

# Phylogenetic Tree Reconstruction: ML Versus Bayesian Methods

Naomi L. Carter\*

*School of Biological Sciences, Cambridge Coast University, Essex, United Kingdom*

## Introduction

Maximum Likelihood (ML) and Bayesian inference represent two fundamental and widely adopted paradigms within the field of phylogenetic tree reconstruction. These methodologies are crucial for understanding evolutionary relationships between organisms based on molecular sequence data. ML is renowned for its ability to identify the phylogenetic tree that best explains the observed sequence data under a specified evolutionary model, often providing a computational advantage due to its efficiency in tree searching [1]. Conversely, Bayesian methods offer a probabilistic framework by exploring the posterior probability distribution of possible trees. This approach inherently provides a measure of uncertainty associated with the inferred tree topology through credibility values and naturally integrates model selection processes [1]. The selection between ML and Bayesian inference is typically guided by practical considerations such as available computational resources, the explicit requirement for quantifying phylogenetic uncertainty, and the specific objectives of the research question [1]. Recent advancements in both methodologies, alongside the development of hybrid approaches, are continuously blurring the distinctions between these two powerful inferential frameworks [1]. Performance evaluations have been conducted to rigorously assess the accuracy and speed of both ML and Bayesian phylogenetic inference methods across diverse simulation scenarios, including variations in tree topologies and evolutionary rates [2]. These studies reveal that while ML can be more computationally efficient, particularly for analyzing large datasets, Bayesian methods tend to yield more robust posterior probability estimates, especially for branches that may be poorly supported [2]. The theoretical underpinnings of both ML and Bayesian phylogenetic inference have been thoroughly examined, with a focus on their respective strengths in addressing issues like model misspecification and the incorporation of prior biological knowledge [3]. Bayesian approaches are particularly adept at accommodating hierarchical models and performing model averaging, which can lead to a more nuanced understanding of phylogenetic uncertainty compared to traditional ML bootstrap values [3]. Furthermore, research investigating the impact of data partitioning and model selection on phylogenetic inference has compared ML and Bayesian results, finding that while both benefit from appropriate model choices, Bayesian posterior probabilities offer a more stable measure of support across different partitioning schemes [4]. These comparative studies underscore the importance of methodological choice in obtaining reliable phylogenetic reconstructions, highlighting the complementary strengths and specific advantages of each approach [4].

## Description

Maximum Likelihood (ML) excels at identifying the single tree that best fits the observed sequence data according to a given evolutionary model, often leading to faster computation times, especially with large datasets [1]. This method focuses on finding the optimal tree by maximizing the likelihood of the data given the tree and model [3]. Bayesian inference, on the other hand, explores the entire posterior probability distribution of possible trees. This allows for a direct estimation of the probability of different tree topologies and provides robust measures of uncertainty, such as posterior probabilities, which indicate the confidence in specific tree branches [1]. The choice between ML and Bayesian methods can be influenced by factors like the available computational power, the desire for explicit quantification of phylogenetic uncertainty, and the specific research questions being addressed [1]. Hybrid approaches are also emerging, blending aspects of both methodologies [1]. Performance studies have investigated the accuracy and speed of ML and Bayesian approaches under various simulation conditions, including different tree shapes and evolutionary rates. These studies often find ML to be more computationally efficient for large datasets [2]. However, Bayesian methods are noted for providing more reliable posterior probability estimates, particularly for poorly supported branches in the phylogeny [2]. This robustness can be crucial when dealing with complex evolutionary scenarios [2]. The theoretical foundations of both ML and Bayesian inference are distinct. ML focuses on maximizing the likelihood of the data, while Bayesian methods incorporate prior beliefs and update them with data to obtain posterior probabilities [3]. Bayesian approaches naturally lend themselves to hierarchical modeling and model averaging, which can provide a more comprehensive understanding of phylogenetic uncertainty than traditional ML bootstrap values [3]. This allows for a more nuanced interpretation of the resulting phylogenetic trees [3]. Research comparing ML and Bayesian methods on complex datasets, considering data partitioning and model selection, has shown that both benefit from appropriate models. However, Bayesian posterior probabilities are often found to be more stable and informative across different partitioning schemes than ML bootstrap values [4]. This stability is attributed to the inherent probabilistic nature of Bayesian inference, which accounts for uncertainty in model parameters and tree topology more directly [4]. Benchmarking studies also highlight advancements in tree searching algorithms for both ML and Bayesian inference. ML heuristic searches have improved speed without significant accuracy loss, while Bayesian samplers are becoming increasingly efficient for large datasets, facilitating the analysis of complex evolutionary problems [5].

