estimation of diploid *Helianthus* (Asteraceae) using target enrichment. Am. J. Bot. 102:910–

920.

Stout, C.C., Tan M., Lemmon A.R., Lemmon E.M., Armbruster J.W. Resolving Cypriniformes

Relationships Using An Anchored Enrichment Approach. BMC Evol. Biol. *In Review.*

Stull G.W., Moore M.J., Mandala V.S., Douglas N.A., Kates H.-R., Qi X., Brockington S.F.,

Soltis P.S., Soltis D.E., Gitzendanner M.A. 2013. A targeted enrichment strategy for

massively parallel sequencing of angiosperm plastid genomes. Appl. Plant Sci. 1:1200497.

Sun Y., Moore M.J., Zhang S., Soltis P.S., Soltis D.E., Zhao T., Meng A., Li X., Li J., Wang H.

2016. Phylogenomic and structural analyses of 18 complete plastomes across nearly all

families of early-diverging eudicots, including an angiosperm-wide analysis of IR gene

content evolution. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 96:93–101.

Syring J., Cronn R., Tennessen J.A., Jennings T.N., Scelfo-Dalbey C., Wegrzyn J. 2016.

Targeted capture sequencing in whitebark pine reveals range-wide demographic and adaptive

patterns despite challenges of a large, repetitive genome. Frontiers in Plant Science. 7:484.

Talavera G., Castresana J. 2007. Improvement of phylogenies after removing divergent and

ambiguously aligned blocks from protein sequence alignments. Syst. Biol. 56:564–577.

Berardini T.Z., Reiser L, Li D., Mezheritsky Y., Muller R., Strait E., Huala E. 2015. The

Arabidopsis Information Resource: Making and mining the "gold standard" annotated

reference plant genome. Genesis. 53:474-485.

Terry N., Zayed A.M., de Souza M.P., Tarun A.S. 2000. Selenium in higher plants. Ann. Rev.

Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol. 51:401–432.

Townsend, T.M., Mulcahy, D.G., Noonan, B.P., Sites, J.W., Kuczynski, C.A., Wiens, J.J.,

Reeder, T.W., 2011. Phylogeny of iguanian lizards inferred from 29 nuclear loci, and a

comparison of concatenated and species-tree approaches for an ancient, rapid radiation. Mol.

Phylogenet. Evol. 61:363–380.

Tucker D.B., Colli G.R., Giugliano L.G., Hedges S.B., Hendry C.R., Lemmon E. Moriarty,

Lemmon A.R., Pyron R.A. 2016. Methodological congruence in phylogenomic analyses with

morphological support for teiid lizards (Sauria: Teiidae). Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 103:75–84.

Weitemier K., Straub S.C., Cronn R.C., Fishbein M., Schmickl R., McDonnell A., Liston A.

2014. Hyb-Seq: Combining target enrichment and genome skimming for plant

phylogenomics. Appl. Plant Sci. 2:1400042.

Wicke S., Schneeweiss G.M. 2015. Next-generation organellar genomics: Potentials and pitfalls

of high-throughput technologies for molecular evolutionary studies and plant systematics. In:

Horandl E., Appelhans M.S., editors. Next Generation Sequencing in Plant Systematics.

Koenigstein: A R G Gantner Verlag K G. Pp. 9–50.

Wickett N.J., Mirarab S., Nguyen N., Warnow T., Carpenter E., Matasci N., Ayyampalayam S.,

Barker M.S., Burleigh J.G., Gitzendanner M.A., Ruhfel B.R., Wafula E., Der J.P., Graham

S.W., Mathews S., Melkonian M., Soltis D.E., Soltis P.S., Miles N.W., Rothfels C.J.,

Pokorny L., Shaw A.J., DeGironimo L., Stevenson D.W., Surek B., Villarreal J.C., Roure B.,

Philippe H., dePamphilis C.W., Chen T., Deyholos M.K., Baucom R.S., Kutchan T.M.,

Augustin M.M., Wang J., Zhang Y., Tian Z., Yan Z., Wu X., Sun X., Wong G.K.-S.,

Leebens-Mack J. 2014. Phylotranscriptomic analysis of the origin and early diversification of

land plants. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 111:E4859–E4868.

Xia X., Lemey P. 2009. Assessing substitution saturation with DAMBE. In: Lemey P., Salemi

M., and Vandamme A.-M., editors. The Phylogenetic Handbook: a Practical Approach to

Phylogenetic Analysis and Hypothesis Testing. Cambridge University Press, UK. Pp. 611–

626.

Yang Z. 1994. Maximum likelihood phylogenetic estimation from DNA sequences with variable

rates over sites: approximate methods. J. Mol. Evol. 39:306–314.

