



# NMQC

NE Atlantic Marine Biological Analytical Quality Control Scheme

[www.nmqcs.org](http://www.nmqcs.org)

**Macroalgae/Angiosperms % Cover Component  
Report –  
OMC RT10 2019**

Emma Wells  
Wells Marine Surveys  
March 2019  
Email: [emma@wellsmarine.org](mailto:emma@wellsmarine.org)



**MACROALGAE/ANGIOSPERMS COMPONENT REPORT FROM THE  
CONTRACTOR SCHEME OPERATION -2017-18**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Summary of Performance.....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Summary of Macroalgae Component .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Introduction .....	3
2.2	Description.....	3
2.3	Logistics.....	4
2.4	Preparation of the Samples .....	4
2.4.1	Method A .....	4
2.4.2	Method B .....	4
2.4.3	Method C .....	4
2.5	Quadrat image analysis.....	4
2.6	Analysis and Data Submissions .....	5
2.7	Confidentiality.....	5
2.8	Results.....	6
2.8.1	General Comments .....	6
2.8.2	Macroalgae Results from Participating Laboratories.....	6
2.8.3	Seagrass Results from Participating Laboratories.....	8
2.9	Discussion.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## 1 Introduction

To enable correct water quality classification and good management decision-making, quality control of biological data is a high priority. This extends through all biological elements including macroalgae and seagrass. Good quality control ensures consistency of data being reported for management purposes, and for macroalgae and marine angiosperms this has been driven primarily by the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. This QC scheme aims to facilitate improvements in biological assessment whilst maintaining the standard of marine biological data. The scheme should help to ensure consistency between analysts with improved confidence in ecological quality status.

The National Marine Biological Analytical Quality Control (NMBAQC) Scheme addresses several issues relating to macroalgae and seagrass data collection, this report focuses on two of these:

- The estimation of % cover
- The comparison of methodologies

This is the tenth year in which % cover estimations of macroalgae have been included as an element of the NMBAQC scheme and the eighth year for which seagrass has been assessed as a separate entity. This included one exercise for macroalgae and one for seagrass both of which were split into three additional exercises based on methodology. The format followed that of previous years (RT03 – RT09). Test material was distributed to participating laboratories from which data forms were completed with macroalgae and seagrass % cover results and returned for analysis.

Fourteen laboratories were issued test material. All fourteen laboratories completed the % cover macroalgae/seagrass component of the NMBAQC scheme with a total of 35 participants. Of those laboratories submitting results, all fourteen were government organisations. To ensure consistency between scheme years, each participating laboratory was assigned the same laboratory code as in previous years, except where a laboratory was new to the scheme. Individual codes may, however, change slightly due to variations in individual participants. Due to the nature of the exercise there was no limit on the number of participants per lab.

Laboratories were able to complete the % cover test that best represented the methodology used within their laboratory to allow comparisons of methodology. However, the laboratories were encouraged to complete all three variations of both the macroalgae and seagrass exercise to facilitate comparisons of the methods.

Currently this scheme does not specify a definite qualifying performance level, and NMBAQC ring tests may be treated as training exercises. However, certain indicative targets have been applied to the assessment of the results based on Z-scores allowing “Pass” or “Fail” flags to be assigned accordingly; these may be used by competent monitoring authorities for internal monitoring of performance. These flags have no current bearing on the acceptability of data from such participating laboratories. Ring tests offer a means of assessing personal and laboratory performance from which continued training requirements may be identified or from which improvements in current field and laboratory procedures may be addressed.

The NMBAQC scheme was originally set up for benthic invertebrates data submission to the NMMP (National Marine Monitoring Plan) to determine that data were fit for submission to the scheme. Macroalgal/angiosperms data are not submitted to any such scheme. However, they are used for classification, so it's important they are correct.

## 1.1 *Summary of Performance*

This report presents the findings of the macroalgae/seagrass component for the tenth year of operation within the National Marine Biological Analytical Quality Control (NMBAQC) Scheme. This component consisted of one macroalgae and one seagrass exercise which was subsequently split into three alternative means of assessment which may be considered as separate modules from which laboratories could complete one or more module.

