

# The fqr package: R tools for analyzing floristic quality assessment data

Andrew Gard<sup>1</sup>, Alexia Myers<sup>1</sup>, and Irene Luwabelwa<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lake Forest College, Lake Forest IL, USA  Corresponding author

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

## Software

- [Review](#) 
- [Repository](#) 
- [Archive](#) 

Editor: [Michael Mahoney](#) 

## Reviewers:

- [@ifoxfoot](#)
- [@mhesselbarth](#)

Submitted: 15 January 2024

Published: unpublished

## License

Authors of papers retain copyright  
and release the work under a  
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0  
International License ([CC BY 4.0](#))

## Summary

Floristic Quality Assessment (FQA) is a standardized method for rating the ecological value of natural areas based on the plant species found within them ([Spyreas, 2019](#); [Swink et al., 1994](#)). Each species considered native to a particular region is assigned a *coefficient of conservatism*, C, on a scale of 0-10 by experts in local flora (non-native species are assigned a zero C-value by default). Larger values of C correspond to species that tend to be found in undegraded sites, while lower values indicate species that are more tolerant to human impacts ([Bauer, 2018](#)). An inventory of the site is conducted and the average of the C-values found there is computed. This *native mean C-value*, sometimes weighted by the total number of plant species identified to give the so-called *floristic quality index* ([Bowles & Jones, 2006](#)), is frequently used by land managers and other agents to quantify an area's state of conservancy ([Zinnen, 2021](#)).

In recent years, it has become increasingly standard for practitioners to upload their floristic quality assessments to a central repository, [universalfqa.org](#) ([Freyman et al., 2016](#)), which already includes tens of thousands of assessments from over one hundred floristic quality databases. This large public data cache represents a potentially invaluable resource for quantitative ecologists, though it has so far gone largely unexplored due to a lack of both technical tools for interacting programatically with the repository and statistical methods for analyzing the floristic quality data housed there.

fqr is an R ([R Core Team, 2022](#)) package which facilitates the analysis of occurrence and co-occurrence of plant taxa at the regional level. Pulling data on-demand from [universalfqa.org](#), it provides both organizational tools for handling the disparate sorts of data housed there and statistical ones for drawing novel conclusions from that data.

## Statement of need

The [universalfqa.org](#) website is calibrated for practitioners in the field rather than data analysts at their desks. It facilitates the recording, storing, and publicizing of individual floristic quality assessments and performs calculations of the statistical measures most often cited by land managers and conservation organizations in their reporting, including native mean-C. However, its focus on individual assessments is not well-suited to analyses that might wish to consider multiple assessments simultaneously.

The fqr package enables analysis with a wider lens, allowing users to consider database-wide records of plant taxa or characteristics. By examining entire collections of assessments simultaneously, ecologists may gain insights into floristic quality assessment as well as the various plant species it tracks. Among the wide range of questions made answerable by fqr are the following:

- what is the co-occurrence profile of a given species of interest? What other plants (or types of plants) is it most frequently identified alongside?

- 41     ▪ which species in a given database might be misclassified? Based on their co-occurrence
- 42       profiles, might some be more or less conservative than previously thought?
- 43     ▪ what species are most commonly identified in certain regions? Which have been reported
- 44       seldom or not at all?
- 45     ▪ which non-native species have become widespread in particular regions? Which tend
- 46       to be symptomatic of degraded areas, and which seem to be able to coexist alongside
- 47       conservative native plants?

48   There is currently great need in the ecological community to validate and potentially refine  
49   the floristic quality assessment methodology ([Spyreas, 2019](#)). Because C-values, the metric  
50   on which FQA is ultimately based, are assigned based on the experience of small numbers of  
51   local experts, there are inevitable inconsistencies and irregularities which only a larger-scale  
52   reconsideration can address. Thus far the community has only been able to take preliminary  
53   or ad hoc steps in that direction ([Bourdaghs et al., 2006](#); [Matthews et al., 2015](#)). The fqar  
54   package will allow for a more deep, targeted analysis.

## 55   Typical workflow

56   Analysts using fqar will typically download and reformat assessments of interest before using  
57   functions like `assessment_cooccurrence_summary` to analyze the data. The following workflow  
58   does just this for the *Flora of the Chicago Region* database, an updated version of the original  
59   floristic quality manual ([Wilhelm & Rericha, 2017](#)). Depending on the needs of the specific  
60   user, such analysis can be restricted to particular practitioners, organizations, or locations, or  
61   redirected entirely along the lines described in the previous section.

