The danger zone: the joint trap of incomplete lineage sorting and long-branch

attraction in placing Rafflesiaceae

Liming Cai[1,2], Liang Liu[3], Charles C. Davis[2]

[1]Department of Integrative Biology, the University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712,
USA

[2]Department of Organismal Biology, Harvard University Herbaria, Harvard University,
Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

[3]Department of Statistics, the University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA

Abstract

Two key factors have been implicated as major impediments to phylogenomic inference:

incomplete lineage sorting (ILS)—especially in cases where clades are in the anomaly

zone—and erroneous gene tree estimation—commonly manifested by long-branch

attraction in the Felsenstein zone. Seldom have these factors been analyzed when they

occur simultaneously as in cases involving ancient adaptive radiations. Rafflesiaceae

(Malpighiales) is an iconic holoparasitic plant clade growing west of Wallace's line in

tropical Southeast Asia. This clade has been notoriously difficult to place phylogenetically

and is nested within an explosive ancient radiation in Malpighiales. To complicate matters,

parasitic plants like Rafflesiaceae are well-known to exhibit accelerated rates of nucleotide

substitution. Here, using 2,141 genes we identify for the first time that accelerated

substitution rates is a genome-wide phenomenon in holoparasites. We demonstrate two

orders of magnitude increase in substitution rates in Rafflesiaceae compared to its free-

living relatives, rendering nearly every gene prone to long-branch attraction. Our analyses

rejected the monophyletic (Rafflesiaceae, Euphorbiaceae) clade proposed in previous

studies but favored an earlier divergence of Rafflesiaceae in close affinity with

Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae, Putranjivaceae, and Pandaceae. Rafflesiaceae is therefore prey to

a joint trap of the anomaly and Felsenstein zones. Moreover, owing to massive gene loss

within Rafflesiaceae, our simulation suggests that this represents an intractable

phylogenetic problem that will never achieve a single phylogenetic resolution. Our case

study highlights a seemingly insurmountable confluence of factors—a danger zone—that

hinders phylogenomic resolution and demonstrates the need to be flexible in cases where

multiple phylogenomic placements are equally likely.

Keywords

Adaptive radiation, homoplasy, anomaly zone, composition bias, heterotachy, PhyloBayes,

gene genealogy interrogation

Introduction

Adaptive radiation is one of the most fascinating problems in evolutionary ecology; it

occurs when a single lineage rapidly diverges into many descendant lineages each with

substantial changes in their morphology, behavior, and physiology. Well-known examples

of adaptive radiations include Galapagos finches, Caribbean anoles, Hawaiian silverswords

and lobeliads, and cloud forest *Viburnum* (Baldwin 1997; Grant and Grant 2007; Givnish et

al. 2009; Losos 2011; Donoghue et al. 2022). Despite the intriguing nature of adaptive

radiations, such clades often present challenges for phylogenetic inference. These clades

often exhibit a combination of short and long branches resulting from extensive

accumulation of mutations, which is a particularly vexing problem (Glor 2010). Species

trees of clades that have undergone adaptive radiations are likely to fall within the

'anomaly zone' in which the most common gene tree differs from the species tree, resulting

in a potentially high amount of incomplete lineage sorting (ILS; Degnan and Rosenberg

2006). In addition, mutational saturation and rate heterogeneity among descendent

branches in these radiations can lead to various systematic errors, such as long-branch

attraction and compositional bias (Kapli et al. 2020).

All these factors are further confounded when the radiation is particularly ancient, as in the

case of Malpighiales—a Cretaceous explosive radiation that has produced plants with

diverse morphologies that range from temperate deciduous trees (Salicaceae) and tropical

mangroves (Rhizophoraceae) to submerged tropical aquatics (Podostemaceae; Davis et al.

2005). Among the strangest of all malpighialean members is the holoparasitic family

Rafflesiaceae, which produces the world's largest flower (Nikolov and Davis 2017).

Furthermore, the family is atypical even compared to most other parasitic plants. Species in

Rafflesiaceae are endoparasites that live out their vegetative life hidden entirely inside

their grapevine hosts; their flowers only emerge for sexual reproduction (*Tetrastigma*,

Vitaceae; Kuijt 1969; Nikolov et al. 2013; Nikolov and Davis 2017). Endoparasitism has

given rise to a series of distinct morphological modifications that have made their

taxonomy controversial (Teixiera-Costa and Davis, 2021). For example, the vegetative

organs of Rafflesiaceae are highly reduced and persist only as strands of cells embedded

within their liana host *Tetrastigma* (Nikolov et al. 2014). Other plant endoparasites share

similar modifications and thus it is not surprising that Cronquist grouped distantly related

parasitic families such as Hydnoraceae and Mitrastemonaceae together with Rafflesiaceae

(Barkman et al. 2004; Cronquist 1981; Davis and Wurdack 2004; Davis et al. 2007;

Wurdack and Davis 2009).

Today, Rafflesiaceae sensu stricto includes only large-flowered endoparasites and are

placed in Malpighiales (Barkman et al. 2004; Davis and Wurdack 2004; Davis et al. 2007;

Wurdack and Davis 2009) as sister to Euphorbiaceae (Davis et al. 2007; Bendiksby et al.

2010), highlighting a prominent contrast in floral size between these two sister clades.

Despite strong support for the placement of Rafflesiaceae as a close relative of

Euphorbiaceae sensu lato, this placement was based only on five mitochondrial and nuclear

genes. One recent attempt using the Angiosperm353 sequence capture probe set, on the

other hand, did not confidently resolve its placement within Malpighiales (<0.5 posterior

probability; Zuntini et al. 2024). The complete loss of the entire chloroplast genome in

Rafflesiaceae also ruled out the potential of this widely used phylogenetic marker to

resolve its placement (Molina et al. 2014; Cai et al. 2021a).

The recently published genome of *Sapria himalayana* Griff. (Cai et al. 2021a), together with

the companion transcriptome data from the related genera *Rafflesia* and *Rhizanthes*,

offered the hope of expanding the genomic toolkit for resolving the placement of

Rafflesiaceae. However, these resources highlight four genomic aspects of the clade that

further confound their phylogenetic placement. First, nearly half of the conserved genes in

Rafflesiaceae are lost (Cai et al. 2021a), which greatly restricts the repertoire of gene

candidates for phylogenomic research. These losses are overrepresented in genes

corresponding to conserved functions such as photosynthesis and plastid organization,

which are common targets of phylogenomic markers. Second, members of Rafflesiaceae,

like numerous other parasitic plants, are known to acquire foreign genetic materials from

their hosts via horizontal gene transfer (HGT; Davis and Wurdack 2004; Xi et al. 2012; Xi et

al. 2013), which can confound species tree inference. Ancestral genes acquired by HGT that

are shared by all Rafflesiaceae are useful for resolving within-family relationships as

exemplified by the application of 16S in Barkman et al. (2008) and Bendiksby et al. (2010),

but such genes are inappropriate for placing Rafflesiaceae within Malpighiales. Third, the

well-characterized high substitution rate in Rafflesiaceae may lead to spurious species tree

reconstruction because of long-branch attraction (Nickrent and Starr 1994; Nickrent and

Duff 1996). This phenomenon was demonstrated in all three cellular genomes using

representative genes across multiple independently evolved parasitic lineages (Bromham

et al. 2013; Young and dePamphilis 2005), but to what extent this phenomenon spans the

entire nuclear genome has not previously been tested in Rafflesiaceae. Fourth, the unusual

AT-rich (GC% = 24%) genome of Rafflesiaceae likely contributes to compositional bias that

may incorrectly group distantly related taxa as close relatives (Foster and Hickey 1999;

Knight et al. 2001; Wang et al. 2004).

The ancient radiation of Malpighiales includes nine of the ten most difficult angiosperm

clades to date (Smith et al. 2013), easily placing its members as the most extraordinary and

difficult phylogenomic problem to resolve in angiosperms. For Rafflesiaceae, the potentially

greatly accelerated substitution rates combined with the aforementioned genomic

anomalies attributable to its parasitic modality likely make this an even more intractable

phylogenomic problem. Rafflesiaceae falls into a joint trap that we term 'the danger zone' of

ILS and long-branch attraction. The 'danger zone' represents a toxic combination for

achieving a tidy phylogenetic resolution. Here, using 2,141 genes including a broad

sampling of Malpighiales, we tackle the joint problem of ILS and long-branch attraction

using a combination of approaches that accommodate genealogical heterogeneity among

loci and rate heterogeneity among sites.

RESULTS

Phylogenomic datasets

By combining data from two published genome and transcriptome studies within

Malpighiales (Cai et al., 2019; Cai et al., 2021a), we generated a phylogenomic dataset of

2,141 loci, each containing at least 10 out of 43 species in Malpighiales (supplementary

table S1, Supplementary Material online). A phylogenetic based approach from Yang and

Smith (2014) was applied to remove paralogs and potential HGTs. These 43 species

included all three genera of Rafflesiaceae (*Sapria, Rafflesia,* and *Rhizanthes*) and three

outgroup species from Oxalidales and Celastrales. The concatenated DNA matrix consisted

of 3,228,591 sites with a gene and character occupancy of 70.9% and 81.8%, respectively.

Two species exhibiting exceptional levels of missing data were *Galearia maingayi* (88.1%

missing) and *Ixonanthes reticulata* (79.5% missing). Each locus on average contained 31

species and the median length of DNA alignment was 1,275 bp after trimming. The mean

branch support for maximum likelihood (ML) gene trees was 68.4 when using ultrafast

bootstrap (UFBP) and 54.2 using traditional non-parametric bootstrap (BP), but the mean

support for the placement of Rafflesiaceae was only 49.2 UFBP or 26.3 BP. We also created

two additional datasets, namely G1553 and G647, with increasingly stringent filtering

criteria for missing data. The G1553 dataset included 1,553 loci with less than 14 missing

species (33%). The concatenated matrix of G1553 included 2,139,714 DNA sites and a

mean branch support of 68.6 UFBP. The G647 dataset included 647 loci with less than 9

missing species (20%). The concatenated matrix of G647 included 846,640 DNA sites and a

similar mean branch support of 68.2 UFBP. All curated alignments and gene trees are

available on Zenodo (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.11643026).

