International Journal of Innovations & Research Analysis (IJIRA)
ISSN :2583-0295(Online), Impact Factor: 7.662, Volume 05, No. 03(II), July- September, 2025, pp 161-170

Phytosociology and Phytoassociation: An Overview of Concepts and Applications

Seema Sen[1*] | Rachana Dinesh[2]

[1]Department of Botany, J.N.V. University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India.
[2]Department of Botany, J.N.V. University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India.

[*]Corresponding Author: senseema18@gmail.com

Citation: Sen, S., & Dinesh, R. (2025). Phytosociology and Phytoassociation: An Overview of Concepts and Applications. International Journal of Innovations & Research Analysis, 05(03(II)), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.62823/ijira/5.3(ii).8043

ABSTRACT

Phytosociology, a specialized branch of botanical science concerned with vegetation, offers a rigorous framework for the systematic study of plant communities. It furnishes the essential conceptual and methodological machinery for the detailed description, hierarchical classification, and analytical comprehension of the persistent, discernible patterns governing the co-occurrence of species. Central to this organizational effort is the "phytoassociation," which serves as the fundamental, non-reducible construct for vegetation arrangement. This treatise re-examines the foundational tenets of phytosociology, tracing its historical course from the pioneering contributions of the Zurich–Montpellier (Z-M) school to its contemporary reliance on sophisticated statistical ecology. Furthermore, the paper investigates the indispensable utility of the phytoassociation in basic ecological inquiry, conservation strategy development, and pragmatic land stewardship. Through the felicitous merging of classical, observation-based field methods with advanced statistical and computational techniques, phytosociology has solidified its position as a paramount discipline for addressing pressing environmental crises, notably the acceleration of biodiversity decline and the pervasive impact of climatic instability.

***Keywords**: Phytosociology, Phytoassociation, Land Management, Biodiversity Loss, Climate Change.*

Introduction

Given that the planetary flora constitutes the biological matrix of terrestrial systems that are acting as the primary producers that undergird all subsequent trophic levels, the critical examination of vegetation remains a cornerstone of ecological investigation. The spatial and temporal disposition of plant life is governed by a multifaceted array of environmental controllers, encompassing macro-climatic gradients, edaphic characteristics, available water resources, prevailing disturbance regimes, and complex interspecific dynamics (Kent, 2012). To bring systematic order to the analysis of these intricate arrangements, the intellectual discipline known as phytosociology was conceived.

Also referenced as plant sociology or, less commonly, phytocoenology, this field provides a protocolized system for the delineation, taxonomic arrangement, and ecological exegesis of distinct, observable vegetation units (Braun-Blanquet 1932; Westhoff and van der Maarel 1978). Its ambition extends far beyond a simple floristic inventory; instead, it labors to isolate consistently recurring patterns of species synergy and to elucidate the fundamental ecological ordinances dictating their structure. By statistically juxtaposing an area's botanical constitution with its local environmental circumstances, phytosociology demonstrates that species consistently aggregate into predictable associations that reliably emerge under analogous ecological pressures. This capability yields profound insights into the organizational logic and functional performance of the ecosystem (Chytrý and Tichý, 2003; Dengler et al. 2008; Dengler et al. 2023).

* *Copyright © 2025 by Author's and Licensed by Inspira. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work properly cited.*

The core conceptual anchor of the entire discipline is, without doubt, the phytoassociation. First formally introduced by Gams in 1918 and subsequently refined by Westhoff and van der Maarel (1973), a phytoassociation is precisely defined as a plant assemblage characterized by a relatively stable floristic composition, a recognizable physical structure, and a defined ecological operational range. It is decidedly not a random or arbitrary collection of species; rather, it is a reproducible and distinct vegetation type, formally characterized by the constant presence of a specific suite of diagnostic species (Rodwell 1991). These communities are subject to formal documentation, official naming, and systematic classification, rendering them perfectly suited for rigorous ecological monitoring and sophisticated mapping projects (Dengler et al. 2008). Contemporary phytosociology regards phytoassociations as the atomic constituents of syntaxonomy which is the established hierarchical system for classifying vegetation. Analogous to the ordering of species in biological taxonomy, every phytoassociation possesses a unique identity conferred by a set of diagnostic species or taxa that are concurrently characteristic, highly constant, and differentially present and thereby setting it apart from all other vegetation entities (Willner et al. 2017). This diagnostic methodology provides a robust, stable platform for comparative ecological studies across regions, for the surveillance of biotic resources, for evaluating habitat quality, and, critically, for effective conservation planning (De Cáceres et al. 2015). Thus, by strategically synthesizing quantitative ecological data with detailed floristic analysis, phytosociology and its core concept, the phytoassociation remains essential for both dissecting community ecological mechanisms and supporting practical efforts in land stewardship, habitat restoration, and the anticipation of climatic change repercussions.