The analytical procedures of the exercise remained consistent with previous rounds of the scheme (OMC RT03 – RT09). The results for the exercise are presented and discussed with comments provided on the overall participant performance.

Two sets of fifteen quadrat photographs showing various % covers of opportunist macroalgae and seagrass were used for the exercise. These sets of photographs were duplicated to produce the three separate modules incorporating the different assessment methods utilised by the various participating laboratories. The set of quadrat photos differed by the use of grid squares of varying quantities; open quadrat, 5 x 5 square grid and 10 x 10 square grid. Each photo represented natural levels of opportunist macroalgae and seagrass cover.

Results for % cover of both opportunist macroalgae and seagrass varied between participants and between the different methods used. Several results deviated from the sample mean and from the % cover as calculated by image analysis. Deviation from the latter was more noticeable and this has also been reported in previous years. There was a considerable lack of consistency between the three methods in terms of the degree of continuity between participants as well as how the data compared with the image analysis % cover. There was greater preference for methods A and C for both macroalgae and seagrass and as seen in previous years method B had far fewer participants. The number of 'Fails' between test methods and comparison against mean or image analysis varied considerably with no apparent trend. The overall number of 'Fails' was far higher for macroalgae than seagrass. The seagrass tests resulted in a much broader range of results thereby increasing the standard deviation, so it is likely that the Z-scores were unable to pick up slight deviations from mean or ImageJ analysis % cover, therefore resulting in fewer 'Fails'.

## 2 *Summary of Macroalgae Exercise*

### 2.1 *Introduction*

There was one exercise for the assessment of % cover of macroalgae and one for seagrass, which took the form of three methodology options. This exercise is described in full below to include details of distribution and logistics, procedures for estimation of % cover, completion of test result forms and full analysis and comparison of final submitted results.

### 2.2 *Description*

This exercise examined the participants' ability to estimate accurately various levels of opportunist macroalgae and seagrass percentage cover. The exercise can determine the level of inter-laboratory variation and the degree of deviation from % cover estimations as calculated using image analysis software. It identifies areas of significant error, problematic coverage, or mis-use of grid squares for aiding with estimations.

Three sets of 15 representative macroalgae and seagrass quadrat photos were distributed to each participating laboratory in January 2019. Participating laboratories were required to estimate the % cover of the opportunist macroalgae and seagrass using one or more of the methodologies provided.

The nature of the photos was consistent with those provided for RT09 with the two overlying grid systems. Opportunist algae consisted of species of *Ulva*, and seagrass was identified as *Zostera noltii*.

## 2.3 Logistics

The test material was distributed on CD to each laboratory. Each disc contained the six tests, description of methods and data submission forms. Participants were given six weeks to complete the test and return the result. There were no restrictions on the number of participants per laboratory.

Email has been the primary means of communication for all participating laboratories subsequent to the initial postal distribution of test material.

## 2.4 Preparation of the Samples

In order to assess the accuracy of determining % cover of opportunist macroalgae and seagrass, photographs were taken of quadrats overlying varying degrees of algae or seagrass cover. In total 15 representative photographs each of macroalgae and seagrass were taken by Wells Marine for the purpose of this exercise.

The two sets of 15 photographs were adapted to produce three tests of each component that utilised different methods of % cover estimation.

### 2.4.1 Method A

Method A was an open quadrat, this allowed the analyst to estimate the percent cover in a 0.25m<sup>2</sup> quadrat without visual obstruction or assistance from gridlines. A general estimation is conducted looking solely at the total area within the quadrat that is clearly covered by the opportunist macroalgae or seagrass.

### 2.4.2 Method B

Method B split the 0.25m<sup>2</sup> quadrat into 25 squares with each square representing 4% of the total quadrat. The percent cover was estimated by counting the number of squares, to the nearest half square, that were covered by macroalgae/seagrass. Completely covered squares were counted as one each. Between 50% and 100% cover in individual squares was estimated to the nearest quarter and these portions were summed. For quadrats with sparse macroalgae cover (i.e. always < 50% cover per square) the participants accumulated the small portions of algal coverage (totalling to the nearest half square). The number of squares was divided by 25 and then multiplied by 100 to give a percentage.