Identifying suitable genes for placing Rafflesiaceae

To identify suitable genes for phylogenetic reconstruction, especially regarding the

placement of Rafflesiaceae, we used ten metrics to quantify various aspects of phylogenetic

properties (supplementary table S2, Supplementary Material online). These metrics

included six tree-wise features such as number of species, alignment length, average nodal

support, total tree length, root-to-tip branch length variance, and gene tree–species tree

congruence; and four metrics specific to Rafflesiaceae, including its DNA compositional

bias, branch lengths, and nodal support. These ten metrics were significantly correlated (*p*-

value <0.05) in 24 out of the 45 comparisons (Fig. 1). For example, the mean nodal support,

which is a widely applied metric for selecting high-quality phylogenetic markers, was

significantly positively correlated with alignment length and gene tree–species tree

congruence. Rafflesiaceae-specific features, however, largely formed a unique covarying

cluster in the correlation heatmap and were relatively independent of the other tree-wise

metrics (supplementary fig. S1, Supplementary Material online). For example, the nodal

support of Rafflesiaceae's placement was strongly positively correlated with its own

branch length (*p*-value < 2.2e-16, Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.48), but

counterintuitively, negatively correlated with the number of species and gene tree–species

tree congruence (Fig. 1).

Fig. 1 Pairwise correlation between ten metrics of gene phylogenetic property. The scatter
plots on the lower left depict the raw distribution between any pair of metrics; the circles
on the upper right represent the significance and direction of Pearson correlation tests. The
size of the circles is negatively scaled with the *p*-value in log scale, and the red-to-blue hue
of the Pearson correlation coefficient represents the negative-to-positive correlation.
174

Initial phylogenetic reconstructions yielded weakly supported, conflicting species

trees

Explorative phylogenetic reconstructions using concatenation and coalescent methods

recovered multiple distinct placements of Rafflesiaceae (referred to as H1-H19 in Fig. 2B;

supplementary table S3; supplementary data S1, Supplementary Material online). Despite

the effort to reduce missing data, mitigate compositional and rate heterogeneity, and

accommodate ILS, none of these results were well supported. Two topologies were

frequently recovered, which either placed Rafflesiaceae as sister to Putranjivaceae alone

(H2) or as sister to the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of Putranjivaceae,

Pandaceae, Rhizophoraceae, and Erythroxylaceae (H11). The monophyletic (Rafflesiaceae,

Putranjivaceae) (H2) was supported by ML analysis of the concatenated DNA alignments

with the least amount of missing data (G647) and the full coalescent analyses from

starBEAST. For ML analyses, this topology received 67 BP support in RAxML and 87 UFBP

support in IQ-TREE. The Bayesian inferences in starBEAST grouped these two families with

0.98 PP, but the relationship among (Rafflesiaceae, Putranjivaceae), (Peraceae,

Euphorbiaceae), and (Erythroxylaceae, Rhizophoraceae, and Pandaceae) remained elusive

(PP< 0.53; supplementary fig. S2, Supplementary Material online). On the other hand, an

earlier divergence of Rafflesiaceae featured in H11 was supported by complex site models

such as the PhyloBayes infinite profile mixture model (0.86 PP) and the empirical protein

profile mixture model (69 BP), and most summary coalescent analyses. The other two

topologies, H15 and H18, were also recovered by more than one analysis. H15 placed

Rafflesiaceae sister to the MRCA of Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae, Rhizophoraceae,

Erythroxylaceae, Pandaceae, and Putranjivaceae. It was recovered by the concatenated

Dayhoff six-state recoded protein alignment (analysis 11) and two summary coalescent

analyses with subsampled gene trees (analysis 16 and 17). H18 placed Rafflesiaceae with

the MRCA of Ixonanthaceae, Rhizophoraceae, and Erythroxylaceae, which was supported

by the DNA alignment of the G1553 dataset (UFBP = 32 in IQ-TREE and BP = 47 in RAxML).

Despite these conflicts, the initial analyses reveal four clades that are frequently associated

with Rafflesiaceae, including (Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae), Putranjivaceae, Pandaceae, and

(Erythroxylaceae, Rhizophoraceae). The divergence between these clades was

characterized by a series of short internal branches, leading to extensive phylogenetic

conflicts (Fig. 2A). For the four internal nodes among these clades plus Rafflesiaceae, the

concordant gene quartet frequencies, defined as the percentage of decisive gene trees

supporting that branch, ranged from 34.8% to 40.7% (Minh et al. 2020a). The quartet

frequencies for other early-diverging lineages in Malpighiales were similarly low and

ranged from 34.8% to 41.0%, reflecting the well-recognized recalcitrant relationship in

Malpighiales. Similarly, site concordance factor summarized from DNA and protein

alignments also suggested strongly conflicting signals. Among the five focal clades, the site

concordance factors ranged from 30.6 to 40.8% for DNA and from 30.6 to 38.8% for

protein (Fig. 2A). The GC content of Rafflesiaceae was comparable to other free-living

Malpighiales and did not cause the low concordance factors observed above

(Supplementary fig. S3, Supplementary Material online).

Fig. 2 Extensive phylogenetic conflicts lead to weakly supported conflicting placements of Rafflesiaceae. **A**. Conflicting phylogenetic signals evidenced by gene and site concordance factors. The reference species tree is inferred by MP-EST from the complete dataset (analysis 14 in **C**). The numbers on each node illustrate the proportions of concordant versus discordant genes. These concordance factors (CFs) are also visualized as pie charts for genes, DNA sites, and protein sites. **B**. Alternative placement of Rafflesiaceae across various data subsampling and species tree inference schemes. The 19 hypothesized placements of Rafflesiaceae are variously supported by coalescent or concatenation analyses and their branch support values are color coded. **C**. Method summary for 18 explorative phylogenetic analyses.

Modeling is more effective than masking in mitigating site heterogeneity

Given the exceptionally long branch leading to stem group Rafflesiaceae (Fig. 2), we employed two divergent strategies to mitigate the effects of compositional and rate heterogeneity. We first applied the CAT-GTR model in PhyloBayes v3.1.1 to a smaller dataset of 168 genes, which provides infinite mixture models of site-specific evolutionary profiles (Lartillot et al. 2013). Two out of four Markov chains converged with a maximum discrepancy of 0.15 after running for 41,253 generations, which took more than one month and 32 nodes on the high-performance computing cluster. This phylogeny placed Rafflesiaceae as sister to the MRCA of Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae, Pandaceae, and Putranjivaceae (H11 in Fig. 2B) with moderate support (0.86 PP). However, because of the low support of its immediate descendant branch (0.58 PP), these three clades—including Rafflesiaceae, (Pandaceae, Putranjivaceae), and (Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae)—formed a polytomy. Moreover, the branch length of stem group Rafflesiaceae was inferred to be 0.543 and its ancestral branch to be 0.0008. This result suggested a 679-fold change in branch length before and after the divergence of Rafflesiaceae. Despite the even longer terminal branch leading to Podostemaceae and high GC content, the phylogenetic affinity between Podostemaceae and Hypericaceae was maximumly supported in all analyses due to the longer internal branch supporting their shared ancestry (Fig. 2A; supplementary fig. S3; supplementary data S1, Supplementary Material online).

Second, we applied the six-state Dayhoff amino acid recoding (Dayhoff et al. 1978) to mask mutational noises. This amino acid recoding did not effectively resolve the placement of Rafflesiaceae, nor did it improve the overall resolution of the species tree. The Dayhoff6 recoding allowed us to use more loci compared to the mixture models in PhyloBayes. Species tree inferred from the recoded G647 dataset placed Rafflesiaceae with 12 BP as sister to the MRCA of Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae, and Pandaceae (H6 in Fig. 2B). Results from the recoded G1553 dataset placed Rafflesiaceae with 19 BP as sister to the MRCA of Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae, Putranjivaceae, Pandaceae, Erythroxylaceae, and Rhizophoraceae (H15 in Fig. 2B).

Topology tests supported conflicting hypotheses

We tested the goodness-of-fit of individual genes and concatenated alignments to proposed

species trees under the concatenation and coalescent models.

First, we applied the Gene Genealogy Interrogation (GGI) implemented in (Arcila et al.

2017) to assess the fit of individual genes to the proposed topologies. Only three out of the

2,141 genes significantly supported one of the hypotheses in the AU test (p-value >0.95).

The monophyly of Rafflesiaceae and Putranjivaceae (H2) was slightly favored over other

hypotheses (supplementary fig. S4, Supplementary Material online). Results from the KH

test and SH test were similar; very few genes contained sufficient information to

significantly support any of the hypotheses (supplementary fig. S4, Supplementary Material

online).

Second, we assessed topologies using concatenated DNA and protein alignments. The

results were sensitive to the type of input data (DNA vs. protein), the amount of missing

data (G647 vs. G1553), and even the phylogenetic inference program (RAxML vs. IQ-TREE).

Ten hypotheses (H1, H5, H7–10, H12–14, and H16; supplementary table S4, Supplementary

Material online) were universally rejected by all tests, including the monophyly of

(Rafflesiaceae, Euphorbiaceae). Four hypotheses (H2, H4, H6, and H11) were supported by

at least two topology tests (AU test p-value >0.05, RELL bootstrap >0.05). The monophyly

of Rafflesiaceae and Putranjivaceae (H2) was supported by DNA alignments under the GTR

model, but strongly rejected using protein alignments under the C30 profile mixture model.

The close relationship between Rafflesiaceae and (Erythroxylaceae, Rhizophoraceae) (H4)

was similarly supported by DNA alignments but not protein data. We also obtained

inconsistent results when using RAxML or IQ-TREE, despite using the same input data and

substitution model. For example, the AU test in IQ-TREE accepted H4 (p-value = 0.544)

when applying the G1553 DNA alignment. But this hypothesis was rejected with a p-value

of 0.03 when using the likelihood calculated by RAxML (supplementary table S4,

Supplementary Material online).

Finally, we evaluated alternative species trees under the multiple species coalescent model.

The optimum tree placed Rafflesiaceae as sister to the MRCA of all four focal clades (H15)

with a pseudolikelihood of -7433872.434 in MP-EST. The second-best tree was H11,

followed by H12 as the third-best tree. Using parametric bootstrapping, we found that the

difference in pseudolikelihoods was not statistically significant among the top three (p-

value ≥ 0.05) but were all significantly better than the fourth tree. Therefore, our likelihood

ratio test rejected all but three hypotheses (H11, H12, H15) under the coalescent model

(supplementary table S4, Supplementary Material online).

