Ten simple rules for selecting an R package

Caroline J. Wendt 1 , 2 , G. Brooke Anderson 3 *

- 1 Department of Statistics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, United States of America
- 2 Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, United States of America
- **3** Department of Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, United States of America

Abstract

Write the abstract here.

Author summary

Write the author summary here.

Text based on plos sample manuscript, see

http://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/s/latex

Introduction

Explain what R is and how its package ecosystem works. Points:

- Open source project, where many people contribute with their own extensions
- Large variation in the quality of different extensions (packages)
- That some R users, particularly new ones, struggle with finding and picking which packages to use.

11

Ideas of 10 things Finding packages:

- CRAN task views
- Textbooks ("[x] with R"). May not be latest...
- Google searches, social media (#rstats)
- Conferences (and online streams of those). RStudio, UseR.

Picking a good package:

• On a public repository like CRAN or Bioconductor. Explain more about these repositories and what their standards are. Explain their role in the community. Give the alternative ways that R packages can be shared (GitHub, zipped file posted somewhere else). How these regularly check code and help with managing the web of dependencies.

June 12, 2020 1/5

st Corresponding author: Brooke.Anderson@colostate.edu

- Quality of the documentation. Types of documentation (help files, vignette, packagedown website, bookdown book).
- Coverage by tests. Explain about unit testing and how it can help control quality.
- Peer review. ROpenSci. Associated with a peer reviewed paper. Associated with a book put out by a scientific publisher?
- Looking up package authors. Is there role in R development (RStudio, some big bio labs)? Is the work part of their work from an academic lab? Do they have a history of a lot of R development? GitHub profile. Google scholar profile. Also, is it a team of developers? Robust team?
- Evidence of established package. Lots of version. Clear NEWS providing explanations of changes. History of Issues and those being resolved.
- Exploring the code yourself. How open source framework provides this. GitHub mirror of CRAN if you don't want to download the zipped package file yourself.

Here are two sample references: [1,2].

Introduction

R is a language and environment for statistical computing and graphics that was developed by statisticians and is collaboratively maintained by an international core group of contributors. Unlike many popular proprietary languages (e.g., MATLAB, SAS, SPSS), R is highly extensible, free and open-source software; the user can access and thus change, extend, and share code for desired applications. Accordingly, a vibrant community of R users has emerged, many of which engage in the development of extensions to the functionality of base R software known as packages. A prominent contributor in the R community, Hadley Wickham, views functional programming as analogous to following a recipe; to conceptualize packages, imagine R is the kitchen and packages are the special gadgets which allow you to cook and bake new recipes. R packages are coding delectables that enable the user to perform practical tasks (e.g., wrangling and cleaning data frames, designing interactive apps for visualizing data, performing dimensionality reduction) and solve problems (e.g., training regression and classification models, assessing the beta diversity of a population, analyzing gene expression microarray data) with interesting techniques.

As a natural consequence of the open-source nature of R, there is variation in the quality of different packages among the numerous choices that exist. The advanced R user—having developed an intuition for their workflow—may tend to be relatively confident when searching for and selecting packages. By contrast, a common experience that characterizes learning R at the outset is the struggle to 1) find a package to accomplish a particular task and 2) choose the best package to perform that task. Even so, there remain obscure and complicated problems that morph selecting an R package into a barrier despite experience.

52

53

61

63

In coding as in life, we endeavor to make choices that optimize outcomes. Just as one may go about shopping for shoes, deciding which graduate program to pursue, or conducting a literature review, there is a science behind selection. We inform our decisions by assessing, comparing, and filtering options based on indicators of quality such as utility, association, and reputation. Likewise, choosing an R package requires attending to similar details. We outline ten simple rules for finding and selecting R packages so that you will spend less time searching for the right tools and more time coding delicious recipes.

June 12, 2020 2/5

list of 10 rules	
currently in no particular order and not precisely worded)	•
1. Consider your purpose	7
 What do you want to use the package to accomplish? features functions organization package description compare similar options 	:
2. Spend time searching; find and collect options	,
 internet searches (keyword "in R") textbooks ("[x] with R" series) tutorials courses social media (#rstats) conferences (e.g., RStudio, useR!) consult collaborators CRAN task views 	:
3. Check how it's shared	:
 check repository association CRAN Bioconductor GitHub purpose of repositories: mechanisms of quality control that regularly check code and manage webs of dependencies 	;
• alternative ways R packages can be shared (not repo)	,
zipped filecollaborators	9
4. Explore the availability and quality of help	,
 help files help() vignettes DOCUMENTATION file "cheatsheets" from RSudio RDocumentation (key word search, task views) websites (e.g., packagedown) bookdown books 	9 9 10 10 10
 compare documentation completeness and resource quality find ways to get help beyond initial documentation listservs 	10 10 10
 online communities Stack Overflow (frequency of questions and answers on the topic) See if GitHub repo for the package seems responsive to Issues Rcpp is an example of high-quality help 	10 10 11 11

June 12, 2020 3/5

	 associated book maintainer, Dirk, is known to be responsive to user questions (listserv) ample documentation including examples to get started 	11 11 11
5.	Verify the credibility of the author(s)	11
•	team or single author (robust team?) associations (e.g., academia, industry, labs) expertise reputation experience (e.g., portfolio of packages, history of R development) role in R development (e.g., RStudio, regarded bio labs) profiles (e.g., GitHub, Google Scholar, Research Gate, Twitter)	111 111 111 112 122 123
6.	Investigate the package development	12
	best practices unit testing (manage quality control) dependencies coverage by tests number of versions clarity of NEWS (explain updates and changes) GitHub Issues (history, resolution)	12 12 12 12 12 12
7.	Read, research literature, seek evidence of peer review	13
•	publications package itself papers about the package ROpenSci associations with books or publications from scientific publishers	13 13 13 13
8.	Quantify how established the package is	13
•	dependencies versions updates number of downloads popularity leaderboard ranking systems	13 13 14 14 14 14
9.	Put the package to the test	14
• ;	explore code interact with trial and error get a feel for using it in context of your goal open-source framework GitHub mirror of CRAN as an alternative to downloading zipped package file	14 14 14 14
10.	Develop your own package	15
• :	necessity innovative idea novel approach or method unique and specialized purpose	15 15 15

June 12, 2020 4/5

References

1. Feynman RP, Vernon Jr. FL. The theory of a general quantum system interacting	157
with a linear dissipative system. Annals of Physics. 1963;24: 118–173.	158
doi:10.1016/0003-4916(63)90068-X	159
2. Dirac PAM. The lorentz transformation and absolute time. Physica. 1953;19:	160
888-896. doi:10.1016/S0031-8914(53)80099-6	161

June 12, 2020 5/5