Historical Underpinnings of Phytosociology

The intellectual wellspring of phytosociology is situated at the confluence of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, marking a deliberate intellectual shift from mere descriptive natural observation toward analytical vegetation science. Early thinkers came to the realization that vegetation could only be understood as a direct manifestation of complex ecological drivers specifically climate, geography, and soil chemistry rather than a simple list of plants.

- **Early Pioneers and Conceptual Shifts:** An early seminal contribution came from Grisebach (1838), who pioneered the categorization of vegetation regions using floristic data integrated with geographical and environmental parameters, effectively foretelling later biogeographical methods. A profound conceptual leap was achieved by Warming (1895) in his work *Plantesamfund* (later *The Oecology of Plants*), which established the radical notion that vegetation required analysis in terms of life-forms and adaptive ecological strategies. Warming meticulously outlined the commanding influence of environmental gradients i.e., light availability, hydrological factors, and temperature on plant morphological strategies and community structure, establishing the philosophical basis for modern plant ecology (Pignatti, 2018).
- **The Formalization by the Zurich–Montpellier School:** The formal, systematic establishment of phytosociology as a cohesive discipline is primarily credited to Josias Braun-Blanquet (1932), the leading figure behind the highly influential Zurich–Montpellier School (Z-M). Braun-Blanquet rigorously codified the method of utilizing relevés that is the standardized sampling plots within which every vascular plant species is recorded, alongside an estimate of its relative abundance and cover dominance. To assure data consistency, he introduced the Braun-Blanquet cover-abundance scale, a semi-quantitative system that merged density and dominance estimations into a standardized set of categorical values. This scale struck a practical balance between qualitative description and quantitative precision, creating a standard protocol for capturing detailed vegetation structure (Westhoff and van der Maarel 1973; Rodwell 1991).
- **Global Acceptance and Data Collection:** The Z-M methodology rapidly achieved widespread global acceptance owing to its inherent pragmatic simplicity, field reproducibility, and methodological versatility. By the mid-20th century, it had become the standard operating procedure for vegetation surveys across significant portions of Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America, establishing itself as the default protocol for national vegetation mapping and ecological monitoring in numerous nations (Chytrý et al. 2016). Its enduring power lay in its ability to consistently identify recurrent, ecologically sound plant associations as units possessing reliable floristic and ecological traits that could be placed within a hierarchical scheme. The resultant massive accumulation of phytosociological data eventually necessitated the development of extensive national and multinational vegetation data repositories.

- **Modern Data Infrastructures:** The relevé-based data collection protocol initiated by Braun-Blanquet became the template for contemporary vegetation informatics. Key examples include the European Vegetation Archive (EVA), which aggregates millions of relevés for performing large-scale ecological syntheses and biodiversity analyses across the European continent, and sPlot, a global platform that synthesizes plot data for conducting complex macroecological and biogeographical investigations worldwide (Bruelheide et al. 2019).
- **The Quantitative Ascent:** While the original Z-M framework was predominantly qualitative and often criticized for the subjectivity inherent in expert judgment, subsequent decades witnessed its highly successful integration with powerful computational and statistical apparatus, including ordination, cluster analysis, and various numerical classification techniques (van der Maarel 1979; McCune 1997). These advancements substantially boosted both the analytical power and the objective reproducibility of the science while retaining the relevé as the foundational sampling entity. Presently, relevé-derived data remains critical for syntaxonomic classification, the formulation of conservation policy, and ongoing ecological surveillance (Dengler et al. 2023). Thus, the history of phytosociology is a narrative of methodological refinement, culminating in a mature, globally connected discipline that successfully integrates classical natural history with contemporary quantitative ecology.