Long-branch attraction contributes to erroneous species tree reconstruction

To further explore how fast-evolving genes prone to long-branch attraction may contribute

to the conflicting placements of Rafflesiaceae, we partitioned the data into eight subsets

with increasing synonymous substitution rates (d_S) in stem group Rafflesiaceae. The

median d_S value of stem group Rafflesiaceae ranged from 0.47 to 0.85 in these datasets and

35.1% of genes have experienced more than one synonymous substitution per site ($d_S >1$;

Fig. 3B). These substitution rates were 4.6 times higher than in *Manihot* (Euphorbiaceae)

and 3.3 times higher than in *Populus* (Salicaceae; supplementary fig. S5, Supplementary

Material online). Topology tests on these data subsets recaptured the results above that

DNA and protein support different hypotheses (Fig. 3C-E). Five hypotheses were favored

by all DNA datasets under the GTR model (AU test p-value >0.05), which variously placed

Rafflesiaceae with Putranjivaceae (H2), (Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae) (H1), and

Ixonanthaceae (H19), or with clades containing these families (H5, H18). Among these five

hypotheses, the phylogenetic affinity between Rafflesiaceae, Putranjivaceae (H2) decreased

when rapidly evolving genes were added to the analysis (Fig. 4C). In contrast, support for

the affinity between Rafflesiaceae, Ixonanthaceae, and (Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae) (H4, H18

and H19) increased instead. The protein alignment revealed a similar trend under the JTT

model. The monophyletic (Rafflesiaceae, Putranjivaceae) (H2) was generally favored

except when genes with the highest d_S values were added. However, the C30 protein

mixture model exclusively placed Rafflesiaceae with the MRCA of Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae,

Pandaceae, and Putranjivaceae (H11), which was strongly rejected under the JTT model

(Fig. 3E).

Fig. 3 Changes in topology test results when adding more rapidly evolving genes. **A.** Distribution of synonymous substitution rate (d_S) in the focal branch of stem group Rafflesiaceae. **B.** Distribution of d_S and number of genes in eight data subsets by gradual addition of genes with higher d_S. **C–E.** Dynamics in AU test *p*-values for alternative hypotheses across eight datasets under the GTR substitution model of DNA alignment (**C**), the JTT substitution model of protein alignment (**D**), and the C30 profile mixture model of protein alignment (**E**).

The anomaly zone and coalescent simulations

To explore the effects of ILS, we first calculated the branch length in coalescent units for focal clades. The three successive short internal branches among Rafflesiaceae and the other four focal clades ranged from 0.031 to 0.064 in coalescent units (Fig. 4A). The estimated minimum branch length to escape the anomaly zone was 0.536, which is ten times longer than the actual branch lengths (Fig. 4B). This result suggests that these rapid radiations involving Rafflesiaceae are clearly victims of the anomaly zone. Our gene tree simulation also corroborated this conclusion; the most common gene tree was discordant from the true species tree (Fig. 4D), which ranked 11th in frequency. The highly consistent frequencies between the empirical and simulated gene trees suggested that most gene tree variations can be explained by ILS. However, a significant difference was observed in topology H15, in which Rafflesiaceae was placed at the base of Malpighiales—a classic signal of long-branch attraction in empirical data (Kapli et al. 2020). This topology was

present in only 11% of the true gene trees in simulation but increased to 17% when adding

in the ML inference step. This result captured the biases generated during the ML inference

step, likely stemming from long-branch attraction, and aligned well with the empirical

distribution of gene tree frequencies (Fig. 4D).

Fig 4. The anomaly zone and coalescent simulation. **A.** Reference species tree for coalescent

simulation with labeled branches. **B**. For each internal branch pair in a four-taxon tree,

boundaries of the anomaly zone a(x) calculated from (Degnan and Rosenberg 2006) are

compared to the empirical branch length (y). Two out of three branch pairs (b-c and c-d)

fall within the anomaly zone as y< a(x). **C.** Site concordance factors for branches b, c, and d

in the simulated DNA sequences. The concordant sites are less than 33% (random

distribution) in branches b and c. **D.** Gene tree frequency for the 15 alternative placements

of Rafflesiaceae (H1–H15) in the empirical gene trees (dark grey), simulated true gene

trees under the multispecies coalescent model (MSC; medium grey), and inferred maximum

likelihood (ML) gene trees based on the simulated sequences (light grey). In all three cases,

gene trees consistent with the true species tree topology have very low frequency.

When inferring the species tree from simulated alignments, none of the concatenated

analyses recovered the true species tree. Specifically, when more than 4,000 loci were used,

the true topology was strongly rejected, suggesting statistical inconsistency

(supplementary table S5, Supplementary Material online). Instead, the incorrect species

topologies were variously supported by AU tests. H5 and H15 were most frequently

favored, which placed Rafflesiaceae with (Putranjivaceae, Euphorbiaceae) or the MRCA of

Rhizophoraceae and Euphorbiaceae, respectively. In contrast, summary coalescent

methods consistently recovered the true species when at least 4,000 loci were used

(supplementary table S6, Supplementary Material online). The gene tree estimation error

was as high as 78.1% for 500-bp-alignments and 70.0% for 2000-bp-alignments in terms of

the placement of Rafflesiaceae. Such high estimation error led to incorrect species tree

estimation when less than 3,000 genes were used. But even when enough loci were used

and the true species tree was recovered, the BP support for Rafflesiaceae was still

moderate to low (35–84 BP) and did not increase with the number of genes used.

Moreover, alternative topologies could not be rejected based on the likelihood ratio test.

For example, the difference in pseudolikelihoods between the true species tree H11 and an

alternative topology H5 was 0.71 when using 1,000 genes (pseudolikelihood = -10968.5)

and 20.3 when using 10,000 genes (pseudolikelihood = -109763.3), which were not

statistically significant (p–value >0.51, supplementary table S6, Supplementary Material

online).

DISCUSSION

Challenges in identifying genes with optimum phylogenetic signal

Selecting reliable genes with desired phylogenetic properties has been a routine practice to

remove biased signals and reduce computational burden. These phylogenetic properties

often exhibit various levels of covariance (Koch 2021). In our dataset, we found that some

commonly applied criteria for selecting phylogenetically informative loci, including high

gene tree–species tree congruence, high gene tree support, and low missing taxa, strongly

covary (Fig. 2). We also discovered that genes exhibiting clock-like features such as lower

root-to-tip variance do not necessarily have higher gene tree resolution (p-value 0.34),

which also corroborated with previous studies (Koch 2021). Regarding the placement of

Rafflesiaceae, the genes ideal for improving global phylogenetic resolution may not be

suitable for resolving this particular clade because Rafflesiaceae-specific phylogenetic

metrics do not covary with most tree-wise statistics. Instead, identified correlation patterns

were counter-intuitive—the nodal support of Rafflesiaceae was positively correlated with

missing data (p-value < 2.2e-16, Pearson correlation coefficient = -0.23) and negatively

correlated with global gene tree–species tree congruence (p-value = 9.1e-08, Pearson

correlation coefficient = -0.12; Fig. 2). As a result, canonical practices to select genes based

on tree-wise phylogenetic properties could confound the placement of Rafflesiaceae.

Focusing on Rafflesiaceae-specific metrics, the nodal support of Rafflesiaceae was strongly

influenced only by its own branch length, rather than the long descending branch or

compositional bias (Fig. 2). Therefore, its recalcitrant placement appears to be primarily

driven by the ancestral rapid radiation and less by the mutational saturation accumulated

in the stem group. The low branch support of Rafflesiaceae (mean BP = 23.6), on the other

hand, makes it less reliable as a locus selection criterion. For example, further investigation

of genes with high support values of Rafflesiaceae suggested that they were artifacts of

incorrect placement—genes with higher than 85 BP almost exclusively placed Rafflesiaceae

at the base of Malpighiales (supplementary table S2, Supplementary Material online).

These genes are in fact more likely to suffer from long-branch attraction. Therefore, neither

tree-wise properties nor Rafflesiaceae-specific metrics are reliable criteria for selecting

genes to place Rafflesiaceae. This is potentially a result of the altered selective pressure in

Rafflesiaceae stemming from parasitism (Cai et al. 2021a), making otherwise slowly

evolving phylogenetic markers behave differently. Another evidence of the differentiated

selection is our unsuccessful attempt to amplify angiosperm probe sets in Rafflesiaceae,

which are highly informative universal phylogenetic markers, but are largely lost or greatly

modified in Rafflesiaceae (Davis, unpublished data). When such species are the focus of

phylogenetic investigation, additional efforts should be made to test whether commonly

applied tree-wise metrics for phylogenetic informativeness are consistent at lineage-

specific levels.

Genome-wide rate acceleration leads to extreme homoplasy

The shift to a parasitic lifestyle has fundamentally reshaped the selective forces acting on

autotrophic functions such as photosynthesis (Cai 2023). As a result, relaxed selection and

accelerated nucleotide substitution rates are often characterized in the plastid and nuclear

genomes (Bromham et al. 2013; Wicke et al. 2016; Chen et al. 2023), but less so in the

mitochondria (Petersen et al. 2020). In Rafflesiaceae, this rate acceleration and the

ancestral rapid radiation that gave rise to stem group Rafflesiaceae created a sharp

contrast in branch lengths before and after the origin of Rafflesiaceae. The largest length

difference between these two branches was observed in the PhyloBayes analysis under the

CAT-GTR mixture model, which implied a 679-fold change. Estimates based on the

homogeneous site models in ML methods consistently implied a smaller change (68–82

fold). It is possible that homoplasy sites were incorrectly counted as ancestral mutations in

simplified site models, thus underestimating derived changes. Regardless, at least two

orders of magnitude of change were seen in these branch lengths, leading to extensive

phylogenetic conflicts. These conflicts are reflected by the low gene and site concordance

factors. Among the five focal clades shown in Fig. 2A, the lowest concordant factors were

seen in Rafflesiaceae. These low values remained consistent when using alternative

topologies, suggesting that incorrect phylogenetic placement is not the cause. Instead, it

originated from the excessive homoplasy in stem group Rafflesiaceae. This is corroborated

by our coalescent simulation in which only 29.41% of the simulated sites were concordant

with the true species tree (Fig. 4C).

The combination of high ILS and homoplasy present significant challenges for species

reconstruction using either concatenation or coalescent methods (Martyn and Steel 2012;

Roch et al. 2019). Our species tree falls well within the anomaly zone (Fig. 4B). As a result,

the concatenation method is statistically inconsistent because in our simulation analysis,

the true species tree was strongly rejected when more data were added. In the empirical

data, we also observed increased support for spurious relationships when rapidly evolving

genes were added (e.g., H4, H18, H19 in Fig. 3C). Homoplasy and long-branch attraction

also can confound coalescent-based inferences (Liu et al. 2023). In our simulation, gene

tree frequencies for the fifteen alternative topologies were largely consistent between the

simulated true gene trees and gene trees inferred from the simulated alignments (Fig. 4D).

Yet, a disproportionately high frequency of H15 was recovered among estimated gene trees

when they were inferred from sequences likely suffering from long-branch attraction.

When aggregating such erroneous signals into concatenated alignments, it may contribute

to the support of H15 in optimum species tree searches and in likelihood ratio tests (Fig.

2B; supplementary table S4, Supplementary Material online).

Insights to the phylogenetic placement of Rafflesiaceae

Our simulation concluded that current methods for modeling substitution and coalescent

processes are insufficient to fully resolve the origin of Rafflesiaceae within Malpighiales.