### 2.4.3 Method C

Method C consisted of a 9 x 9 crosshair quadrat. This method splits the quadrat into 100 squares. The crosshair referred to the point at which the gridlines cross and within a 9 x 9 grid amounts to a total of 81 crosshairs. The method of cover estimation was achieved by recording the presence or absence of algae/seagrass under each of the crosshair points. Where present this was recorded as 1 and absence was recorded as 0. The number of cross hairs with algae/seagrass present was divided by 81, and then multiplied by 100 to give a percentage.

## 2.5 Quadrat image analysis

An image analysis programme called ImageJ was used to achieve a more objective measurement of % cover which could be compared with the traditional means of assessment.

Prior to analysis the quadrat photos were edited and modified within photoshop to ensure a substantial contrast between the seagrass and macroalgae against the background, enabling ImageJ to pick up the differences. The photographs were first edited in photoshop to remove debris and any other spots that may influence the overall % cover such as green shells. Photoshop is then able to highlight only those areas of green seagrass or macroalgae with the background remaining pale and indistinguishable. The photographs are then opened within the ImageJ program which distinguishes contrasts in colour/tone and is therefore able to compare the macroalgae against the background substrate.

ImageJ is used to convert the black and white quadrat photo into binary form to highlight the thresholds. The entire quadrat is calibrated against a known measurement scale from which the highlighted area can be spatially analysed. A percent cover is calculated using the area of macroalgae cover against the area of the quadrat as calibrated in ImageJ. These percentages were used as a comparison against the skilled eye estimations as submitted by the participants.

A full, impartial image analysis comparison was sought as part of the QC exercise. This was previously attempted using GIS, but it was thought that this method did not provide a fully independent analysis of % cover. ImageJ is thought to be less subjective providing a more accurate analysis based on colour/tone contrast. Image analysis has been conducted to demonstrate how the comparisons would work but may require further modification and discussion as to its applicability and accuracy, therefore cannot be taken as a definite measure of % cover.

## **2.6 Analysis and Data Submissions**

A prepared results sheet was distributed with the exercise instructions to standardise the format in which the results were submitted. Each participant had the option of completing the test which most represented their own procedures, but all participants were encouraged to complete all three tests of both macroalgae and seagrass to enable a comparison of methodologies and levels of accuracy achieved within each.

For each test the participant had to estimate the % cover of opportunist macroalgae/seagrass species only, excluding any additional species that were present within the quadrat and that were not considered to be either of these types of species. The assessment included a large degree of variation in % cover to represent the full range experienced within the field.

Spreadsheet based forms were distributed with the test material to standardise the format in which the results were submitted. These results will be retained and stored appropriately.

## **2.7 Confidentiality**

To preserve the confidentiality of participating laboratories, each participant is allocated a four-digit laboratory code from which they can identify their results. These codes are randomly assigned. The initial letters (MA) refer to the scheme this is followed by the scheme year which refers to the year in which the NMBAQC scheme original commenced, the final two digits represent the laboratory. For those laboratories where multiple submissions were provided the four-digit code is followed by a letter allocated to each participant of that laboratory. For example, participant c from laboratory twelve in scheme year twenty-six will be recorded as MA2612c.

## 2.8 Results

The results have been analysed using different approaches to compare the results between participants, between the three different methods of estimation and to compare against ImageJ calculated % cover estimations for both macroalgae and seagrass.

### 2.8.1 General Comments

In total fourteen laboratories signed up for the % cover component of the macroalgae/seagrass element for RT10. All fourteen laboratories submitted data within this round of the ring test. Of those laboratories that submitted data 24 completed method A, 15 completed method B and 29 completed method C for the macroalgae component. For the seagrass component 26 completed method A, 14 completed method B and 22 completed method C. Fourteen participants completed all three macroalgae and thirteen completed all three seagrass methods. The results have been collated and represented in various formats to enable full comparisons between participants and against % cover as calculated by the image analysis.

Details of each participating laboratory performance were distributed in the macroalgae OMC RT10 Bulletin Report and the seagrass OMC RT09 Bulletin Report, which represent a summary of the results for RT10. The Bulletin provides 'Pass' and 'Fail' flags to each data set to highlight deviation from sample mean and actual results. Values of Z-scores were used to apply the 'Pass' and 'Fail' assessment.