Syntaxonomy in Phytosociology

Just as systematic taxonomy organizes individual biological species into a hierarchy, syntaxonomy provides the formal, structural scaffold used in phytosociology to classify plant communities. This structure is of paramount importance, enabling researchers to precisely define, compare, and analytically examine vegetation across disparate ecological gradients and geographical areas (Westhoff and van der Maarel 1978; Kent 2012). The phytoassociation remains the basic unit of this hierarchical structure, with progressively higher-level units aggregating communities based on shared floristic similarities, common diagnostic species, and analogous ecological characteristics.

To maintain essential international comparability and scientific clarity, the classification and formal naming of these communities are strictly regulated by the stipulations of the International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature (ICPN). The ICPN, first published by Barkman, Moravec, & Rauschert in 1986 and periodically updated by Weber, Moravec, & Theurillat (2000), establishes rigid rules for the nomenclature, definition of type specimens, and scientific dissemination of syntaxa (the technical classification units).

The universally accepted syntaxonomic hierarchy ascends as follows:

- **ASSOCIATION (*associatio*)**
  - **Defining Criteria:** This unit is the elemental, core building block of the syntaxonomic system. It represents a plant community distinguished by a specific, well-defined floristic composition, the reliable presence of diagnostic species, and a consistent range of habitat conditions.
  - **Nomenclature:** Associations are typically named using a suffix derived from the name of one or more characteristic or dominant species; for example, *Caricetum davallianae* identifies a fen meadow assemblage dominated by the sedge *Carex davalliana* (Braun-Blanquet 1932; Mueller-Dombois and Ellenberg, 1974).
  - **Application:** Associations are the basis for detailed biodiversity inventories and vegetation mapping projects because they capture the smallest, consistently recognizable, and ecologically coherent vegetation units (Ewald 2003).
- **ALLIANCE (*allianzo*)**
  - **Defining Criteria:** An alliance strategically consolidates several closely related associations that share a common inventory of associated and characteristic species.
  - **Scope:** Alliances represent broader ecological groupings than associations, providing crucial insight into community relationships that prevail under similar macro-environmental conditions.
  - **Exemplification:** The alliance *Caricion davallianae* encompasses multiple fen meadow associations dominated by various *Carex* species (Rodwell, 1991).

- **Application:** They are essential for regional vegetation classification, large-scale ecological comparisons, and standardized conservation typologies, such as the EUNIS habitat classification in Europe (Chytrý et al., 2016).

- **ORDER (*ordo*)**
  - **Defining Criteria:** Orders are higher-level units that aggregate alliances sharing significant diagnostic species and are characteristic of analogous ecological zones or life-forms.
  - **Scope:** Orders frequently reflect major, overarching ecological factors, such as regional climate or primary substrate (soil) type.
  - **Exemplification:** The order *Molinietalia caeruleae* includes various meadow and fen alliances specifically adapted to moist, often nutrient-poor, soils (Westhoff and van der Maarel 1978).
  - **Application:** They enable researchers to study vegetation distribution patterns at expansive spatial scales, linking local community composition to major regional ecological processes.

- **CLASS (*classis*)**
  - **Defining Criteria:** Occupying the apex of the hierarchy, the class aggregates multiple orders that possess shared fundamental floristic elements, broad ecological adaptations, and analogous physical structure (physiognomy).
  - **Scope:** Classes embody the most generalized, broad-brush categories of vegetation units within the entire phytosociological structure.
  - **Exemplification:** The class *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* includes a broad range of wet, mesic, and dry grassland communities across the European realm (Rodwell 1991).
  - **Application:** Classes are fundamental for generating standardized vegetation typologies, allowing for reliable cross-regional comparison and formal integration into major conservation policy frameworks (Janssen et al. 2016).

The stringent rules governing the nomenclature for all these units are explicitly detailed within the *International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature* (Weber et al., 2000), guaranteeing methodological consistency and terminological clarity across all international research endeavors.

Importance of Syntaxonomy

The hierarchical nature of syntaxonomy is vital because it:

- Provides a standardized, formal lexicon for describing vegetation in all ecological research.
- Facilitates robust and reliable cross-regional and international comparisons of vegetation data.
- Serves as an essential analytical tool for biodiversity conservation initiatives and precise habitat monitoring (Kent, 2012; Chytrý et al. 2016).
- Effectively establishes the link between local community composition and the dynamics of environmental gradients and broader ecosystem functions.