Massive gene loss in this parasitic plant clade renders a greatly reduced pool of

phylogenetic markers that are far from enough to achieve a definitive placement.

Meanwhile, alternative methods employing macro- and micro-scale gene synteny have

been increasingly implemented to untangle recalcitrant relationships in angiosperms and

teleost fishes (Zhao et al. 2021; Parey et al. 2023). As more genomic data to be developed in

Malpighiales and beyond, the application of these new methods may provide some novel

insights into this thorny phylogenetic problem.

Despite these challenges, two hypotheses were consistently recovered across multiple

analyses, placing Rafflesiaceae with Putranjivaceae (H2), or with the MRCA of

Putranjivaceae, Pandaceae, Euphorbiaceae, and Peraceae (H11). First, the monophyletic

(Rafflesiaceae, Putranjivaceae) relationship (H2) was supported by the 'democratic vote'

approach of GGI, concatenation methods with homogeneous site models, and full

coalescent models. In the GGI test, this topology was slightly favored by most genes, yet the

difference is not statistically significant for nearly all genes. Such a result is not surprising

because individual loci may not contain enough information to reject alternative

hypotheses (Arcila et al. 2017; Puttick et al. 2018). When aggregating signals into

concatenated alignments, support for the monophyletic (Rafflesiaceae, Putranjivaceae)

became statistically significant (supplementary table S4, Supplementary Material online).

All concatenation methods with homogeneous site models (i.e., GTR and JTT) supported

this hypothesis with consistently high confidence across datasets with different levels of

missing data or evolutionary rates. This included the full coalescent model from starBEAST

at high confidence (0.98 PP; supplementary fig. S2, Supplementary Material online).

However, this hypothesis was strongly rejected when mixture models were used. Both the

CAT-GTR and C30 mixture models favored an earlier divergence of Rafflesiaceae as

suggested in H11 (supplementary table S4, Supplementary Material online). Moreover,

ASTRAL and MP-EST also recovered H11 as the optimum species tree and the support is

statistically significant under the likelihood ratio test.

Between these two hypotheses, H11 was supported by more complex and realistic models

such as the site mixture model and the multispecies coalescent model. In addition, it is also

important to recognize that the GGI and AU test of concatenated alignments can be

positively misleading when ILS is prevalent. The drawbacks of concatenation under high

ILS have been discussed extensively (Song et al. 2012; Xi et al. 2014; Edwards et al. 2016).

Similarly, the GGI approach can also suffer from ILS especially in the anomaly zone where

the most common gene tree differs from the species tree (Degnan and Rosenberg 2006).

Indeed, our simulation demonstrates that the concordant gene trees occur at very low

frequency, which will lead to the rejection of the true species tree using the GGI approach

(Fig. 4).

The four tropical families suggested to be close relatives of Rafflesiaceae include

Putranjivaceae, Pandaceae, Euphorbiaceae, and Peraceae, all of which have a pantropical

distribution. Pentamerous dioecious flowers, such as those in Rafflesiaceae, are commonly

found in Putranjivaceae (and the unsampled close relative Lophopyxidaceae) and

Pandaceae (Matthews and Endress 2013; Wurdack et al. 2004). But all these free-living

lineages produce only minute flowers, corroborating the previous claim that the enormous

flowers of Rafflesiaceae evolved from ancestors with tiny flowers (Davis et al. 2007).

Although the highly modified morphology of Rafflesiaceae makes it challenging to identify

synapomorphies, several shared features support its close relationship with the proposed

sister families. For example, like Rafflesiaceae, Putranjivaceae also releases sulfur-rich,

strong-smelling chemicals to attract pollinators. The foul odor of Rafflesiaceae flowers

largely comes from dimethyl disulfide and dimethyl trisulfide (Jürgens et al. 2013; Wee et

al. 2018). In *Drypetes* (Putranjivaceae), such a strong smell comes from isothiocyanates

from the glucosinolates pathway (Johnson et al. 2009). Future studies focusing on the

metabolic pathway of these chemicals will elucidate whether they are derived from a

shared ancestor.

Conclusion

Both incomplete lineage sorting and long-branch attraction have played an important role
in shaping the recalcitrant placement of Rafflesiaceae. The unique life-history strategy of
this endoparasitic family of plants has led to unique evolutionary patterns of genes that
have different patterns of "phylogenetic informativeness" compared to their free-living
relatives. We have demonstrated for the first time that accelerated substitution rate is a
genome-wide phenomenon in this parasitic plant lineage and contributes to long-branch
attraction. We also identified two plausible phylogenetic scenarios for the placement of
Rafflesiaceae, either with Putranjivaceae or the common ancestor of Putranjivaceae,
Pandaceae, Euphorbiaceae, and Peraceae. Both placements support a tropical origin of the
family and the striking contrast in flower size between Rafflesiaceae and its ancestors.
However, our simulation also suggested that the combination of incomplete lineage sorting,
long-branch attraction, and massive gene loss has created a vexing phylogenetic scenario
that is impossible to resolve with currently available methods for phylogenetic inference.

Materials and Methods

Phylogenomic dataset assembly, sequence alignment, and gene tree reconstruction

We combined the two phylogenomic datasets from our previous studies (Cai et al. 2019;
Cai et al. 2021a) to generate a 2,141-gene dataset (supplementary table S1, Supplementary
Material online). The combined dataset included 43 species representing all three genera of
Rafflesiaceae, twenty-one families broadly sampled across Malpighiales, and three
outgroup species from Oxalidales and Celastrales. Briefly, the two datasets were merged
based on gene IDs of the three Malpighiales species sampled in both studies (*Manihot
esculenta*, *Populus trichocarpa*, and *Jatropha curcas*). Then, the tree-based ortholog
identification approach from Yang and Smith (2014) was applied iteratively to remove HGT
genes in Rafflesiaceae or paralogs arising from gene duplications. The final phylogenomic
dataset consisted of 2,141 protein-coding orthogroups satisfying the following three
criteria: (1) included at least one vertically transmitted gene from Rafflesiaceae; (2)
included at least 10 species (23% species completeness); (3) all genes are orthologous to
each other, and no paralogs generated by gene duplications prior to the divergence of

Malpighiales were included. No new molecular data was generated for this study and a

detailed description of how we assembled the dataset is provided in supplementary note

S1, Supplementary Material online.

Protein and CDS sequences of these 2,141 single-copy orthogroups were aligned using

MAFFT v.7.299 (Katoh and Standley 2013) and then converted into the corresponding

codon alignments using pal2nal (Suyama et al. 2006). Alignments were trimmed by trimAL

v1.2 (Capella-Gutiérrez et al. 2009) to remove sites containing more than 50% missing data

in the DNA and protein alignments.

We inferred a ML phylogeny for each locus based on DNA alignments using IQ-TREE v2.3.2

(Minh et al. 2020b). Optimal substitution models for each alignment were determined by

ModelFinder (Kalyaanamoorthy et al. 2017) using the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)

within IQ-TREE. Branch supports were assessed using ultrafast bootstrap approximation

(UFBP; Hoang et al. 2018) with 1000 replicates along with the '-bnni' option to reduce the

risk of overestimating branch support resulting from model violations. We also used a non-

parametric bootstrap (BP) with 100 replications to assess branch support for each gene

tree. All DNA alignments, protein alignments, and individual gene trees were deposited in

Zenodo (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.11643026). All scripts used for orthogroup selection and

gene tree reconstruction are available on the GitHub repository

(https://github.com/lmcai/Rafflesiaceae_phylogenomics).

Quantifying phylogenetic properties of individual genes

Each gene was quantified for the following phylogenetic properties using SortaDate (Smith

et al. 2018): number of species, alignment length, average gene tree support, total tree

length, root-to-tip branch-length variance, and gene tree–species tree congruence

(supplementary table S2, Supplementary Material online). A species tree estimated by

ASTRAL-III v5.7.3 (Zhang et al. 2017) based on all 2,141 orthogroups (analysis 12 in Fig.2;

see the following section for species tree estimation) was used for assessing gene tree–

species tree congruence, but we removed all Rafflesiaceae species to avoid the systematic

bias stemming from artificially fixing this unstable node. Four phylogenetic metrics specific

to Rafflesiaceae were extracted: the base compositional bias of Rafflesiaceae, the branch

length of stem-group Rafflesiaceae and its ascending parent branch, and the nodal support

of Rafflesiaceae. The base compositional heterogeneity was derived from the Chi-square

test in IQ-TREE, whereas the other metrics were summarized using a custom Python script

from gene trees (available on GitHub). Finally, we modeled the pairwise Pearson

correlation among these phylogenetic metrics. The correlation heatmap was generated

using the function 'heatmap' from the R package corrplot (Wei et al. 2017).

Generation of phylogenetic hypotheses with data subsampling

Eighteen explorative phylogenomic analyses were conducted (Figure 1, supplementary

table S3, Supplementary Material online). These comprised concatenation (11 analyses)

and coalescent methods (7 analyses) that used either DNA (13 analyses) or protein

alignments (5 analyses) for the complete dataset (5 analyses) or subsampled datasets (7

analyses). Two data subsets were created in an attempt to minimize the artifacts from

missing data, especially in the four focal clades that were closely related to Rafflesiaceae.

These four clades included (Euphorbiaceae, Peraceae), Putranjivaceae, Pandaceae, and

(Erythroxylaceae, Rhizophoraceae). First, a 1,553–loci dataset (referred to as G1553) was

selected from the complete dataset (referred to as G2141) to include genes that contained

at least 29 species (67% species completeness) and at least three of the four focal clades.

Second, a 647–loci dataset (referred to as G647) was created to select genes containing at

least 34 species (80% species completeness) and three of the four focal clades.

Concatenation analysis—We inferred the ML phylogeny based on DNA alignments (analysis

1–5 in Fig. 2) using ExaML v3.0.18 (Kozlov et al. 2015), RAxML v8.2.11 (Stamatakis 2014),

and IQ-TREE. For both complete and subsampled datasets, the best partition schemes were

determined using PartitionFinder v2.1.1 (Lanfear et al. 2017), the corrected Akaike

Information Criterion, and the heuristic rcluster searching algorithm (--rcluster-percent

10). Species trees were subsequently inferred under the GTR + G model. Branch support

was evaluated using 100 BP replicates in ExaML and RAxML; and using 1000 UFBP

replicates in IQ-TREE. For protein analyses (analysis 7–9 in Fig. 2), we applied the GAMMA

model to the unpartitioned complete dataset (analysis 7) in ExaML and a site-specific

posterior mean site frequency (PMSF) model (Wang et al. 2018) to the subsampled

datasets in IQ-TREE (analysis 8 and 9). The PMSF model approximates the empirical profile

mixture model of Le et al. (2008), which is a variant of the infinite mixture model CAT-GTR

in PhyloBayes. It can effectively ameliorate long-branch attraction artifacts and is

computationally more efficient (Wang et al. 2018). Because of the memory limit of our

computing cluster, we only applied the PMSF model to subsampled datasets (G647 and

G1553) and used 30 mixture components for protein profile (LG+C30+F+G).