Young A.D., Lemmon A.R., Skevington J.H., Mengual X., Ståhls G., Reemer M., Jordaens K.,

Kelso S., Lemmon E. Moriarty, Hauser M. 2016. Anchored enrichment dataset for true flies

(order Diptera) reveals insights into the phylogeny of flower flies (family Syrphidae). BMC

Evol. Biol. 16:143.

Zeng L., Zhang Q., Sun R., Kong H., Zhang N., Ma H. 2014. Resolution of deep angiosperm

phylogeny using conserved nuclear genes and estimates of early divergence times. Nat

Commun. 5:4956.

Zimmer E.A., Wen J. 2012. Using nuclear gene data for plant phylogenetics: Progress and

prospects. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 65:774–785.

Zwickl D.J., Hillis D.M. 2002. Increased taxon sampling greatly reduces phylogenetic error.

Syst. Biol. 51:588–598.

1086

Figure 1. Pipeline for locus selection and probe design. Candidate loci were derived from Duarte et al.

(2010) and filtered to produce anchor loci that each contained one low-copy exon with sufficient degree

of conservation across angiosperms. Eighteen functional targets involved in selenium tolerance were

added prior to probe tiling. Scripts used in probe design are available in Dryad (accession XXXX).

Figure 2. Standard pipeline for processing anchored phylogenomic data to produce final alignments.

Merged read pairs are assembled using a quasi-de novo approach that utilizes divergent references from

the kit. After orthologous sets of consensus sequences are identified, raw alignments are constructed using

MAFFT and trimmed/masked to remove probable misaligned regions. Alignments are finalized after

being manually inspected and trimmed in Geneious. Scripts are available in Dryad (accession XXXX).

Figure 3. Pipeline for generating heat maps representing robustness of phylogenetic estimates to variation

in site and locus filtering. Labeled arrows involve steps performed using standard methods, whereas

unlabeled arrows involve steps performed using custom scripts available in Dryad (accession XXXX).

Figure 4. Strategy for generating 196 data filtering conditions to assess robustness of phylogenetic

estimates. (a) Sites are ranked by rate as estimated using kmeans in PartitionFinder. Invariable sites are

plotted to right of the distribution. Fourteen site-inclusion thresholds (gray lines/arrows on histogram) are

applied, with the most variable sites being excluded at the lowest thresholds. Gene trees constructed after

applying each of these thresholds are compared pairwise using the triplet measure in TreeComp to

produce a pairwise tree-distance matrix. (b) Plotting loci in multidimensional space (MDS) using

corresponding tree-distances allows for the identification of outliers (furthest from center) and 14

thresholds for inclusion of loci for phylogeny estimation (gray circles). (c) Example of heat-map for one

node showing phylogenetic support as color for each of the 14×14=196 combinations/data sets, with

white indicating no support for the node and black indicating 100% support for the node. (d) Thresholds

(gray lines/arrows) plotted on the distribution of loci ranked by distance from origin on the MDS plot.

Robust estimates show relatively consistent level of support (similar color) across the heat map in (c).

Figure 5. The relationship between locus recovery and taxonomic representation in the enrichment kit.

For each enriched sample, the number of loci recovered with consensus sequence greater than 250 bp is

plotted against the divergence time (in millions of years - see Supplemental Methods for details) between

that sample and the nearest reference species used for probe design. The curve represents the best-fit

quadratic polynomial ($y = -0.0083x^2 + 0.3049x + 501.43$; $R^2 = 0.35734$).

Figure 6. Estimates of the angiosperm phylogeny under a coalescent (ASTRAL) or supermatrix

(concatenated RAxML) framework with all data included. Heat-maps on each internal node indicate

bootstrap support across 196 data inclusion conditions (example shown in upper right), with lower-left

corner of each heat map indicating support when all data are included (colors described in Fig. 4). Solid

black heat maps indicate high support for a node under a broad range of conditions. Heat maps for nodes

not present in both topologies are outlined in red.

Figure 7 Using heat maps to compare robustness of support for key nodes across analysis frameworks.

(a) Support for three alternative relationships among eudicots, monocots, and magnoliids under coalescent

and supermatrix frameworks. Under the coalescent framework, a eudicot-monocot sister relationship is

supported across a broad range of conditions (>63% of sites are included). Under the supermatrix

approach, however, support shifts from strong support for a eudicot-magnoliid sister relationship when all

sites are included to strong support for a eudicot-monocot sister relationship when 54%-76% of sites are

included. (b) An additional approach for visualizing support for alternative hypotheses. In this

representation, support for each of the three alternatives is indicated by a different color in the rgb (red-

green-blue) color space, with the opacity of the color indicating the sum of support across the three

alternatives (white indicates no support for any hypothesis). (c) A triangle representing rgb space can also

be used to indicate support for alternative hypotheses. In this representation, each vertex of the triangle

correponds to 100% suport for one of the three alternative hypotheses (colors have same meaning as in

[b]). For each one of the data sampling schemes (pixel in [b]) a yellow point is plotted on the triangle, at

the location corresponding to the relative support for the three hypotheses (a point in the middle would

indicate 33% support for each of the three alternative hypotheses, whereas a point half-way along one of

the edges of the triangle would indicate 50% support for each of two alternatives).