From Qualitative to Quantitative Approaches

The initial Zurich–Montpellier (Z-M) model, established by Braun-Blanquet, was fundamentally qualitative, relying primarily on characteristic, differential, and constant species which is identified through expert field observation to delineate vegetation associations and structure syntaxa. While it successfully standardized the descriptive aspects of vegetation, it was routinely criticized for the inherent subjectivity involved, particularly in the expert-led selection of sampling plots (relevés) and the subjective weighting of diagnostic species (van der Maarel 2005).

Over the past few decades, phytosociology has undergone a radical methodological metamorphosis, marked by the systematic adoption of quantitative and computational apparatus. The widespread availability of advanced statistical software, the aggregation of massive vegetation archives, and the development of sophisticated GIS tools have collectively propelled the field toward a more objective, transparently reproducible, and intrinsically data-driven analysis of plant communities (Chytrý et al. 2016; Dengler et al. 2023).

Quantitative Advances in Phytosociology

This seismic shift from an essentially descriptive domain to a quantitative, empirically rigorous science is arguably the most important developmental trajectory in modern vegetation ecology. Where classical Z-M approaches depended on expert judgment to define community boundaries and isolate "characteristic species," which introduced an element of human interpretation, the integration of statistical methodologies has made the science globally relevant, precise, and scientifically robust (van der Maarel and Franklin, 2013; Dengler et al. 2023).

- **Cluster Analysis**

Cluster analysis has emerged as an exceedingly influential technique for the objective, numerical classification of vegetation data. Its primary function is the statistical grouping of relevés into discrete, coherent community types based on objective calculations of floristic similarity or dissimilarity, thereby ensuring significantly greater reproducibility compared to earlier, purely descriptive methods (Legendre and Legendre, 2012).

  - **Dissimilarity Metrics:** Commonly employed metrics for quantifying dissimilarity include the Jaccard index (which operates solely on species presence/absence), the Sørensen index (which gives greater weight to shared species), and the Bray–Curtis measure (which importantly incorporates species abundance and cover data). For instance, the Bray–Curtis measure has successfully been deployed to distinguish coastal versus inland shrubland assemblages in Mediterranean studies based on subtle variations in soil moisture content (de Bello et al. 2006).
  - **Clustering Techniques:** Recent advances include robust hierarchical clustering algorithms (such as Ward's method), powerful k-means partitioning routines, and sophisticated model-based clustering frameworks. These innovations enable ecologists to accurately discern fine-scale vegetation patterns even in highly heterogeneous, structurally complex landscapes. As an example, hierarchical clustering has been used to establish consistent grassland community typologies across disparate Central European territories, substantially refining inter-regional classifications (Tichý et al. 2020).

Ordination Methods

Ordination methods function synergistically with clustering by reducing highly complex, multi-species datasets onto a few readily interpretable dimensions (axes), effectively positioning vegetation plots along underlying environmental or ecological gradients.

- **Principal Component Analysis (PCA):** Frequently applied to uncover dominant ecological gradients, such as moisture availability or soil nutrient regimes; for example, PCA has successfully revealed the nutrient-driven gradients controlling the structure of European temperate forests (Ewald 2003).
- **Detrended Correspondence Analysis (DCA):** A technique designed to mitigate mathematical distortion in long gradients, and extensively used to model ecological turnover, successfully capturing shifts in species composition across steep altitudinal profiles in mountain ranges like the Himalayas (Schmidt et al. 2011).
- **Canonical Correspondence Analysis (CCA):** A highly valuable constrained ordination technique that directly tests the correlation between community composition and specific environmental variables, often employed in wetland ecology to illustrate the controlling influence of salinity and water depth on plant distribution (ter Braak and Šmilauer 2018).
- **Non-metric Multidimensional Scaling (NMDS):** The preferred approach for analyzing complex ecological data that exhibits pronounced non-linear relationships, used extensively in dryland ecosystems to visually demonstrate the combined impacts of rainfall variability and grazing intensity on community assembly dynamics (Li et al. 2020) .

Furthermore, ordination techniques have been expanded to incorporate analyses of **plant** functional traits and phylogenetic information, which provides mechanistic explanations for ecological processes that extend beyond simple species identity; for example, trait-based ordination has revealed the inherent trade-offs in drought-tolerance strategies among the woody species of the Mediterranean biome (Pérez Ramos et al. 2012).

Indicator Species Analysis

The **Indicator Value (IndVal) method** (developed by Dufrêne and Legendre, 1997) has been instrumental in the objective identification of reliable diagnostic species.