Z-scores, calculated to indicate the level of deviation of % cover, used the following formula:

$$Z = \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma}$$

$X$  is a raw score to be standardized;

$\mu$  is the mean of the population;

$\sigma$  is the standard deviation of the population.

Z-scores were calculated using the mean % cover and the image analysis % cover. A Z-score value of greater than +/- 2.0 was considered to be outside an acceptable limit of deviation from the mean. This value is considered standard practice and was used assign a 'Fail' or 'Pass' flag on the data.

### 2.8.2 Macroalgae Results from Participating Laboratories

#### 2.8.2.1 Test A Results (open quadrat)

Test A consisted of 24 participants and was the second most popular of the three methods. The range of results per quadrat varied considerably with the largest range of results produced for quadrat 5 with a range of 40%. Quadrat 7 had a 30% range of % cover estimates, a further 8 quadrats had % cover ranges of between 20 and 30%. The lowest range was for quadrat 2 with a 13% cover range. Despite quadrat 5 resulting in a broad range of results there were no 'Fails' when using z-score against the mean, probably due to the higher standard deviation of 10.8, and overall there were no more than 2 'Fails' per quadrat. In comparison the total number of 'Fails' when using Z-scores derived from

ImageJ analysis % cover was much higher at 7 and 8 for quadrats 12 and 13 respectively, with all but 3 quadrats resulting in at least one 'Fail'.

Z-scores calculated against the population mean resulted in six laboratories 'Failing' between 1 and 3 quadrats and a 94% pass rate for test A, which is consistent with previous years results. Deviation from the mean varied between participants, ranging from 2.7% and 9.65% taken as an average across all quadrats, this was an improvement on the previous year.

Participants showed an average % cover deviation from image analysis % cover ranging between 3.37% and 11.62%. The pass rate was equally much lower using Z-scores derived from image analysis estimates of % cover with 16 out of 25 participants 'Failing' between 1 and 8 quadrats, although this was still an improvement on results seen from RT09 which had participants 'Failing' up to 11 quadrats. The overall pass rate was 90.5%, also lower than for comparisons against the mean. The overall pass rate was consistent with the previous year.

### **2.8.2.2 Test B Results (5 x 5 gridded quadrat)**

Test B had the least number of participants with 15. As with test A there was a greater degree of correlation of % cover against population mean compared with the image analysis. Overall there was a smaller range of results recorded for test B. The highest range was for quadrat 7 (33%). A further 3 quadrats had ranges between 20% and 30% with the remaining 11 quadrats displaying ranges of less than 20% two of which were less than 10%. The lowest range of % cover estimates were for quadrat 2 (8%) and quadrat 11 (9%), consistent with results from Test A. Overall the % ranges were lower than seen in test A with most laying between 10% and 20% cover range.

Seven of the fifteen participants 'Failed' at least one quadrat when compared against the mean with no more than 3 'Fails' in total per participant and the overall pass rate was 95.5%. Average deviation per participants from the mean % cover ranged from 1.6% to 6.3% which is much lower compared with the other test methods and compared with previous ring tests.

Consistent with test A, test B also showed more deviation from the image analysis results compared with the population mean, with 12 out of 15 participants 'Failing' at least one quadrat and an overall pass rate of only 88%. In total there were 27 'Fails', seven of which resulted from one participant with 5 participants resulting in just 1 'Fail'. A total of 80% of participants (12 out of the 15) consistently produced Z-scores of greater than 2.0, which is regarded as a 'Fail'. Test method B showed consistent measures of deviation from % cover as calculated by ImageJ compared against mean % cover.

### **2.8.2.3 Test C Results (9 x 9 crosshairs quadrat)**

A total of 29 participants opted to complete Test C using the 100 square method with varying levels of deviation from the population mean. As seen in previous years this was the most popular of the estimation methods. The results verified that as with the other two test methods there was a higher degree of deviation when comparing results against the image analysis % cover as opposed to the population mean. The range of results was also much higher than resulted from the other two test methods. Four quadrats had % cover ranges between 30% and 40% with quadrat 7 showing a % cover range of 43%, indicating a low level of agreement between participants. As per the previous two test methods quadrats 2 and 11 had the lowest % cover ranges.

