

# Analysis of short-term vegetation dynamics combining hyperspectral measurements and RTMs inversion

#### <u>Marco Celesti</u>

Christiaan van der Tol, Sergio Cogliati, Roberto Colombo, Franco Miglietta, Cinzia Panigada, Francisco Pinto, Uwe Rascher, Dirk Schüttemeyer, Giulia Tagliabue , Peiqi Yang, Micol Rossini

Remote Sensing of Environmental Dynamics Laboratory Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences University of Milano-Bicocca Milano, Italy

ELISTUDI DI MILANO



marco.celesti@unimib.it

- Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence is emitted as a function of absorbed excitation energy (APAR) and fluorescence quantum efficiency ( $\Phi_F$ )





- Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence is emitted as a function of absorbed excitation energy (APAR) and fluorescence quantum efficiency ( $\Phi_F$ )

 it is then propagated through the leaf and the canopy -> Top
 Of Canopy (TOC) fluorescence



Porcar-Castell et al. (2014) JEB





- Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence is emitted as a function of absorbed excitation energy (APAR) and fluorescence quantum efficiency ( $\Phi_F$ )

 it is then propagated through the leaf and the canopy -> Top
 Of Canopy (TOC) fluorescence

→ leaf pigments/structure + canopy structure + physiology + environmental condition ...



Porcar-Castell et al. (2014) JEB





- Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence is emitted as a function of absorbed excitation energy (APAR) and fluorescence quantum efficiency ( $\Phi_F$ )

- it is then propagated through the leaf and the canopy -> Top
Of Canopy (TOC) fluorescence

→ leaf pigments/structure + canopy structure + physiology + environmental condition ...

 $\rightarrow$  growing amount of products



Porcar-Castell et al. (2014) JEB





- Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence is emitted as a function of absorbed excitation energy (APAR) and fluorescence quantum efficiency ( $\Phi_F$ )

it is then propagated through the leaf and the canopy -> Top
Of Canopy (TOC) fluorescence

→ leaf pigments/structure + canopy structure + physiology + environmental condition ...

 $\rightarrow$  growing amount of products

Porcar-Castell et al. (2014) JEB

Developing a flexible modeling framework for integrating several sources of information at different scales









![](_page_6_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

Rossini et al. (2016) RS

![](_page_7_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_4.jpeg)

700

6.046

100

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

Rossini et al. (2016) RS

![](_page_8_Figure_3.jpeg)

van der Tol et al. (2009,2014) Vilfan et al. (2016)

![](_page_8_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_3.jpeg)

van der Tol et al. (2016) RSE & Migliavacca et al. (2017) New Phyt. Using far-red fluorescence ( $F_{760}$ ) and reflectance  $\approx 1$ nm FWHM

![](_page_10_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_4.jpeg)

- to retrieve F and  $\Phi_F$  from SCOPE inversion on very high resolution TOC measurements, together with "classical" vegetation parameters

 to compare modeled F values (red and far-red) with state of the art independent radiance-based retrievals (Spectral Fitting Method and SpecFit)

 to evaluate temporal evolution of retrieved parameters for assessing vegetation status during an induced stress experiment

![](_page_11_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Material and Methods – data acquisition

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Different doses applied over ~30 days

- ~ 1600 measurements
- $\rightarrow$  ~1400 after filtering

![](_page_12_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### Material and Methods – data acquisition

![](_page_13_Picture_1.jpeg)

H. above ground (cm)	~130 cm
Observed diam.(cm)	~58 cm

![](_page_13_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_4.jpeg)

Different doses applied over ~30 days

- ~ 1600 measurements
- $\rightarrow$  ~1400 after filtering

Spectrometer	Range (nm)	FWHM (nm)	Application
1 – HR4000f	350-1050	1	ρ and VIs computation
2 – QE65000	657-740	0.25	F at O <sub>2</sub> -B
3 – HR4000a	700-800	0.1	F at O <sub>2</sub> -A

![](_page_13_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_10.jpeg)

#### Material and Methods – data acquisition

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

Observed diam.(cm) ~58 cm	

![](_page_14_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_4.jpeg)

Different doses applied over ~30 days

- ~ 1600 measurements
- $\rightarrow$  ~1400 after filtering

Spectrometer	Range (nm)	FWHN (nm)	Application
1 – HR4000f	350-1050	1	ρ and VIs computation
2 – QE65000	657-740	0.25	F at O <sub>2</sub> -B
3 – HR4000a	700-800	0.1	F at O <sub>2</sub> -A