- **IndVal Principle:** The IndVal metric mathematically synthesizes a species' specificity (its unique confinement to a single community group) and its fidelity (its consistent frequency of occurrence within that group) to objectively identify species that are most powerfully and reliably associated with a particular vegetation type.
- **Field Application Examples:** Within the European Alps, IndVal analysis isolated *Dryas octopetala* as a statistically robust indicator for calcareous grasslands, while *Carex curvula* was confirmed as the reliable indicator for acidic alpine meadows (Rolando et al. 2009). Such objectively identified species are indispensable for delimiting the ecological boundaries of vegetation units and directing specific, effective conservation measures.
- **Statistical Rigor:** Advanced statistical frameworks have been proposed to test indicator values using randomization and permutation models, significantly enhancing the reliability of results, especially for very large datasets De Cáceres et al. (2010). IndVal is also now standard practice in restoration ecology for monitoring project success by quantitatively confirming the re-establishment of target indicator species (Zelený 2020).

Big Data and Vegetation Databases

The twenty-first century has witnessed phytosociology scale up dramatically i.e., from localized plot surveys to sweeping global syntheses which is driven by the creation of vast, interconnected vegetation databases:

- **sPlot:** Recognized as the world's largest, unified global vegetation plot database, encompassing millions of relevés used to analyze planetary patterns in biodiversity and functional diversity, for example, revealing global macro-gradients in plant functional traits that are closely tied to climate (Bruelheide et al. 2019).
- **EVA (European Vegetation Archive):** A meticulously harmonized data archive of European vegetation that serves as the basis for pan-European habitat classification, informs continental conservation policy, and enables crucial cross-country ecological comparisons (Chytrý et al. 2016).
- **TRY Plant Trait Database:** While not a plot archive itself, TRY links individual species to measurable functional traits (e.g., leaf area, seed mass), which, when integrated with plot-level data, provides unprecedented mechanistic insights into ecosystem functionality, such as predicting future shifts in biomass or productivity under varying climate scenarios (Kattge et al. 2020).

These powerful resources enable seamless integration with GIS-based predictive modeling and cutting-edge remote sensing technologies, allowing for vegetation analysis across an enormous range of spatial scales, from a local stand to an entire continental biome. For instance, EVA data, when combined with high-resolution satellite imagery, has been successfully deployed to map the suitability of various priority Natura 2000 habitats across the European Union (Dengler et al. 2023).

Significance of the Quantitative Shift

The comprehensive adoption of quantitative methods in phytosociology has resulted in transformative improvements:

- **Objectivity:** Statistical techniques minimize personal interpretation and subjective bias in defining associations.
- **Reproducibility:** Standardized numerical approaches ensure that studies can be scientifically validated and replicated across diverse geographies.
- **Multi-Scale Relevance:** Local community data can now be robustly and logically linked to regional and global vegetation patterns and trends.
- **Ecosystem Function:** Trait-based approaches directly connect vegetation classification to mechanistic ecosystem processes, vastly improving the predictive capacity of the field.

- **Policy Mandate:** Quantitative ecological data provides the indispensable, evidence-based foundation for key environmental policy frameworks and robustly supports large-scale habitat mapping and biodiversity monitoring (Mucina et al. 2016).

In essence, phytosociology has successfully navigated a transition from a descriptive natural history field to a fully integrated, globally significant scientific discipline dedicated to explaining the ecological and functional roles of plant communities in a rapidly changing world.

Applications in Ecology and Conservation

The established principles of phytosociology and the fundamental concept of the phytoassociation have profound, enduring practical relevance across applied ecology, environmental regulation, and conservation strategy.