Summary coalescent analysis—We used ASTRAL-III and MP-EST v2.1 (Liu et al. 2010) to

infer species trees under the coalescent model. For ASTRAL analyses (analysis 12, 15 in Fig.

2C; supplementary table S3, Supplementary Material online), ML gene trees inferred from

DNA alignments of the complete dataset G2141 were used and branch support was

evaluated using the local posterior probability. To reduce the impact of gene-tree

estimation error, we also collapsed spurious branches with less than 70 UFBP using

Newick Utilities v1.6 (Junier and Zdobnov 2010). The collapsed gene trees were then used

to infer the species tree in ASTRAL (analysis 15). For MP-EST analyses, we used both the

complete dataset (analysis 13, 14) and the subsampled datasets (analysis 16, 17) for

species tree estimation (supplementary table S3, Supplementary Material online). Branch

support was evaluated using 100 replicates from BP gene trees inferred from the DNA

sequences.

Full coalescent analysis—We inferred a species tree using the full coalescent model and the

uncorrelated lognormal clock (UCLN) model implemented in the starBEAST2 package of

BEAST v.2.4.5 (analysis 18 in Fig. 2; Ogilvie et al., 2017; Bouckaert et al., 2014). The high

computational demand of starBEAST2 required us to further subsample the dataset by

species and loci. We therefore included 13 representative species from focal clades and

filtered the DNA alignments to generate an 81-exon alignment. The selection of exon

instead of full length CDS sequence is because the exceptionally long intron in Rafflesiaceae

(up to 97.8 kb; Cai et al. 2021a) may violate the recombination assumption of the

coalescent model. We ran starBEAST2 for 500 million generations sampling every 50,000

generations. Each locus was assigned to its own relaxed clock and a HKY model of

molecular evolution. For more details regarding starBEAST, see supplementary note 2,

Supplementary Material online. The sequence alignment and xml file for running the

analysis is provided in the GitHub repository.

Application of complex compositional and rate heterogeneity models

We employed two divergent strategies to mitigate the effects of compositional and rate

heterogeneity. We first used the CAT-GTR model in Phylobayes v3.1.1, which provides

infinite mixture models of site-specific evolutionary profiles (Lartillot et al. 2013; analysis 6

in Fig. 2). To ease convergence and reduce computational burden, we used a subsampled

dataset of 168 genes (209,782 DNA sites) that are present in at least 75% of the species

and all focal clades. We ran the CAT-GTR model in four independent chains until

convergence was reached between at least two chains. We assessed convergence based on

effective sample size of parameters (target > 200) and the maximum discrepancy observed

across all bipartitions (target < 0.15) using bpcomp and tracecomp in PhyloBayes.

In addition to modeling the complex site-specific process, we also applied the six-state

Dayhoff amino acid recoding (Dayhoff et al. 1978) in an attempt to mask mutational noises,

especially in stem group Rafflesiaceae (analysis 10 and 11 in Fig. 2). Dayhoff recoding

groups the twenty amino acids into six bins, each containing a set of biochemically similar

amino acids. We recoded the protein alignment from the G647 and G1553 datasets using

Phylogears v2.2 (Tanabe 2012). ML trees were subsequently inferred for each of the two

concatenated datasets under the MULTIGAMMA model in RAxML. Branch support was

assessed with 100 rapid BP replicates followed by a thorough ML search.

Evaluating gene and site phylogenetic conflicts

We used gene tree quartet frequency and site concordance factors to quantify phylogenetic

conflicts using ASTRAL and IQ-TREE, respectively. Gene tree quartet frequency

summarizes the percentages of consistent quartets among decisive gene trees based on a

reference species tree (Sayyari and Mirarab 2016). The site concordance factor was

similarly defined but used a heuristic method to sample alignment sites (Minh et al. 2020a).

The gene tree quartet frequency was calculated by ASTRAL when invoking the full branch

annotation option (-t 2). We used the filtered gene tree branches from the complete dataset

to infer the quartet frequency (branch support >70 UFBP; analysis 15 in Fig. 2). In doing so,

we aimed to summarize quartet frequency from only informative branches. To calculate

site concordance factor in IQ-TREE, we used the same ASTRAL tree as the reference species

tree and the concatenated DNA and protein alignments from the G1553 dataset as input.

For each internal branch, 200 quartets were sampled to obtain stable site concordance

factors (--scf 200).

Fit of individual gene trees to proposed topologies

The initial phylogenetic reconstructions revealed four focal clades that are closely related

to Rafflesiaceae (Fig. 2). To more finely place Rafflesiaceae, we proposed a total of 19

topologies with all possible placements of Rafflesiaceae relative to these four clades (H1–

H15 in Fig. 2). We also added two topologies proposed by Barkman et al (2004) and Davis

et al (2007), which placed Rafflesiaceae with Passifloraceae (H17) and Euphorbiaceae

(H16), respectively. Finally, Ixonanthaceae or (Ixonanthaceae, (Erythroxylaceae,

Rhizophoraceae)) was also inferred as a close relative of Rafflesiaceae in some

concatenation analyses. Thus, we also added two hypotheses that placed Rafflesiaceae with

(Ixonanthaceae, (Erythroxylaceae, Rhizophoraceae)) (H18) or Ixonanthaceae alone (H19).

We tested the fitness of individual gene trees to the 19 alternative topologies using Gene

Genealogy Interrogation (GGI) implemented in Arcila et al. (2017). Briefly, for each of the

2,141 genes, we conducted constrained phylogenetic searches enforcing the relationship

imposed by each of the 19 hypotheses. Only genes containing at least two of the four focal

clades were used for GGI analysis. Site likelihood scores for each tree were obtained under

the GTR+G model based on DNA alignments in RAxML. Topology tests were conducted by

statistically comparing the site likelihood scores among all proposed topologies via three

tests implemented in CONSEL v0.20 (Shimodaira and Hasegawa 2001)—the AU test

(Shimodaira 2002), the Shimodaira–Hasegawa (SH) test (Shimodaira and Hasegawa 1999),

and the Kishino-Hasegawa (KH) test (Kishino and Hasegawa 1989). Among these three

approaches, the AU test uses multi-scale bootstrapping techniques and is most suitable for

simultaneous comparisons of multiple trees. Finally, trees were ranked according to the *p*-

values supporting each hypothesis and visualized using R.

Fit of concatenated alignments to proposed topologies

We evaluated the support for 19 *a priori* hypotheses using the concatenated alignments of

the G647 and G1553 datasets. For DNA alignments, site likelihood scores for each

constraint topology were obtained under the GTR + G model in RAxML. We then conducted

AU, SH, and KH tests in CONSEL following the same method described above. We also

conducted AU, SH, and KH tests in IQ-TREE using RELL approximation and bootstrapping.

Topology tests for protein alignments were conducted under the LG+C30+F+G profile

mixture model in IQ-TREE.

Fit of proposed topologies under the multispecies coalescent model

To compare the goodness-of-fit of species trees to the empirical gene trees under the

coalescent model, we conducted a pairwise likelihood ratio test between the 19 proposed

topologies (Liu et al. 2019). We first conducted constrained species tree searches in

ASTRAL-III using the empirical gene trees from the G2141 dataset. We then optimized the

branch length of these proposed species trees and calculated the likelihood in MP-EST. We

used the test2.sptree function from the R package phybase v2.0 (Liu and Yu 2010) to

conduct the likelihood ratio test described in Liu et al. (Liu et al. 2019). The likelihood ratio

test statistic is given by $t = 2(L_{\text{Tree2}} - L_{\text{Tree1}})$, in which L_{Tree1} and L_{Tree2} are the log-likelihoods

of the null and alternative hypotheses. The statistical significance (*p*-value) of the

comparison was evaluated by generating a null distribution of *t* via bootstrap sampling

gene trees 100 times (Liu et al. 2019).

Identify spurious relationships arising from mutational noises

To explore the sensitivity of these topology tests to saturation and model selection, we

generated eight data subsets with increasing mutation rates in Rafflesiaceae and then

evaluated the 19 hypotheses using the AU test and RELL bootstrapping. First, we calculated

the d_S value of stem group Rafflesiaceae using data from Cai et al (2021a; Supplementary

Table S2). Briefly Cai et al (2021a) used codon alignments from nine species—including all

four Rafflesiaceae sampled in this study, plus *Manihot esculenta* (Euphorbiaceae), *Jatropha*

curcas (Euphorbiaceae)*, Populus trichopoda* (Salicaceae)*, Arabidopsis thaliana*

(Brassicaceae), and *Glycine max* (Fabaceae)—to infer substitution rates under a free ratio

model in PAML v4.8 (Yang 2007). This allowed for the estimation of synonymous (d_S) and

nonsynonymous (d_N) rates for each branch on the species tree. Detailed description for

PAML analysis can be found in Cai et al. (2021a) and on GitHub

(https://github.com/lmcai/Sapria_genomics/tree/master/5_selection).

We then ordered the G1553 dataset based on the d_S of stem group Rafflesiaceae. We

excluded loci with larger than 3.0 d_S in stem group Rafflesiaceae to avoid saturation. A total

of 1,182 loci were retained for further investigation. These loci were then ordered based on

d_S values from low to high. Eight data subsets were generated by including 150, 300, 450,

600, 750, 900, 1,050, and 1,182 loci with increasing d_S values. Finally, we conducted

topology tests on concatenated DNA and protein alignments using the AU test and RELL

bootstrapping following the methods described above. For DNA analyses, the GTR+G model

was applied to the unpartitioned alignments. For protein analyses, both JTT+F+R4 and

LG+C30+F+G model were applied to the unpartitioned alignments.

Test of the anomaly zone

The anomaly zone in a four-taxon species tree is defined by the length ratio of the two

internal branches (Degnan and Rosenberg 2006). To test if the focal clades fall within the

anomaly zone, we estimated the boundaries of the anomaly zone a(x) according to equation

4 from (Degnan and Rosenberg 2006). We used the phylogeny estimated by MP-EST from

the complete dataset as the reference species tree (analysis 14 in Fig. 2). Here, the three

internal nodes among the focal clades form three pairs of parent-descendent branches

whose topology matches the asymmetrical four-taxon phylogeny from (Degnan and

Rosenberg 2006). If the length of the descendant internal branch is smaller than a(x), then

the internode pair is in the anomaly zone.