62   First, download all public assessments in the desired database and reshape them into a standard  
63   format:

```
library(fqar)
chicago_fqas <- download_assessment_list(database_id = 80)
chicago_invs <- assessment_list_inventory(chicago_fqas)
```

64   The output of the former command is a list of data frames in the original format provided  
65   by [universalfqa.org](#). Each of these data frames includes several different sorts of information:  
66   species-level observations, summary statistics, and metadata. The second command isolates  
67   the species inventories and stores them in a tidy format ([Wickham, 2014](#)).

68   Next, extract co-occurrence information from this collection of species inventories:

```
chicago_cooccurrence <- assessment_cooccurrences(chicago_invs)
```

69   fqar provides tools for both quantitative and visual descriptions of the co-occurrence profile of  
70   given species.

```
species_profile(chicago_invs,
               species = "Fragaria virginiana",
               native = TRUE) # a data frame
species_profile_plot(chicago_invs,
                   species = "Fragaria virginiana",
                   native = TRUE) # a visualization
```




Figure 1

71 Here we see that *Fragaria virginiana*, the wild strawberry, is listed with  $C = 0$  in the Chicago  
72 database but co-occurs with a wide variety of more conservative species. In particular, it has  
73 been found with 10's more frequently than it has with other 0's.

74 Summary co-occurrence information for the entire database can be extracted with  
75 `assessment_cooccurrences_summary`, which gives a complete listing of all observed species  
76 and their co-occurring mean C-values.

```
chicago_summary <- assessment_cooccurrences(chicago_invs)
```

77 The data generated by functions like these will be invaluable in the validation and refinement  
78 of floristic quality assessment.

## 79 Availability

80 The `fqr` package is freely available via the Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN).

```
81 install.packages("fqr")
```

82 Alternatively, the latest developmental version can be installed directly from GitHub:

```
83 devtools::install_github("equitable-equations/fqr")
```

84 Thorough documentation is provided. A long-form vignette gives a birds-eye overview of the  
85 package's functionality while help files for individual functions provide guidance on particular  
86 data analysis tasks.

## 87 Acknowledgements

88 Partial funding for this project was provided by the James Rocco Program. The authors  
89 also wish to thanks Glenn Adelson, Ph.D (Lake Forest College) and Justin Thomas, M.Sc  
90 ([NatureCITE](#)) for their insight into floristic quality assessment.

## 91 References

92 Bauer, K., J. (2018). Ecology of floristic quality assessment: Testing for correlations between  
93 coefficients of conservatism, species traits and mycorrhizal responsiveness. *AoB PLANTS*,

- 94 10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plx073>
- 95 Bourdaghs, M., Johnston, C. A., & Regal, R. R. (2006). Properties and performance of the  
96 floristic quality index in great lakes coastal wetlands. *Wetlands*, 26(3), 718–735.
- 97 Bowles, M., & Jones, M. (2006). Testing the efficacy of species richness and floristic quality  
98 assessment of quality, temporal change, and fire effects in tallgrass prairie natural areas.  
99 *Natural Areas Journal*, 26(1), 17–30. [https://doi.org/10.3375/0885-8608\(2006\)26%5B17:](https://doi.org/10.3375/0885-8608(2006)26%5B17:TTEOSR%5D2.0.CO;2)  
100 [TTEOSR%5D2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.3375/0885-8608(2006)26%5B17:TTEOSR%5D2.0.CO;2)
- 101 Freyman, W. A., Masters, L. A., & Packard, S. (2016). The universal floristic quality assessment  
102 (FQA) calculator: An online tool for ecological assessment and monitoring. *Methods in*  
103 *Ecology and Evolution*, 7(3), 380–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12491>
- 104 Matthews, J. W., Spyreas, G., & Long, C. M. (2015). A null model test of floristic quality  
105 assessment: Are plant species' coefficients of conservatism valid? *Ecological Indicators*, 52,  
106 1–7.
- 107 R Core Team. (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation  
108 for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 109 Spyreas, G. (2019). Floristic quality assessment: A critique, a defense, and a primer. *Ecosphere*,  
110 10(8), e02825.
- 111 Swink, F., Wilhelm, G., & others. (1994). *Plants of the chicago region*.
- 112 Wickham, H. (2014). Tidy data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 59(10), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v059.i10>
- 113
- 114 Wilhelm, G., & Rericha, L. (2017). *Flora of the chicago region: A floristic and ecological*  
115 *synthesis*.
- 116 Zinnen, S., J. (2021). Niche ecology in floristic quality assessment: Are species with higher  
117 conservatism more specialized? *Ecological Indicators*, 121. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.107078)  
118 [ecolind.2020.107078](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.107078)