- **Biodiversity Inventory and Protected Area Planning:** Phytosociological research provides the means for the rigorous classification and formal documentation of all vegetation types, thereby forming the essential empirical basis for comprehensive biodiversity inventories and the accurate identification of ecologically valuable areas. Standardized syntaxonomic schemes are crucial for recognizing rare or critically imperiled vegetation types and for establishing the precise boundaries of protected ecological reserves (Rodwell, 2006; Dengler et al. 2020). Contemporary conservation strategies, such as the extensive Natura 2000 Network in Europe, rely critically upon this standardized vegetation classification to continuously monitor habitat integrity and establish reliable ecological baselines for adaptive management interventions (Chytrý et al. 2020). Furthermore, the targeted identification of indicator and diagnostic species within phytoassociations serves to strategically prioritize conservation funding and efforts by clearly identifying the most sensitive or unique ecosystems requiring protection.
- **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Ecological Monitoring:** Phytosociology serves as an indispensable methodological component within all EIA procedures, being used to establish detailed baseline ecological conditions and to anticipate the likely ecological consequences of proposed industrial or development projects. The discipline's unique ability to discern subtle floristic and structural distinctions between vegetation types furnishes a crucial analytical lens for objectively evaluating the ecological significance of proposed land-use changes (Dengler et al. 2014). By systematically comparing present-day floristic composition and structure against historical relevé data, ecologists can accurately forecast impacts such as habitat fragmentation, soil quality decline, and the potential for invasive species colonization, thereby enabling regulatory bodies to mandate effective and proportionate mitigation measures.
- **Sustainable Land Management and Habitat Restoration:** The precise classification of vegetation into specific phytoassociations offers practical, evidence-based guidance for ecological restoration projects, sustainable agroforestry practices, and sophisticated habitat management programs. For instance, the specialized discipline of restoration ecology now heavily utilizes phytosociological databases to select appropriate, historically accurate species assemblages that align optimally with both pre-disturbance composition and local abiotic/biotic suitability (Török et al. 2016). This targeted, scientifically informed approach significantly boosts the long-term ecological resilience and success of restored ecosystems. Likewise, managers of rangelands and commercial forests utilize this classification framework to determine maximum sustainable grazing loads, strategically plan afforestation/reforestation programs, and implement essential erosion-control techniques (Bakker et al. 2020).
- **Advancing Ecological Theory and Global Change Research:** While traditionally viewed as stable entities, phytoassociations are now primarily studied as dynamic, responsive systems heavily influenced by natural disturbance cycles, successional trajectories, and, most critically, climate change. Longitudinal monitoring of relevé data from large archives such as sPlot and EVA yields invaluable, multi-decadal insight into global vegetation change dynamics (Bruelheide et al. 2019). For instance, large-scale comparative ecological analyses have unequivocally demonstrated that global temperature increases are inducing plant communities to track shifts in environmental suitability by migrating along significant altitudinal and latitudinal gradients (Pescador et al. 2021). The continuous integration of phytosociology into macroecological and trait-based functional studies fundamentally strengthens its capacity to address existential questions surrounding biodiversity loss and ecosystem fragility under the intense pressures of rapid global environmental change.

Concluding Perspective

Phytosociology, rigorously anchored by the concept of the phytoassociation, maintains its status as a foundational, indispensable scientific discipline within modern vegetation science. It has successfully navigated the methodological transition from its initial descriptive phase within the Zurich–Montpellier School to its present form as a rigorous, data-intensive science that seamlessly integrates informatics, advanced statistical modeling, and core ecological theory. The provision of standardized, universally accepted terminology for all vegetation units, as mandated by the International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature, ensures a level of global scientific consistency that facilitates reliable international comparisons.

The practical utility of the discipline is vast and diverse, providing essential empirical support for environmental impact assessment, strategic conservation biology, effective land restoration efforts, and the advancement of predictive ecological theory. As global environmental crises including accelerating climate change, invasive species proliferation, and pervasive habitat destruction that continue to intensify, the need for the systematic, rigorous study of plant communities becomes ever more pronounced. Phytosociology furnishes the necessary methodological and conceptual framework for understanding the complexities of vegetation pattern and distribution, thereby making direct and measurable contributions to global conservation efforts by informing evidence-based management strategies and policy decisions.

Looking toward the future, the projected deepening integration of big data analytics, sophisticated functional trait ecology, and high-resolution remote sensing is certain to further expand the analytical power and predictive capacity of phytosociology (Dengler et al. 2023). This ongoing methodological evolution secures the discipline's central position at the core of contemporary ecological science, guaranteeing its continued, critical role in safeguarding global plant biodiversity and ecological integrity throughout the remainder of the Anthropocene.