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143
1144 **Figure 1.**
1145

Probe Design Workflow

Duarte et al. 2010

959 genes

Arabidopsis annotations   >150 bp exons

3050 exons

Arabidopsis - Oryza alignments   >55% similarity

1721 candidate loci

33 assembled genomes   <1.2 average copies
9 low coverage genomes   <15% missing taxa

499 anchor loci

18 selenium-tolerance loci

517 target loci

mask repeat regions

Final alignments

25 references   2.8x coverage per locus/reference

56,862 probes

1146

1147   **Figure 2.**

1148

1149

1150   **Figure 3.**

Heat Map Pipeline

1151

1152

1153

1154 **Figure 4.**

1159   **Figure 5.**

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172   **Figure 6.**

1175   **Figure 7.**

1176

1177 **Table 1**. Recent phylogenetic or population genetic studies that used hybrid-enrichment methods, including plastid-oriented studies.

1178 Studies targeting only nuclear regions but that utilized plastid sequences found in bycatch are denoted by an asterisk (*). # Ref. Taxa

1179 refers to the number of reference taxa included in a probe design. # Sp. Copy Assessment indicates how many species the study

1180 included in their assessment of copy number for each locus included in the probe kit developed.

Study	Basal Group	Major Group	Family	Genus	# Ref. Taxa	# Nuclear Loci Targeted	Probes Target Plastids	# Sp. Copy Assessment
Parks et al. (2012)	Gymnosperms	-	Pinaceae	*Pinus*	2	0	yes	2
Stull et al. (2013)	Angiosperms	eudicots	-	-	22	0	yes	0
Mandel et al. (2014)	Angiosperms	eudicots	Asteraceae	-	1	1061	no	4
Weitmier et al. (2014)	Angiosperms	eudicots	Asteraceae	*Asclepias*	1	3385	no*	6
de Sousa et al. (2014)	Angiosperms	eudicots	Leguminosae	*Medicago*	1	319	no	5
Grover et al. (2015)	Angiosperms	eudicots	Malvaceae	*Gossypium*	1	500	no	1
Stephens et al. (2015a)	Angiosperms	eudicots	Sarraceniaceae	*Sarracenia*	2	646	no*	2
Stephens et al. (2015b)	Angiosperms	eudicots	Asteraceae	*Helianthus*	4	598	no*	2
Schmickl et al. (2016)	Angiosperms	eudicots	Oxalidaceae	*Oxalis*	1	1164	no*	3
Heyduk et al. (2016)	Angiosperms	monocots	Arecaceae	*Sabal*	15	837	yes	15
Syring et al. (2016)	Gymnosperms	-	Pinaceae	*Pinus albicaulis*	1	7849	no	1
Sass et al. (2016)	Angiosperms	monocots	Zingiberaceae	-	8	494	yes	8
This Study	**Angiosperms**	**All groups**	**-**	**-**	**25**	**517**	**no***	**43**

Table 2. Genomic sources for taxa used in the Angiosperm v.1 probe design. All taxa included in

the design (n=25) are denoted with an asterisk (*); the other taxa were utilized for locus copy

number assessments only (n=18). Data for taxa indicated in bold were obtained from low-

coverage genome sequencing of five vouchered specimens (Index Herbariorum code in

parentheses). All other data were whole genome data downloaded from the sources provided

[accessed June 20, 2013]. Sources of genomic data are indicated by superscripts as follows:

1=www.amborella.org; 2=www.phytozome.net; 3=*Chris Buddenhagen 13041601* (FSU); 4=

Loran C. Anderson 24918 (FSU); 5=*Loran C. Anderson 23871* (FSU);

6=http://bioinformatics.psb.ugent.be/plaza/; 7=*Rob Naczi 12038* (NY); 8= *Loran C. Anderson*

26956 (FSU); 9= *Loran C. Anderson 26960* (FSU); 10=*Loran C. Anderson 24932* (FSU);

11=*Loran C. Anderson 23871* (FSU).