Coalescent simulation

To further explore how ILS and homoplasy affect species tree reconstruction, we simulated
gene trees and DNA alignments based on the coalescent and mutational parameters from
the empirical dataset. The MP-EST species tree estimated from the complete dataset
(analysis 14 in Fig. 2) was used as the reference species tree and was pruned to include
only one species from each of the five focal clades plus an outgroup, *Crossopetalum*. We
used the function 'sim.coal.mpest' in the R package Phybase v2.0 (Liu and Yu 2010) to
simulate 10,000 gene trees using the reference species tree. We then modified the branch
lengths of the simulated gene trees to reflect the inter-species and inter-locus rate variation
in mutational units. To do so, we fit a Gaussian distribution to each internal and terminal
branches (e.g., terminal branches leading to *Sapria*, Rafflesiaceae) from the empirical ML
gene trees using function 'fitdistr' in the R package MASS v7.3-54 (Ripley et al. 2013). We
then assigned branch length in mutation units to the simulated trees by randomly sampling
the corresponding Gaussian distribution. Finally, we used the parameters of the GTR+F+G4
model estimated by ExaML based on the complete dataset (analysis 1 in Fig. 2) to simulate
DNA alignments in Seq-Gen v1.3.4 (Rambaut and Grassly 1997). For each gene, four
alignments with different lengths (500, 1000, 1500, and 2000 bp) were simulated to reflect
high to low levels of gene tree estimation error (Mirarab et al. 2016; Cai et al. 2021b). We
then inferred gene trees in IQ-TREE under the GTR+F+G4 model using 100 bootstrap
replicates. Species trees were estimated using both concatenation and coalescent methods.
For concatenation analyses, we applied the unpartitioned dataset in IQ-TREE under the
GTR+F+G4 model. Branch support was estimated by 1000 UFBP. For the coalescent
method, we applied the ML gene trees in MP-EST and ASTRAL. Branch support was
estimated by 100 BP replicates. We also subsampled the dataset to include 500, 1000,
2000, 3000, 4000, and 5000 loci with four alignment lengths. Finally, we conducted AU
tests in IQ-TREE and likelihood ratio tests in MP-EST to statistically evaluate alternative
topologies.

Acknowledgements:
We thank the two anonymous reviewers for insightful comments on the initial version of
the manuscript. We thank members of the Davis lab for feedback on early versions of this
study.

Funding

This research was supported by National Science Foundation (NSF) AToL grant (DEB-

0622764), NSF grant DEB-1120243, and startup funds from Harvard University to CCD. LC

was supported by the Stengl-Wyer Postdoc Fellowship from the University of Texas at

Austin.

Data availability

No new sequencing data was generated. All DNA alignments, protein alignments, and

individual gene trees were available on Zenodo (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.11643026). All

codes to conduct the analysis were available on GitHub

https://github.com/lmcai/Rafflesiaceae_phylogenomics.

Reference

Arcila, D., Ortí, G., Vari, R., Armbruster, J.W., Stiassny, M.L., Ko, K.D., Sabaj, M.H., Lundberg, J.,
    Revell, L.J., Betancur-R, R. 2017. Genome-wide interrogation advances resolution of
    recalcitrant groups in the tree of life. Nat Ecol Evol, 1:0020.
Baldwin, B.G. 1997. Adaptive radiation of the Hawaiian silversword alliance: congruence
    and conflict of phylogenetic evidence from molecular and non-molecular
    investigations. Molecular evolution and adaptive radiation, 103:1840-1843.
Barkman, T.J., Bendiksby, M., Lim, S.-H., Salleh, K.M., Nais, J., Madulid, D., Schumacher, T.
    2008. Accelerated rates of floral evolution at the upper size limit for flowers.
    Current Biology, 18:1508-1513.
Barkman, T.J., Lim, S.-H., Salleh, K.M., Nais, J. 2004. Mitochondrial DNA sequences reveal the
    photosynthetic relatives of Rafflesia, the world's largest flower. Proceedings of the
    National Academy of Sciences, 101:787-792.
Bendiksby, M., Schumacher, T., Gussarova, G., Nais, J., Mat-Salleh, K., Sofiyanti, N., Madulid,
    D., Smith, S.A., Barkman, T. 2010. Elucidating the evolutionary history of the
    Southeast Asian, holoparasitic, giant-flowered Rafflesiaceae: Pliocene vicariance,
    morphological convergence and character displacement. Molecular Phylogenetics
    and Evolution, 57:620-633.
Bromham L., Cowman P.F., Lanfear R. 2013. Parasitic plants have increased rates of
    molecular evolution across all three genomes. BMC Evol. Biol. 13:1–11.
Bouckaert, R., Heled, J., Kühnert, D., Vaughan, T., Wu, C.-H., Xie, D., Suchard, M.A., Rambaut,
    A., and Drummond, A.J. (2014). BEAST 2: a software platform for Bayesian
    evolutionary analysis. PLoS Comput Biol 10, e1003537.
Cai L. 2023. Rethinking convergence in plant parasitism through the lens of molecular and
    population genetic processes. Am. J. Bot. 110:e16174.

Cai, L., Arnold, B.J., Xi, Z., Khost, D.E., Patel, N., Hartmann, C.B., Manickam, S., Sasirat, S., Nikolov, L.A., Mathews, S., *et al.* 2021a. Deeply Altered Genome Architecture in the Endoparasitic Flowering Plant Sapria himalayana Griff.(Rafflesiaceae). Current Biology.

Cai, L., Xi, Z., Amorim, A.M., Sugumaran, M., Rest, J.S., Liu, L., Davis, C.C. 2019. Widespread ancient whole-genome duplications in Malpighiales coincide with Eocene global climatic upheaval. New Phytologist, 221:565-576.

Cai, L., Xi, Z., Lemmon, E.M., Lemmon, A.R., Mast, A., Buddenhagen, C.E., Liu, L., Davis, C.C. 2021b. The Perfect Storm: Gene Tree Estimation Error, Incomplete Lineage Sorting, and Ancient Gene Flow Explain the Most Recalcitrant Ancient Angiosperm Clade, Malpighiales. Systematic Biology, 70:491-507.

Capella-Gutiérrez, S., Silla-Martínez, J.M., Gabaldón, T. 2009. trimAl: a tool for automated alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. Bioinformatics, 25:1972-1973.

Chen X., Fang D., Xu Y., Duan K., Yoshida S., Yang S., Sahu S.K., Fu H., Guang X., Liu M., Wu C., Liu Y., Mu W., Chen Y., Fan Y., Wang F., Peng S., Shi D., Wang Y., Yu R., Zhang W., Bai Y., Liu Z.-J., Yan Q., Liu X., Xu X., Yang H., Wu J., Graham S.W., Liu H. 2023. Balanophora genomes display massively convergent evolution with other extreme holoparasites and provide novel insights into parasite–host interactions. Nat. Plants. 9:1627–1642.

Cronquist, A. 1981. An integrated system of classification of flowering plants. Columbia university press.

Davis, C.C., Latvis, M., Nickrent, D.L., Wurdack, K.J., Baum, D.A. 2007. Floral gigantism in Rafflesiaceae. Science, 315:1812-1812.

Davis, C.C., Webb, C.O., Wurdack, K.J., Jaramillo, C.A., Donoghue, M.J. 2005. Explosive radiation of Malpighiales supports a mid-Cretaceous origin of modern tropical rain forests. The American Naturalist, 165:E36-E65.

Davis, C.C., Wurdack, K.J. 2004. Host-to-parasite gene transfer in flowering plants: phylogenetic evidence from Malpighiales. Science, 305:676-678.

Dayhoff, M., Schwartz, R., Orcutt, B. 1978. 22 a model of evolutionary change in proteins. Atlas of protein sequence and structure, 5:345-352.

Degnan, J.H., Rosenberg, N.A. 2006. Discordance of species trees with their most likely gene trees. PLOS Genet, 2:e68.

Degnan, J.H., Rosenberg, N.A. 2009. Gene tree discordance, phylogenetic inference and the multispecies coalescent. Trends in ecology & evolution, 24:332-340.

Donoghue, M.J., Eaton, D.A., Maya-Lastra, C.A., Landis, M.J., Sweeney, P.W., Olson, M.E., Cacho, N.I., Moeglein, M.K., Gardner, J.R., Heaphy, N.M. 2022. Replicated radiation of a plant clade along a cloud forest archipelago. Nature Ecology & Evolution, 6:1318-1329.

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. Molecular phylogenetics and evolution, 94:447-462.

Foster, P.G., Hickey, D.A. 1999. Compositional bias may affect both DNA-based and protein-based phylogenetic reconstructions. Journal of molecular evolution, 48:284-290.

Givnish, T.J., Millam, K.C., Mast, A.R., Paterson, T.B., Theim, T.J., Hipp, A.L., Henss, J.M., Smith,
J.F., Wood, K.R., Sytsma, K.J. 2009. Origin, adaptive radiation and diversification of
the Hawaiian lobeliads (Asterales: Campanulaceae). Proceedings of the Royal
Society B: Biological Sciences, 276:407-416.
Glor R.E. 2010. Phylogenetic Insights on Adaptive Radiation. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.
41:251–270.
Grant, P.R., Grant, B.R. 2007. How and why species multiply: the radiation of Darwin's
finches. Princeton University Press.
Hoang, D.T., Chernomor, O., Von Haeseler, A., Minh, B.Q., Vinh, L.S. 2018. UFBoot2:
improving the ultrafast bootstrap approximation. Mol Biol Evol, 35:518-522.
Jin, D.-M., Wicke, S., Gan, L., Yang, J.-B., Jin, J.-J., Yi, T.-S. 2020. The Loss of the Inverted
Repeat in the Putranjivoid Clade of Malpighiales. Frontiers in plant science, 11:942.
Johnson, S.D., Griffiths, M.E., Peter, C.I., Lawes, M.J. 2009. Pollinators,"mustard oil" volatiles,
and fruit production in flowers of the dioecious tree Drypetes natalensis
(Putranjivaceae). American Journal of Botany, 96:2080-2086.
Junier, T., Zdobnov, E.M. 2010. The Newick utilities: high-throughput phylogenetic tree
processing in the UNIX shell. Bioinformatics, 26:1669-1670.
Jürgens, A., Wee, S.L., Shuttleworth, A., Johnson, S.D. 2013. Chemical mimicry of insect
oviposition sites: a global analysis of convergence in angiosperms. Ecology Letters,
16:1157-1167.
Kalyaanamoorthy, S., Minh, B.Q., Wong, T.K., von Haeseler, A., Jermiin, L.S. 2017.
ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. Nat Methods,
14:587.
Kapli, P., Yang, Z., Telford, M.J. 2020. Phylogenetic tree building in the genomic age. Nat Rev
Genet, 21:428-444.
Katoh, K., Standley, D.M. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
improvements in performance and usability. Mol Biol Evol, 30:772-780.
Kishino, H., Hasegawa, M. 1989. Evaluation of the maximum likelihood estimate of the
evolutionary tree topologies from DNA sequence data, and the branching order in
Hominoidea. J Mol Evol, 29:170-179.
Knight, R.D., Freeland, S.J., Landweber, L.F. 2001. Rewiring the keyboard: evolvability of the
genetic code. Nature Reviews Genetics, 2:49-58.
Koch, N.M. 2021. Phylogenomic subsampling and the search for phylogenetically reliable
loci. Molecular Biology and Evolution.
Kozlov, A.M., Aberer, A.J., Stamatakis, A. 2015. ExaML version 3: a tool for phylogenomic
analyses on supercomputers. Bioinformatics, 31:2577-2579.
Kuijt, J. 1969. The biology of parasitic flowering plants. Berkeley, Los Angeles: Univ. Calif.
Press.
Lanfear, R., Frandsen, P.B., Wright, A.M., Senfeld, T., Calcott, B. 2017. PartitionFinder 2: new
methods for selecting partitioned models of evolution for molecular and
morphological phylogenetic analyses. Molecular biology and evolution, 34:772-773.
Lartillot, N., Rodrigue, N., Stubbs, D., Richer, J. 2013. PhyloBayes MPI: phylogenetic
reconstruction with infinite mixtures of profiles in a parallel environment. Syst Biol,
62:611-615.
Le, S.Q., Gascuel, O., Lartillot, N. 2008. Empirical profile mixture models for phylogenetic
reconstruction. Bioinformatics, 24:2317-2323.