References

1. Barkman, J. J., Moravec, J., & Rauschert, S. (1986). Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature. Vegetatio, *67*(3), 145–195. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00039783
2. Bakker, J. P., Berendse, F., & Willems, J. H. (2020). Restoration ecology and vegetation science: A century of progress. Appl. Veg. Sci., *23*(3), 449–457. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12526
3. Braun-Blanquet, J. (1932). Plant sociology: The study of plant communities. New York: McGraw-Hill.
4. Bruelheide, H., Dengler, J., Jiménez-Alfaro, B., Purschke, O., Hennekens, S. M., Chytrý, M., ... & Jansen, F. (2019). sPlot – A new tool for global vegetation analyses. J. Veg. Sci., *30*(2), 161–186. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12710
5. Chytrý, M., & Tichý, L. (2003). Diagnostic, constant and dominant species of vegetation classes and alliances in the Czech Republic: A statistical revision. Folia Facultatis Scientiarum Naturalium Universitatis Masarykianae Brunensis, Biologia, *108*, 1–231.
6. Chytrý, M., Hennekens, S. M., Jiménez-Alfaro, B., Knollová, I., Dengler, J., Jansen, F., ... & Schaminée, J. H. J. (2016). European Vegetation Archive (EVA): An integrated database of European vegetation plots. Appl. Veg. Sci., *19*(1), 173–180. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12191
7. Chytrý, M., Wild, J., Pyšek, P., Jarošík, V., Dendoncker, N., Reginster, I., … & Smilauer, P. (2020). Projecting trends in plant invasions in Europe under climate change. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr., *29*(1), 144–155. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13019
8. De Cáceres, M., Legendre, P., & Moretti, M. (2010). Improving indicator species analysis by combining groups of sites. Oikos, 119(10), 1674–1684. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18334.x
9. De Cáceres, M., Font, X., & Oliva, F. (2015). The management of vegetation classification with fuzzy clustering. J. Veg. Sci., *26*(5), 906–918. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12303

10. Dengler, J., Boonman, C. C. F., Jiménez-Alfaro, B., Schaminée, J. H. J., & Bruelheide, H. (2023). Phytosociology meets macroecology: The future of vegetation science. J. Veg. Sci., 34(1), e13169. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.13169
11. Dengler, J., Chytrý, M., & Ewald, J. (2008). Phytosociology. In S. E. Jørgensen & B. D. Fath (Eds.), EofE (pp. 2767–2779). Elsevier.
12. Dengler, J., Jansen, F., Glöckler, F., Peet, R. K., De Cáceres, M., Chytrý, M., ... & Spencer, N. (2008). The Global Index of Vegetation-Plot Databases (GIVD): A new resource for vegetation science. J. Veg. Sci., *22*(4), 582–597.
13. Dengler, J., Wagner, V., Chytrý, M., Ewald, J., Finckh, M., Jansen, F., ... & Weiser, F. (2023). Phytosociology in the 21st century: A data-rich science for vegetation ecology and conservation. Veg. Classif. Surv., *4*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.3897/VCS.93832
14. Dengler, J., Wagner, V., Dembicz, I., García-Mijangos, I., Naqinezhad, A., Boch, S., … & Chytrý, M. (2014). Grassland ecology: An introduction. Appl. Veg. Sci., *17*(2), 217–220. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12087
15. Dengler, J., Wagner, V., Chytrý, M., & Bruelheide, H. (2020). Phytosociology in the 21st century–A global overview. Appl. Veg. Sci., *23*(3), 367–368. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12546
16. Dengler, J., Wagner, V., Chytrý, M., Ewald, J., Finckh, M., Jansen, F., ... & Weiser, F. (2023). Phytosociology in the 21st century: A data-rich science for vegetation ecology and conservation. Veg. Classif. Surv., *4*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.3897/VCS.93832
17. Dufrêne, M., & Legendre, P. (1997). Species assemblages and indicator species: The need for a flexible asymmetrical approach. Ecol. Monogr., *67*(3), 345–366. https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9615
18. Ellenberg, H. (1988). Vegetation ecology of Central Europe (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
19. Ewald, J. (2003). The calcareous riddle: Why are there so many calciphilous species in the Central European flora? Folia Geobot., *38*(4), 357–366.
20. Gams, H. (1918). *Prinzipienfragen der Vegetationsforschung*. Jena: Fischer.
21. Grisebach, A. (1838). *Die Vegetation der Erde nach ihrer klimatischen Anordnung*. Göttingen: Dieterich.
22. Janssen, J. A. M., Rodwell, J. S., García Criado, M., Gubbay, S., Haynes, T., Nieto, A., ... & Valderrabano, M. (2016). European red list of habitats. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
23. Kattge, J., Bönisch, G., Díaz, S., Lavorel, S., Prentice, I. C., Leadley, P., ... & Wirth, C. (2020). TRY plant trait database – enhanced coverage and open access. *Glob Chang Biol., 26*(1), 119–188. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14904
24. Kent, M., & Coker, P. (1992). *Vegetation Description and Analysis: A Practical Approach*. CRC Press.
25. Kent, M. (2012). Vegetation description and data analysis*:* A practical approach (2nd ed.). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
26. Legendre, P., & Legendre, L. (2012). Numerical ecology (3rd ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
27. Li, D., Trotta, L., Marx, H. E., Allen, J. M., Sun, M., Soltis, D. E., ... & Baiser, B. (2020). For common community phylogenetic analyses, go ahead and use synthesis phylogenies. Ecol*.*, *101*(3), e02974. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2974
28. Mucina, L., Bültmann, H., Dierßen, K., Theurillat, J. P., Raus, T., Čarni, A., ... & Tichý, L. (2016). Vegetation of Europe: Hierarchical floristic classification system of vascular plant, bryophyte, lichen, and algal communities. Appl. Veg. Sci., *19*(1), 3–264. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12257
29. Mueller-Dombois, D., & Ellenberg, H. (1974). Aims and methods of vegetation ecology. New York: Wiley.
30. Pescador, D. S., de Bello, F., Chytrý, M., Jiménez-Alfaro, B., Götzenberger, L., & Lososová, Z. (2021). Climate change reshapes plant community composition in Europe*. Nat. Ecol. Evol. 5*(9), 1236–1246. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-021-01509-3