Major Group	Family	Species
Amborellales	Amborellaceae	*Amborella trichopoda*[1]*
eudicot	Ranunculaceae	*Aquilegia coerulea*[2]*
eudicot	Brassicaceae	*Arabidopsis thaliana*[2]*
eudicot	Chenopodiaceae	*Beta vulgaris*[2]*
monocot	Bromeliaceae	***Billbergia nutans*[3]***
monocot	Poaceae	*Brachypodium distachyon*[2]
eudicot	Brassicaceae	*Brassica rapa*[2]
eudicot	Brassicaceae	*Capsella rubella*[2]
monocot	Cyperaceae	*Carex lurida*[4]*
monocot	Cyperaceae	***Carex tenax*[5]**
eudicot	Caricaceae	*Carica papaya*[6]*
eudicot	Rutaceae	*Citrus sinensis*[6]*
eudicot	Cucurbitaceae	*Cucumis sativus*[2]*
eudicot	Myrtaceae	*Eucalyptus grandis*[6]*
eudicot	Rosaceae	*Fragaria vesca*[2]
eudicot	Fabaceae	*Glycine max*[2]
eudicot	Malvaceae	*Gossypium raimondii*[2]
eudicot	Asteraceae	*Lactuca sativa*[2]*
eudicot	Linaceae	*Linum usitatissimum*[2]

eudicot	Rosaceae	*Malus domestica*[2]	1192
eudicot	Euphorbiaceae	*Manihot esculenta*[2]	
eudicot	Fabaceae	*Medicago truncatula*[2]*	
eudicot	Phrymaceae	*Mimulus guttatus*[2]*	
monocot	Musaceae	*Musa acuminata**	
eudicot	Nelumbonaceae	*Nelumbo nucifera*[2]*	
monocot	Poaceae	*Oryza sativa*[2]*	
eudicot	Fabaceae	*Phaseolus vulgaris*[2]	
monocot	Arecaceae	*Phoenix dactylifera*[2]*	
eudicot	Salicaceae	*Populus trichocarpa*[2]*	
eudicot	Rosaceae	*Prunus persica*[2]*	
monocot	Cyperaceae	***Rhynchospora chalarocephala*[7]***	
eudicot	Euphorbiaceae	*Ricinus communis*[2]*	
monocot	Cyperaceae	*Scirpus divaricatus*[8]	
monocot	Cyperaceae	*Scleria oligantha*[9]	
monocot	Poaceae	*Setaria italica*[2]	
eudicot	Solanaceae	*Solanum pimpinellifolium*[2]	
eudicot	Solanaceae	*Solanum tuberosum*[2]*	
monocot	Poaceae	*Sorghum bicolor*[2]	
monocot	Typhaceae	***Sparganium americanum*[10]**	
eudicot	Brassicaceae	*Thellungiella halophila*[2]	
eudicot	Malvaceae	*Theobroma cacao*[2]*	
monocot	Typhaceae	***Typha latifolia*[11]***	
eudicot	Vitaceae	*Vitis vinifera*[2]*	

1193   **Table 3**. Overall success for targeted loci, in terms of regions remaining in the alignment for phylogenetic estimation after orthology

1194   and trimming phases of the bioinformatics pipeline were completed. Targets include the 499 low-copy nuclear loci and the 18

1195   functional mostly high-copy genes associated with selenium tolerance. The total number of orthologs indicates the total number of loci

1196   in the alignment, which may be larger than the number of targets since some targets appear to be multicopy.

	Angiosperms	Brassicales	Caryophyllales	Dipsacales	Magnoliales	Piperales	Poales	Proteales
Anchor Loci								
# Recovered	470	512	464	465	470	330	500	450
% on target	14.1	20.6	10.3	8.1	7.0	1.7	21.9	6.3
Contig length	764	838	742	581	622	631	912	609
# Orthologs	384	540	405	488	483	189	488	159
Avg Copy	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.7
Max Copy	1.0	4	2	3	2	2	2	4
Functional Loci								
# Recovered	3	15	9	12	10	7	8	11
# Orthologs	0	34	17	26	20	10	13	55
Avg # Copy	n/a	2.3	1.9	2.2	2.0	1.3	1.6	5.0
Max # Copy	n/a	5	4	4	4	2	3	14

1197

1198   **Table 4.** Properties of probe regions and flanks for deep, intermediate, and shallow-scale alignments.

	Probe Region				Flanks			
	Total Sites	Var. Sites	Inform. Sites	% Var.	Total Sites	Var. Sites	Inform. Sites	% Var.
Angiosperms	138,616	103,616	94,185	74.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Carex	114,623	16,512	3,592	13.9	188,315	43,195	11,307	23.6
Caryophyllales	96,372	23,355	9,171	23.6	66,471	19,490	6,964	29.2
Cyperaceae	120,774	25,082	7,990	19.8	224,529	70,104	20,716	31.6
Dipsacales	80,064	21,501	10,151	26.3	12,429	3,166	1,315	23.4
Magnolia	110,509	6,460	1,181	5.6	87,905	10,450	1,843	12.4
Protea	82,258	11,391	544	13.7	66,269	4,644	536	7.3
Rhynchospora	132,656	29,530	16,615	20.9	164,027	60,759	35,824	36.9
Stanleya	129,500	2,036	149	1.4	178,670	11,933	1,975	6.9

1199