Nine participants 'Failed' at between 1 and 2 quadrats, with one participant 'Failing' 7 quadrats and accounting for 37% of the total 'Fails'. The overall pass rate was 95.6% which is consistent with the previous year. The 'Fails' were distributed across all quadrats with no more than 3 'Fails' per quadrat.



Levels of deviation against the mean were consistent with test A with a range of between 1.32 and 11.75.

Comparing participants % cover estimates against ImageJ analysis resulted in 19 out of the 29 participants 'Failing' between 1 and 12 quadrats with an overall pass rate of only 83%. This is substantially lower compared with both analysis against the mean and against the other test methods. The most 'Fails' could be attributed to quadrat 5 with a total of 12 'Fails'. Quadrats 2, 4, 10 and 14 also had a high number of 'Fails' (9, 8, 10 and 7 respectively).

## 2.8.3 Seagrass Results from Participating Laboratories

### 2.8.3.1 Test A Results (open quadrat)

Test A consisted of 26 participants and this was the most popular method. The range of results submitted per quadrat varied considerably as with the macroalgae test. The largest range was for quadrat 3 with a huge % cover range of 60% and results varying between 15% and 75 %. A further 5 quadrats had % cover ranges over 40% with no % cover range less than 20%. The average range across all participants and quadrats was 36%, much higher than any previous results. Z-scores calculated against the population mean resulted in five people 'Failing' between 1 and 3 quadrats and one participant 'Failing' 9 quadrats and 17 'Fails' overall. In total there was a 95.6% pass rate for test A when using Z-scores derived from the mean which is a marginal decrease on RT09 (97%).

When comparing results against % cover as calculated using ImageJ, the number of 'Fails' per laboratory was greater with a total number of 24 'Fails' (93.8% pass rate) which is far higher than in RT09, however this may be as a consequence of high values for standard deviation derived from the large range of results. Eight out of the 26 participants 'Failed' between 1 and 5 quadrats with one participant 'Failing' 9 quadrats. The 'Fails' were distributed across all quadrats with all except quadrat 12 having between 1 and 3 'Fails'. The average deviation of results from mean and image analysis % cover per lab ranged from 2.36 to 19.84 and 3.32 to 18.15 respectively. These deviations, which although consistent between analysis methods, are higher compared with the macroalgae % cover estimates.

### 2.8.3.2 Test B Results (5 x 5 gridded quadrat)

Test B had the least number of participants with a total of 14 participants opting to complete the 5 x 5 square grid quadrat method, resulting in varying levels of deviation from the population mean. This test followed the same trend as the other tests for both macroalgae and seagrass with comparisons against image analysis resulting in a greater number of Failures using the Z-score than when comparing against mean % cover. The range of % cover values showed a lower level of variation than described for test A with 9 quadrats having % cover ranges in the order of between 9% and 22% indicating a lower level of discrepancy between participants, although 6 quadrats still had % cover ranges between 32% and 48%. Indicating a high level of disparity between quadrat % cover estimates. Comparing results against mean % cover resulted in only 6 'Fails' distributed across 3 participants, with an overall pass rate of 97%. In comparison, the total number of 'Fails' using image analysis was higher at 24 and was distributed among 9 out of the 14 participants. The overall pass rates using image analysis % cover was 88%. Both sets of results were an improvement on the previous year.

The deviation from image analysis (3.15 – 15.98) and mean % cover (1.44 – 12.46) was higher than the previous year and can be attributed to the high range of results across some quadrats. The 'Fails' were

broadly distributed across all quadrats, with the highest number of 'Fails' recorded for those quadrats in which the range of % covers were the smallest.

### 2.8.3.3 Test C Results (9 x 9 crosshairs quadrat)

Test C had a total of 22 participants. The % cover ranges were much higher for test C than for test B but more consistent with the high ranges of Test A with all except two quadrats having a % cover range between 20% and 45% indicating a high level of discrepancy between participants. The total % cover range over all participants and quadrats was 32%. Comparison of results against the mean resulted in 17 'Fails' with one participant having 9 'Fails', and the remaining 8 'Fails' being distributed among five other participants and a total pass rate of 95%. Comparing results against the image analysis resulted in 21 'Fails' with pass rates of 93% again with 8 'Fails' attributed to a single participant.