31. Pignatti, S. (2018). Plant life of the Dolomites: Vegetation structure and ecology. Berlin: Springer.
32. Rodwell, J. S. (1991). British plant communities: Volume 1, Woodlands and scrub. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
33. Rodwell, J. S. (2000). *British Plant Communities*. Volume 5: Maritime communities and vegetation of open habitats. Cambridge University Press.
34. Rodwell, J. S. (2000). The European vegetation survey: A basis for international co-operation in the study of European vegetation. *Ann. Bot., 58*(1), 7–12.
35. Rodwell, J. S. (2006). NVC users' handbook. Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC).
36. ter Braak, C. J. F., & Šmilauer, P. (2018). *Canoco reference manual and user's guide: Software for ordination, version 5.1.* Microcomputer Power.
37. Theurillat, J. P., Willner, W., Fernández-González, F., Bültmann, H., Čarni, A., Gigante, D., ... & Weber, H. E. (2021). International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature. 4th edition. Appl. Veg. Sci., *24*(e12491), 1–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12491
38. Tichý, L., Chytrý, M., & Hennekens, S. M. (2020). A comparison of hierarchical agglomerative clustering strategies for classifying plant communities. J. Veg. Sci., *31*(5), 821–832. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12878
39. Török, P., Vida, E., Deák, B., Lengyel, S., & Tóthmérész, B. (2016). Grassland restoration on former croplands in Europe: An assessment of applicability of techniques and costs. *Biodivers. Conserv. 25*(12), 2311–2332. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-016-1152-8
40. van der Maarel, E. (2005). Vegetation ecology—an overview. In E. van der Maarel (Ed.), Vegetation ecology (pp. 1–51). Oxford: Blackwell
41. Warming, E. (1895). ***Plantesamfund: Grundtræk af den økologiske plantegeografi*** [The Oecology of Plants]. Copenhagen: Philipsen.
42. Weber, H. E., Moravec, J., & Theurillat, J. P. (2000). International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature. 3rd edition. J. Veg. Sci., *11*(5), 739–768. https://doi.org/10.2307/3236580
43. Westhoff, V., & van der Maarel, E. (1973). The Braun-Blanquet approach. In R. H. Whittaker (Ed.), Ordination and classification of communities (pp. 617–726). The Hague: Junk.
44. Westhoff, V., & van der Maarel, E. (1978). The Braun-Blanquet approach. In R. H. Whittaker (Ed.), Classification of plant communities (pp. 287–399). The Hague: Junk.
45. Willner, W., Berg, C., & Dengler, J. (2017). Towards a consistent system of European vegetation units: The EuroVegChecklist approach. Appl. Veg. Sci., *20*(3), 538–552. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12291
46. Zelený, D. (2020). Which results of the standard test for community-weighted mean approach are too optimistic? J. Veg. Sci., *31*(1), 50–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12836.

❑❑❑