Liu, L., Anderson, C., Pearl, D., Edwards, S.V. 2019. Modern phylogenomics: building
phylogenetic trees using the multispecies coalescent model. Evolutionary Genomics,
Springer, p. 211-239.
Liu, L., Yu, L. 2010. Phybase: an R package for species tree analysis. Bioinformatics, 26:962-
963.
Liu, L., Yu, L., Edwards, S.V. 2010. A maximum pseudo-likelihood approach for estimating
species trees under the coalescent model. BMC evolutionary biology, 10:1-18.
Liu L, Yu L, Wu S, Arnold J, Whalen C, Davis C, Edwards S. 2023. Short branch attraction in
phylogenomic inference under the multispecies coalescent. Front. Ecol. Evol. 11:
1134764.
Losos, J.B. 2011. Lizards in an evolutionary tree: ecology and adaptive radiation of anoles.
Univ of California Press.
Martyn I, Steel M. 2012. The impact and interplay of long and short branches on
phylogenetic information content. Journal of Theoretical Biology 314:157–163.
Matthews M.L., Endress P.K. 2013. Comparative floral structure and systematics of the
clade of Lophopyxidaceae and Putranjivaceae (Malpighiales). Bot. J. Linn. Soc.
172:404–448.
Minh, B.Q., Hahn, M.W., Lanfear, R. 2020a. New methods to calculate concordance factors
for phylogenomic datasets. Molecular biology and evolution, 37:2727-2733.
Minh, B.Q., Schmidt, H.A., Chernomor, O., Schrempf, D., Woodhams, M.D., Von Haeseler, A.,
Lanfear, R. 2020b. IQ-TREE 2: New models and efficient methods for phylogenetic
inference in the genomic era. Mol Biol Evol, 37:1530-1534.
Mirarab, S., Bayzid, M.S., Warnow, T. 2016. Evaluating summary methods for multilocus
species tree estimation in the presence of incomplete lineage sorting. Systematic
Biology, 65:366-380.
Molina, J., Hazzouri, K.M., Nickrent, D., Geisler, M., Meyer, R.S., Pentony, M.M., Flowers, J.M.,
Pelser, P., Barcelona, J., Inovejas, S.A. 2014. Possible loss of the chloroplast genome
in the parasitic flowering plant Rafflesia lagascae (Rafflesiaceae). Molecular Biology
and Evolution, 31:793-803.
Nickrent, D., Duff, R.J. 1996. Molecular studies of parasitic plants using ribosomal RNA.
Advances in parasitic plant research:28-52.
Nickrent, D., Starr, E. 1994. High rates of nucleotide substitution in nuclear small-subunit
(18S) rDNA from holoparasitic flowering plants. Journal of Molecular Evolution,
39:62-70.
Nikolov, L.A., Davis, C.C. 2017. The big, the bad, and the beautiful: Biology of the world's
largest flowers. Journal of Systematics and Evolution, 55:516-524.
Nikolov, L.A., Endress, P.K., Sugumaran, M., Sasirat, S., Vessabutr, S., Kramer, E.M., Davis, C.C.
2013. Developmental origins of the world's largest flowers, Rafflesiaceae.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 110:18578-18583.
Nikolov, L.A., Tomlinson, P., Manickam, S., Endress, P.K., Kramer, E.M., Davis, C.C. 2014.
Holoparasitic Rafflesiaceae possess the most reduced endophytes and yet give rise
to the world's largest flowers. Annals of botany, 114:233-242.
Ogilvie, H.A., Bouckaert, R.R., and Drummond, A.J. (2017). StarBEAST2 brings faster species
tree inference and accurate estimates of substitution rates. Molecular biology and
evolution 34, 2101-2114.

Parey, E., Louis, A., Montfort, J., Bouchez, O., Roques, C., Iampietro, C., Lluch, J., Castinel, A.,
Donnadieu, C., Desvignes, T. 2023. Genome structures resolve the early
diversification of teleost fishes. Science, 379:572-575.
Petersen G., Anderson B., Braun H.-P., Meyer E.H., Møller I.M. 2020. Mitochondria in
parasitic plants. Mitochondrion. 52:173–182.
Roch S, Nute M, Warnow T. 2019. Long-branch attraction in species tree estimation:
inconsistency of partitioned likelihood and topology-based summary methods. Syst
Biol 68:281–297.
Puttick, M.N., Morris, J.L., Williams, T.A., Cox, C.J., Edwards, D., Kenrick, P., Pressel, S.,
Wellman, C.H., Schneider, H., Pisani, D. 2018. The interrelationships of land plants
and the nature of the ancestral embryophyte. Current Biology, 28:733-745. e732.
Rambaut, A., Grassly, N.C. 1997. Seq-Gen: an application for the Monte Carlo simulation of
DNA sequence evolution along phylogenetic trees. Bioinformatics, 13:235-238.
Ripley, B., Venables, B., Bates, D.M., Hornik, K., Gebhardt, A., Firth, D., Ripley, M.B. 2013.
Package 'mass'. Cran r, 538:113-120.
Sayyari, E., Mirarab, S. 2016. Fast coalescent-based computation of local branch support
from quartet frequencies. Molecular biology and evolution, 33:1654-1668.
Shimodaira, H. 2002. An approximately unbiased test of phylogenetic tree selection. Syst
Biol, 51:492-508.
Shimodaira, H., Hasegawa, M. 1999. Multiple comparisons of log-likelihoods with
applications to phylogenetic inference. Mol Biol Evol, 16:1114-1114.
Shimodaira, H., Hasegawa, M. 2001. CONSEL: for assessing the confidence of phylogenetic
tree selection. Bioinformatics, 17:1246-1247.
Si Quang, L., Gascuel, O., Lartillot, N. 2008. Empirical profile mixture models for
phylogenetic reconstruction. Bioinformatics, 24:2317-2323.
Smith S.A., Brown J.W., Hinchliff C.E. 2013. Analyzing and synthesizing phylogenies using
tree alignment graphs. PLOS Comput. Biol. 9:e1003223.
Smith, S.A., Brown, J.W., Walker, J.F. 2018. So many genes, so little time: A practical
approach to divergence-time estimation in the genomic era. PloS one, 13:e0197433.
Song, S., Liu, L., Edwards, S.V., Wu, S. 2012. Resolving conflict in eutherian mammal
phylogeny using phylogenomics and the multispecies coalescent model. Proceedings
of the National Academy of Sciences, 109:14942-14947.
Stamatakis, A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of
large phylogenies. Bioinformatics, 30:1312-1313.
Suyama, M., Torrents, D., Bork, P. 2006. PAL2NAL: robust conversion of protein sequence
alignments into the corresponding codon alignments. Nucleic Acids Res, 34:W609-
W612.
Tanabe, A. 2012. Phylogears version 2.2. 2012.02. 13.
Teixeira-Costa, L., Davis, C.C. 2021. Life history, diversity, and distribution in parasitic
flowering plants. Plant Physiology, 187:32-51.
Wang, H.-C., Minh, B.Q., Susko, E., Roger, A.J. 2018. Modeling site heterogeneity with
posterior mean site frequency profiles accelerates accurate phylogenomic
estimation. Systematic biology, 67:216-235.
Wang, H.-c., Singer, G.A., Hickey, D.A. 2004. Mutational bias affects protein evolution in
flowering plants. Molecular biology and evolution, 21:90-96.