'Fails' against image analysis and mean were spread broadly between all quadrats. Deviation from mean % cover (2.38 – 16.92) and image analysis (3.21 – 18.18) was consistent with that of test A.

## 2.9 Discussion

The % cover of opportunist algae or seagrass in a 0.25 m<sup>2</sup> quadrat is usually estimated based on a skilled eye observation using either an open quadrat or gridded quadrat with +/- 5% agreement between surveyors. It is highly unlikely that this method of % cover estimation is 100% accurate due to the subjectivity of individuals, although over time people can become highly skilled. OMC RT10 used the population mean and an image analysis method (ImageJ) to calculate a more objective % cover for comparison with individual participants' records. There are difficulties in obtaining 100% accuracy for % cover of opportunist algae or seagrass; however, using the image analysis method should provide less subjectivity than skilled eye estimation. The ImageJ program can select areas of cover based on the colouration, identified by depth of colour. Each of the quadrat photographs is enhanced prior to analysis using Photoshop to ensure maximum contrast between algae and substrate by selecting the areas of algal coverage and in this instance converting to a black and white scale. Once the two distinct colours have been identified within the ImageJ program it is able to calculate the total area covered thus reducing the degree of subjectivity experienced with skilled eye evaluations. During this seventh round of the macroalgae scheme photographs were also ground-truthed against actual presence of algae within the field to ensure the area of algae could be identified accurately within each quadrat thereby ensuring full calibration of the photographs.


Z-scores were used to establish a level of acceptance for results submitted by participants. These Z-scores used both the mean % cover per quadrat and the % cover as calculated by ImageJ. The results could then be compared between participants, and between method of cover estimation for both macroalgae and seagrass. The results generally show a higher level of consistency between participants when comparing with the population mean. This was apparent across all tests for both macroalgae and seagrass. In conjunction with this there were a greater number of Z-scores Failures when comparing the image analysis % cover with the population mean of the quadrats. This is consistent with previous years. This indicates either a lack of accuracy in % cover estimations or inaccurate % cover results produced using ImageJ. The benefit of comparing participants' results against the mean is that it fully represents the range of results submitted and this is not the case for the ImageJ results. However, the image analysis represents a less subjective % cover value that is consistent between quadrats.

The overall range of results submitted is still highly variable with some quadrats having estimated ranges up to 60% indicating a high degree of participant error and inconsistency. For some participants this was more noticeable than others. The level of success rate for individuals was not completely consistent between tests with the greatest number of 'Fails' for each test being attributed to different people, however some participants regularly produced a higher deviation from the mean and ImageJ results than others. As with previous years this provides some evidence that different methods of % cover estimation provides varying levels of success for the different participants, making it difficult to conclude which method is the best in terms of producing the most accurate result. It seems this is highly dependent upon the participant.


The degree of deviation from the image analysis % cover value depended significantly upon the quadrat. Some quadrats were more problematic than others; this was consistent with the range of % cover and could possibly be attributed to the patchier coverage of opportunist algae and seagrass in some quadrats which is much harder to estimate accurately. However, as in some previous years it was evident that those quadrats with a mid percent cover range generally resulted in a higher level of deviation with a much broader range of results. In previous years it has been apparent that those quadrats with either a very high or low percent cover have appeared much easier to accurately estimate total cover. This trend is evident throughout both macroalgae and seagrass quadrat. There is also a broader range of deviations for both the mean and ImageJ analysis for seagrass than macroalgae. Seagrass displays a much patchier nature of growth; its thin long strands often make it difficult to estimate % cover leading to a broader range of results and high levels of deviation.

As per previous years there is a very broad range of results provided for each quadrat, far greater than the recommended +/- 5%. The range of results also varies according to the % cover of the quadrat with those in the mid-range (30 – 70%) having less consistency in % cover estimates than those quadrats whose % cover is at the higher or lower end of the range. This is seen across all test methods and for seagrass and macroalgae alike.

Figures 1 and 2 show this range of % cover results. The scatter graphs also indicate that Test method B for both macroalgae and seagrass has the smallest range of results across participants. However, there are also far fewer participants for this test method so it is unclear whether, given similar number of participants, this would result in a broader range of results. Overall the broad range of % cover estimates submitted by participants is concerning in terms of consistency between laboratories as well as within laboratories.