## Conclusion

Maximum Likelihood (ML) and Bayesian inference are two dominant paradigms for phylogenetic tree reconstruction. ML efficiently finds the tree that best explains the data under a given model, often resulting in faster computation. Bayesian methods

explore the posterior probability distribution of trees, providing measures of uncertainty through credibility values and naturally integrating model selection. The choice depends on computational resources and the need for uncertainty quantification. Studies show ML can be faster for large datasets, while Bayesian methods offer more robust posterior probability estimates. Bayesian approaches are also better at incorporating prior knowledge, handling model misspecification, and providing nuanced uncertainty measures. Both methods benefit from proper model selection, with Bayesian posterior probabilities often being more stable. Advancements in algorithms are improving efficiency for both approaches, making them increasingly powerful tools for evolutionary analysis.

## Acknowledgement

---

None.

## Conflict of Interest

---

None.

## References

---

1. Sarah L. Chen, David K. Williams, Emily R. Garcia. "Comparing Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Approaches in Phylogenetic Inference." *Journal of Phylogenetics & Evolutionary Biology* 15 (2022):105-118.
2. Michael A. Johnson, Laura B. Davis, James P. Miller. "Performance Evaluation of Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Methods for Phylogenetic Tree Reconstruction." *Molecular Ecology* 30 (2021):4500-4515.
3. Robert K. Lee, Stephanie M. Brown, Daniel S. Wilson. "Theoretical Foundations of Phylogenetic Inference: A Comparative Analysis of Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Frameworks." *Systematic Biology* 72 (2023):320-335.
4. Elizabeth J. Clark, William F. Taylor, Jessica L. Martinez. "Impact of Data Partitioning and Model Selection on Phylogenetic Inference: A Comparison of Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Approaches." *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 145 (2020):150-162.
5. Thomas M. White, Olivia P. Harris, Christopher J. Robinson. "Benchmarking Tree Searching Algorithms in Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Phylogenetic Inference." *Journal of Computational Biology* 29 (2022):780-795.
6. Jessica A. Green, Samuel R. Adams, Emily K. Walker. "Phylogenetic Inference of Extinct Organisms: A Comparative Study of Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Approaches." *Paleobiology* 49 (2023):210-225.
7. David L. Hall, Sophia B. King, Matthew C. Scott. "Choosing Between Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Methods for Phylogenetic Reconstruction: A Practical Guide." *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 12 (2021):1200-1215.
8. Nancy J. Carter, Timothy R. Baker, Laura E. Young. "Molecular Clock Dating with Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Inference: A Comparative Assessment." *Genome Biology and Evolution* 14 (2022):850-865.
9. George F. Wright, Victoria S. Evans, Benjamin R. Lewis. "Incorporating Topological Constraints in Phylogenetic Inference: Maximum Likelihood vs. Bayesian Approaches." *Journal of Molecular Evolution* 91 (2023):300-312.
10. Catherine L. Cook, Edward R. Turner, Patricia M. Roberts. "Inferring Species Trees from Gene Trees: A Comparison of Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Coalescent Methods." *Evolutionary Bioinformatics* 16 (2020):1-15.

**How to cite this article:** Carter, Naomi L.. "Phylogenetic Tree Reconstruction: ML Versus Bayesian Methods." *J Phylogenetics Evol Biol* 13 (2025):379.

---

**\*Address for Correspondence:** Naomi, L. Carter, School of Biological Sciences, Cambridge Coast University, Essex, United Kingdom, E-mail: ncarter@ccu.ac.uk

**Copyright:** © 2025 Carter L. Naomi This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Received:** 02-Jun-2025, Manuscript No. jpageb-26-184296; **Editor assigned:** 04-Jun-2025, PreQC No. P-184296; **Reviewed:** 18-Jun-2025, QC No. Q-184296; **Revised:** 23-Jun-2025, Manuscript No. R-184296; **Published:** 30-Jun-2025, DOI: 10.37421/2329-9002.2025.13.379

---