Wee, S.L., Tan, S.B., Jürgens, A. 2018. Pollinator specialization in the enigmatic Rafflesia
cantleyi: a true carrion flower with species-specific and sex-biased blow fly
pollinators. Phytochemistry, 153:120-128.
Wei, T., Simko, V., Levy, M., Xie, Y., Jin, Y., Zemla, J. 2017. Package 'corrplot'. Statistician,
56:e24.
Wurdack, K.J., Davis, C.C. 2009. Malpighiales phylogenetics: gaining ground on one of the
most recalcitrant clades in the angiosperm tree of life. American Journal of Botany,
96:1551-1570.
Xi, Z., Bradley, R.K., Wurdack, K.J., Wong, K., Sugumaran, M., Bomblies, K., Rest, J.S., Davis,
C.C. 2012. Horizontal transfer of expressed genes in a parasitic flowering plant. BMC
genomics, 13:1-8.
Xi, Z., Liu, L., Rest, J.S., Davis, C.C. 2014. Coalescent versus concatenation methods and the
placement of Amborella as sister to water lilies. Systematic biology, 63:919-932.
Xi, Z., Wang, Y., Bradley, R.K., Sugumaran, M., Marx, C.J., Rest, J.S., Davis, C.C. 2013. Massive
mitochondrial gene transfer in a parasitic flowering plant clade. PLoS Genet,
9:e1003265.
Yang, Y., Smith, S.A. 2014. Orthology inference in nonmodel organisms using
transcriptomes and low-coverage genomes: improving accuracy and matrix
occupancy for phylogenomics. Molecular biology and evolution, 31:3081-3092.
Yang, Z. 2007. PAML 4: phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. Mol Biol Evol,
24:1586-1591.
Young N.D., dePamphilis C.W. 2005. Rate variation in parasitic plants: correlated and
uncorrelated patterns among plastid genes of different function. BMC Evol. Biol.
5:16.
Zhang, C., Sayyari, E., Mirarab, S. 2017. ASTRAL-III: increased scalability and impacts of
contracting low support branches. RECOMB international workshop on comparative
genomics, Springer, p. 53-75.
Zhao, T., Zwaenepoel, A., Xue, J.-Y., Kao, S.-M., Li, Z., Schranz, M.E., Van de Peer, Y. 2021.
Whole-genome microsynteny-based phylogeny of angiosperms. Nat Commun,
12:3498.
Wicke S., Müller K.F., Quandt D., Bellot S., Schneeweiss G.M. 2016. Mechanistic model of
evolutionary rate variation en route to a nonphotosynthetic lifestyle in plants. Proc.
Natl. Acad. Sci.:201607576.
Wurdack K.J., Davis C.C. 2009. Malpighiales phylogenetics: gaining ground on one of the
most recalcitrant clades in the angiosperm tree of life. Am. J. Bot. 96:1551–1570.
Wurdack K.J., Hoffmann P., Samuel R., de Bruijn A., van der Bank M., Chase M.W. 2004.
Molecular phylogenetic analysis of Phyllanthaceae (Phyllanthoideae pro parte,
Euphorbiaceae sensu lato) using plastid RBCL DNA sequences. Am. J. Bot. 91:1882–
1900.
Zuntini A.R., Carruthers T., Maurin O., Bailey P.C., Leempoel K., Brewer G.E., Epitawalage N.,
Françoso E., Gallego-Paramo B., McGinnie C., Negrão R., Roy S.R., Simpson L., Toledo
Romero E., Barber V.M.A., Botigué L., Clarkson J.J., Cowan R.S., Dodsworth S., Johnson
M.G., Kim J.T., Pokorny L., Wickett N.J., Antar G.M., DeBolt L., Gutierrez K., Hendriks
K.P., Hoewener A., Hu A.-Q., Joyce E.M., Kikuchi I.A.B.S., Larridon I., Larson D.A., de
Lírio E.J., Liu J.-X., Malakasi P., Przelomska N.A.S., Shah T., Viruel J., Allnutt T.R.,
Ameka G.K., Andrew R.L., Appelhans M.S., Arista M., Ariza M.J., Arroyo J., Arthan W.,

Bachelier J.B., Bailey C.D., Barnes H.F., Barrett M.D., Barrett R.L., Bayer R.J., Bayly M.J., Biffin E., Biggs N., Birch J.L., Bogarín D., Borosova R., Bowles A.M.C., Boyce P.C., Bramley G.L.C., Briggs M., Broadhurst L., Brown G.K., Bruhl J.J., Bruneau A., Buerki S., Burns E., Byrne M., Cable S., Calladine A., Callmander M.W., Cano Á., Cantrill D.J., Cardinal-McTeague W.M., Carlsen M.M., Carruthers A.J.A., de Castro Mateo A., Chase M.W., Chatrou L.W., Cheek M., Chen S., Christenhusz M.J.M., Christin P.-A., Clements M.A., Coffey S.C., Conran J.G., Cornejo X., Couvreur T.L.P., Cowie I.D., Csiba L., Darbyshire I., Davidse G., Davies N.M.J., Davis A.P., van Dijk K., Downie S.R., Duretto M.F., Duvall M.R., Edwards S.L., Eggli U., Erkens R.H.J., Escudero M., de la Estrella M., Fabriani F., Fay M.F., Ferreira P. de L., Ficinski S.Z., Fowler R.M., Frisby S., Fu L., Fulcher T., Galbany-Casals M., Gardner E.M., German D.A., Giaretta A., Gibernau M., Gillespie L.J., González C.C., Goyder D.J., Graham S.W., Grall A., Green L., Gunn B.F., Gutiérrez D.G., Hackel J., Haevermans T., Haigh A., Hall J.C., Hall T., Harrison M.J., Hatt S.A., Hidalgo O., Hodkinson T.R., Holmes G.D., Hopkins H.C.F., Jackson C.J., James S.A., Jobson R.W., Kadereit G., Kahandawala I.M., Kainulainen K., Kato M., Kellogg E.A., King G.J., Klejevskaja B., Klitgaard B.B., Klopper R.R., Knapp S., Koch M.A., Leebens-Mack J.H., Lens F., Leon C.J., Léveillé-Bourret É., Lewis G.P., Li D.-Z., Li L., Liede-Schumann S., Livshultz T., Lorence D., Lu M., Lu-Irving P., Luber J., Lucas E.J., Luján M., Lum M., Macfarlane T.D., Magdalena C., Mansano V.F., Masters L.E., Mayo S.J., McColl K., McDonnell A.J., McDougall A.E., McLay T.G.B., McPherson H., Meneses R.I., Merckx V.S.F.T., Michelangeli F.A., Mitchell J.D., Monro A.K., Moore M.J., Mueller T.L., Mummenhoff K., Munzinger J., Muriel P., Murphy D.J., Nargar K., Nauheimer L., Nge F.J., Nyffeler R., Orejuela A., Ortiz E.M., Palazzesi L., Peixoto A.L., Pell S.K., Pellicer J., Penneys D.S., Perez-Escobar O.A., Persson C., Pignal M., Pillon Y., Pirani J.R., Plunkett G.M., Powell R.F., Prance G.T., Puglisi C., Qin M., Rabeler R.K., Rees P.E.J., Renner M., Roalson E.H., Rodda M., Rogers Z.S., Rokni S., Rutishauser R., de Salas M.F., Schaefer H., Schley R.J., Schmidt-Lebuhn A., Shapcott A., Al-Shehbaz I., Shepherd K.A., Simmons M.P., Simões A.O., Simões A.R.G., Siros M., Smidt E.C., Smith J.F., Snow N., Soltis D.E., Soltis P.S., Soreng R.J., Sothers C.A., Starr J.R., Stevens P.F., Straub S.C.K., Struwe L., Taylor J.M., Telford I.R.H., Thornhill A.H., Tooth I., Trias-Blasi A., Udovicic F., Utteridge T.M.A., Del Valle J.C., Verboom G.A., Vonow H.P., Vorontsova M.S., de Vos J.M., Al-Wattar N., Waycott M., Welker C.A.D., White A.J., Wieringa J.J., Williamson L.T., Wilson T.C., Wong S.Y., Woods L.A., Woods R., Worboys S., Xanthos M., Yang Y., Zhang Y.-X., Zhou M.-Y., Zmarzty S., Zuloaga F.O., Antonelli A., Bellot S., Crayn D.M., Grace O.M., Kersey P.J., Leitch I.J., Sauquet H., Smith S.A., Eiserhardt W.L., Forest F., Baker W.J. 2024. Phylogenomics and the rise of the angiosperms. Nature.:1–8.

Supplementary Information

Supplementary figures

Fig S1 Correlation heatmap of ten phylogenetic metrics. The intensity of the color indicates the strength of the correlation and the dendrogram shows hierarchical clustering results. The four Rafflesiaceae-specific metrics are highlighted in red. Definitions of these phylogenetic metrics are provided in the Materials and Methods.

Fig S2 Optimum placement and divergence time estimation of Rafflesiaceae. The time tree is inferred using 81 exons under the full coalescent model implemented in starBEAST. The blue bars on the node indicate 95% confidence intervals of divergence time (million years, Ma).

Fig S3 DNA composition of Malpighiales species summarized from 2141 genes. Species are ranked based on AT% from high to low and Rafflesiaceae species are highlighted in red.

Fig S4 Gene genealogy interrogation (GGI) to test alternative placements of Rafflesiaceae. Colored lines represent the cumulative number of genes (x-axes) supporting each hypothesis with the highest probability (rank 1) and their associated p-values (y-axes) according to the approximately unbiased (AU) topology test (A), the Kishino-Hasegawa (KH) topology test (B), and the Shimodaira–Hasegawa (SH) topology test (C). Values above the dashed line indicate all rank 1 hypotheses that are significantly better than the alternatives (p-value < 0.05), whereas those below the dashed line are not statistically significant.

Fig S5 Distribution of synonymous substitutions per synonymous site (d_s) in free-living and parasitic Malpighiales. d_s values for *Manihot* (Euphorbiaceae), *Populus* (Salicaceae), and *Sapria* (Rafflesiaceae) are inferred using the free ratio model implemented in PAML.

Supplementary tables
Table S1 Taxon sampling and source of sequence data.

Table S2 Phylogenetic properties of 2141 genes. These metrics include six tree-wise features for each gene including the number of species, alignment length, average nodal support measured by ultrafast bootstrap values (UFBP), total tree length, root-to-tip branch length variance, and gene tree–species tree congruence. Four metrics specific to Rafflesiaceae are also calculated, including DNA compositional bias of Rafflesiaceae (chi-square test p-values), lengths of the branches prior to and immediately after the divergence of Rafflesiaceae, and nodal support of Rafflesiaceae measured by UFBP and non-parametric bootstrapping (BP).

Table S3 Phylogenetic analysis schemes for 18 concatenation and multispecies coalescent model (MSC) based methods. Columns show the input data type, number of genes, and evolutionary models for each analysis.

Table S4 Topology tests for alternative placements of Rafflesiaceae under the concatenation and coalescent models. Hypotheses 1 to 19 (H1-H19) are defined in Fig. 1 and statistically significant support is marked by "**". For concatenation analyses, the number of genes, input data type, species tree inference program, and evolutionary model are provided at the top; the maximum likelihoods, AU test p-values, and RELL bootstrap values (bp-RELL) are calculated for each hypothesis. For coalescent analysis, the pseudo-likelihoods and likelihood ratio test p-values are calculated for the top three topologies.

1153 **Table S5** Topology test on simulated data using concatenated DNA alignments. Hypotheses
1154 1 to 15 (H1-H15) are defined in Fig 1 and H11 is used as the true species tree for
1155 simulation. AU-test *p*-values are calculated using concatenated DNA matrices of different
1156 sizes (a-d). The lengths of simulated genes vary from 500 bp (a), 1000 bp (b), 1500 bp (c),
1157 to 2000 bp (d).
1158
Table S6 Topology test on simulated data using the coalescent based likelihood ratio test.
Hypotheses 1 to 15 (H1-H15) are defined in Fig 1 and H11 is used as the true species tree
for simulation. Differences in pseudo-likelihoods between the inferred best tree and the
true species tree (H11) are calculated for datasets with different gene lengths and numbers
(a-d). For the biggest dataset (gene length =2000 bp; d), we calculate the likelihood ratio
test *p*-values for a randomly selected alternative tree H5, which cannot be rejected in any
test.
1166
1167 **Supplementary Data**
1168 **Data S1** Optimum species trees inferred from the 18 explorative phylogenetic analyses in
1169 newick format. Node labels indicate branch support. See Table S3 for input data and
1170 program parameters.