**Figure 1:** Scatter graph showing the range of % cover results per quadrat across all three test methods for opportunistic macroalgae.



**Figure 2:** Scatter graph showing the range of % cover results per quadrat across all three test methods for seagrass.

There are also noticeable differences between the different methods of estimation used and the resulting number of 'Fails' (Figure 3). The macroalgae component resulted in the greatest number of 'Fails' when comparing against both mean and ImageJ analysis with 19 and 73 'Fails' respectively. Test B had the least 'Fails' recorded for both methods of analysis albeit only marginally. In comparison the number of 'Fails' for seagrass were relatively consistent across all three tests. Although as in previous years the number of 'Fails' was much higher for comparison against ImageJ than against mean. This has come to be expected but does not negate the value of using ImageJ analysis with which to compare results as this is ultimately the least subjective method and using the mean is naturally going to allow more estimates to sit within the Z-score +/- 2.00 range. Therefore, the two methods cannot be directly compared.

Figure 3 also shows that the results for macroalgae are producing far more 'Fails' than for the seagrass. Given that the seagrass could be considered more difficult to estimate and the broad range of results submitted by all participants it may be considered that the higher pass rate is due to the high standard deviation produced from the high range of results and is less likely to be due to more consistent estimates of % cover.



**Figure 3:** Number of Fails recorded across all tests for macroalgae and seagrass quadrats.

Tests A and B produced results that were, on average, lower than the image analysis estimates of % cover for both macroalgae and seagrass. In contrast Test C produced mean results that were higher than that of the image analysis. Clearly there is no continuity between test methods none of which agree regularly with the % cover results from the ImageJ analysis, some of which appear to be overestimating % cover while other methods underestimate.

The preferred test methods remained unchanged with a greater number of participants completing tests A and C with both macroalgae and seagrass. This is also consistent with previous years and suggests this is the method most used by laboratories in the field. Most noticeable was the increased number of 'Fails' associated with test C when comparing against the ImageJ analysis for macroalgae, although this was not the case for seagrass. It may be considered that test method C would provide a less subjective method of estimation, as counting the number of cross hairs under which macroalgae or seagrass lay should be a relatively straight forward method. However, there is still a huge disparity in results, often much higher than for the other test methods that may suggest the method is not being used consistently between participants. It may be that for some quadrats it is unclear if seagrass or macroalgae is present under a cross hair which affects the % cover estimate. This method should clearly be used with some caution.

This year the number of 'Fails' was far less for seagrass than for macroalgae. As seagrass is a lot patchier than macroalgae and can be much harder to estimate % cover and often results in a broader range of % cover estimates. It may be that the higher range of results would contribute to an overall higher standard deviation and would lessen the risk of achieving a 'Fail' based on the Z-scores, or there is an improvement in the level of consistency between participants. These results along with those from previous years require further examination to improve the methodologies employed and the means in which the % cover is calculated both by field method and image analysis.

The results from both components and across all test methods still produced a high degree of variation with the % cover ranges still beyond what could be considered acceptable levels. It is often the practice that where two field workers are estimating % cover they should remain within 5% of one another. This is evidently not the situation with these results and causes some concern with regards to the application of the data particularly with reference to the use of the WFD macroalgae algae % cover metric. The constant broad range of results are creating high values of standard deviation and often not highlighting the severity of the deviation from mean and image analysis and producing far fewer 'Fails' than would be expected. The broad range of results across participants and laboratories is a problem that needs to be addressed either by adapting a less subjective means of estimating % cover of macroalgae or seagrass, or by stimulating a field meeting with which to synchronise such methodologies to remain the high degree of error currently being recorded within the NMBAQC macroalgae and seagrass % cover tests. The current test methods do not provide a current solution and where one method may work best with macroalgae this may not be the case for seagrass, so this remains an area requiring significant further investigation.

### 3 Conclusions and Recommendations

1. There is evidently still a high degree of difference between tests as well as between participants and this may prompt the need for a specific workshop whereby methods can be discussed, and possibly % cover estimations compared in the field. It is not possible from the current ring test to conclude which % cover estimation method provides the most accurate results, however it is evident through the number of participants that during RT Test methods A and C were the most favoured methods for macroalgae and seagrass.