#### Merged together

![](_page_14_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Material and Methods – Inversion cost function**

$$f = ER1^{T}ER1 + w * ER2^{T}ER2$$

$$ER1 = \begin{cases} \rho^{*,RTM}(\lambda) - \rho^{*,meas}(\lambda) &, \lambda \in \lambda_{noabs} \\ (\rho^{*,RTM}(\lambda) - \rho^{*,RTM}_{BL}(\lambda)) + \\ -(\rho^{*,meas}(\lambda) - \rho^{*,meas}_{BL}(\lambda)) &, \lambda \in \lambda_{abs} \end{cases}$$

$$ER2 = \frac{p - p_{0}}{\sigma_{p_{0}}}$$

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### **Material and Methods – Inversion cost function**

$$f = ER1^{T}ER1 + w * ER2^{T}ER2$$

$$ER1 = \begin{cases} \rho^{*,RTM}(\lambda) - \rho^{*,meas}(\lambda) &, \lambda \in \lambda_{noabs} \\ (\rho^{*,RTM}(\lambda) - \rho^{*,RTM}_{BL}(\lambda)) + \\ -(\rho^{*,meas}(\lambda) - \rho^{*,meas}_{BL}(\lambda)) &, \lambda \in \lambda_{abs} \end{cases}$$

$$ER2 = \frac{p - p_{0}}{\sigma_{p_{0}}}$$

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Generally good agreement between modeled and measured reflectance
- Different shapes for full spectrum F modelling

![](_page_21_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### **Results – F values comparison**

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

No systematica bias in  $F_{687}$  but overestimation of  $F_{760}$ 

- $\rightarrow$  inherent to fluorescence optipar shape
- → Overestimation of  $F_{760}$  can be also linked to general slight overestimation of  $\Phi_F$

![](_page_22_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### **Results – F values comparison**

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

Systematic overestimation of  $F_{int}$  reflects results values of  $F_{760}$  $\rightarrow$  Strong overall weight of far-red fluorescence

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Results – time series**

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Results – time series**

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

Maximum theoretical range of  $\Phi_F$  is [0.01:0.05]

 $\rightarrow$  almost entirely covered

Very high  $\Phi_F$  values are in good agreement with the effect of Dicuran on PQ and NPQ

![](_page_26_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

- No variation in the control

![](_page_28_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

- No variation in the control

- in the treated plots,  $\Phi_{\rm F}$  and pigments respond sequentially to the stress event. After 14 days back to pre-treatment state in lower doses

![](_page_29_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

- No variation in the control

- in the treated plots,  $\Phi_{\rm F}$  and pigments respond sequentially to the stress event. After 14 days back to pre-treatment state in lower doses

![](_page_30_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

- No variation in the control

- in the treated plots,  $\Phi_{\rm F}$  and pigments respond sequentially to the stress event. After 14 days back to pre-treatment state in lower doses

![](_page_31_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

- No variation in the control

- in the treated plots,  $\Phi_{\rm F}$  and pigments respond sequentially to the stress event. After 14 days back to pre-treatment state in lower doses

- in the highest dose plants started brownishing and not recovered anymore

![](_page_32_Picture_5.jpeg)

- For the first time we inverted SCOPE on very high resolution top of canopy measurements
- The concurrent retrieval of veg. parameters and sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence provided coherent information on their dynamics. Modeled absolute values of F were in very good agreement with a state of the art retrieval (SFM)
- F can be used as an early warning, Concurrent evaluation of biochem/struct/fluorescence can provide more information on veg. dynamics (stress/recovery)
- With this approach we avoid "contradictory" results (but also missing "surprising" ones), within the domain of applicability of the model

![](_page_33_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_6.jpeg)

**OPTIMISE COST action** for funding my STSM to ITC (C. van der Tol)

![](_page_34_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_4.jpeg)

# **THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION**

#### Marco Celesti

#### Remote Sensing of Environmental Dynamics Laboratory, DISAT, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy

marco.celesti@unimib.it

![](_page_35_Picture_4.jpeg)

# **Results - Numerical inversion of reflectance to model F**

![](_page_36_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Relatively small effect of Vcmo and meteo var. on normalized F (F/PAR)
- In unstressed canopies F variablity is driven by biochemical and structural parameters + incoming light

![](_page_36_Picture_4.jpeg)

# **Results - Numerical inversion of reflectance to model F**

![](_page_37_Figure_1.jpeg)

F response to strong reduction of PQ and NPQ

- Treated F values close to theoretical maximum

![](_page_37_Picture_4.jpeg)

van der Tol et al. (2016) RSE

![](_page_37_Picture_6.jpeg)

#### Results

![](_page_38_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_0.jpeg)

B LINITARI

![](_page_40_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Figure_0.jpeg)