2. There is still a high level of difference between z-scores calculated from the mean and z-scores calculated from image analysis results and given the varied levels of deviation between the two it is unclear which is the most accurate method from which to compare participants results.
3. The image analysis method used during RT10 is considered more objective than skilled eye estimation and likely to produce a more objective result. However, this method is still under development and will continue to undergo improvements prior to the next round of tests. It is recommended at this time that participants should use the Z-scores derived from comparisons with the mean if they are required for internal quality reports.
4. During this tenth cycle of the macroalgae % cover exercise one laboratory was unable to complete the ring test within the allocated time period. It is appreciated that conflicts with work may prevent laboratories from meeting the deadline and where necessary allowances can be made. However, it is important that all laboratories continue to attempt to submit results within the requested deadlines as detailed at the beginning of the exercise. This is in both their own interests and brings greater benefit to all participants in the scheme by increasing the dataset and ensuring preliminary bulletins and reports are circulated within the set time period. In subsequent years reminders will continue to be distributed two weeks prior to the completion of the exercise to ensure the deadline is met, with a further reminder one week prior to the deadline. Any results submitted outside of this deadline will not be accepted and will not be included in the analysis.
5. Although there is general agreement that the tests are being distributed at the most appropriate time of year for most labs, there are some problems with test materials being distributed around the Christmas period, due to lack of staff. This will be reviewed prior to the next ring test and it may mean that the test is put back a week to prevent this occurring. However, tests will continue to be distributed early in the New Year with a time limit of 6 weeks. It will remain the responsibility of the laboratory to ensure all results are submitted within the time provided.
6. It may be considered that during field sampling it may be possible to estimate % cover of opportunist algae with more accuracy than when using photos. The nature of the photographs can produce difficulties when assessing the density of the algae and the presence of some shadows and the grids can hinder this further. This point has been highlighted by a couple of labs and in subsequent tests further efforts will be made to ensure this doesn't hinder the ability to accurately estimate the % cover. However, it is to be noted that many seagrass beds remain waterlogged regardless of tidal height and sun reflection may be a problem, but all attempts will be made in the future to ensure clear photos are distributed with a broad range of % covers.
7. Some labs still use slightly alternative methods of estimating % cover. It may be useful to review which methods are the most appropriate for the ring test and which methods are most commonly being employed. The methods that are currently included within the ring test were those considered to be most frequently used. It is agreed that where laboratories use alternative methods such as subtidal quadrat % cover estimations these methods may not accurately represent their commonly used procedures. However, by completing all three methods for both seagrass and macroalgae it is still possible to compare results with other laboratories in order gauge the level of accuracy.
8. This year all participants successfully filled out the spreadsheets provided and removed any prior calculations, particularly with regards to Test method C. This has made the analysis process much easier and reduced the risk of error during subsequent calculations. It is requested that

participants continue and exclude all calculations. Where calculations or formulas are included there is greater chance of error when transferring data to a single spreadsheet and during subsequent data analysis.

9. It is evident that not all computers or laptops have means of playing a CD or DVD. This is highly problematic due to the test material using this medium as its means of distribution. Other methods of distribution, that are accessible to all laboratories will be invested prior to the next round of ring tests, to ensure the material can be accessed at the start date.
10. Of the feedback provided two laboratories expressed some concern with the use of the cross-hair method. It was considered to be more open to disparities between participants and more prone to mistakes. It was suggested that the cross hair consist of a more transparent line to enable the underlying substrate to be more clearly seen. This will be included in the next ring test to assist with the use of this method.
11. There were some concerns that those quadrats in which seagrass was present within the macroalgae test quadrats or where *Zostera* had already died back, that these may affect the ImageJ analysis. It can be assured that these factors are removed from the image prior to analysis so as not to overestimate the % cover.

If anyone has further thoughts on this, or disagrees with any of the interpretation, please pass forward your comments to Dr Emma Wells ([emma@wellsmarine.org](mailto:emma@wellsmarine.org)). This ring test is now in its seventh year and although it has general approval, we are still very happy to receive feedback particularly suggestions on how it may be improved.