Yang, P., van der Tol, C., Verhoef, W., Damm, A., Schickling, A., Kraska, T., ... Rascher, U. (2018). Using reflectance to explain vegetation biochemical and structural effects on sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 231, 110996 (11 pp.). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.11.039>

This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Using reflectance to explain vegetation biochemical and structural effects on sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence

Peiqi Yang^{a,*}, Christiaan van der Tol^a, Wout Verhoef^a, Alexander Damm^{b,c}, Anke Schickling^d, Thorsten Kraska^e, Onno Muller^d, Uwe Rascher^d

^a*Faculty of Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC), University of Twente, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands*

^b*Remote Sensing Laboratories, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, Zurich 8057, Switzerland*

^c*Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology. Überlandstrasse 133, Dübendorf, Switzerland*

^d*Institute of Bio- and Geosciences, IBG-2: Plant Sciences, Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Leo-Brandt-Str., 52425 Jülich, Germany*

^e*Field Lab Campus Klein-Altendorf, Agricultural Faculty, University of Bonn, Klein-Altendorf 2, 53359 Rheinbach, Germany*

Abstract

The growing availability of global measurements of sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF) can help in improving crop monitoring, especially the monitoring of photosynthetic activity. However, variations in top-of-canopy (TOC) SIF cannot be directly interpreted as physiological changes because of the confounding effects of vegetation biochemistry (i.e. pigments, dry matter and water) and structure. In this study, we propose an approach of using radiative transfer models (RTMs) and TOC reflectance to estimate the biochemical and structural effects on TOC SIF, as a necessary step in retrieving physiological information from TOC SIF. The approach was assessed by using airborne (*HyPlant*) reflectance and SIF data acquired over

*Corresponding author

Email address: p.yang@utwente.nl (Peiqi Yang)

an agricultural experimental farm in Germany on two days, before and during a heat event in summer 2015 with maximum temperatures of 27°C and 34°C, respectively. The results show that over 76% variation among different crops in SIF observations was explained by variation in vegetation biochemistry and structure. In addition, the changes of vegetation biochemistry and structure explained as much as 73% variation between the two days in far-red SIF, and 40% variation in red SIF. The remaining unexplained variation was mostly attributed to the variability in physiological status. We conclude that reflectance provides valuable information to account for biochemical and structural effects on SIF and to advance analysis of SIF observations. The combination of RTMs, reflectance and SIF opens new pathways to detect vegetation biochemical, structural and physiological changes.

Keywords: chlorophyll fluorescence, reflectance, radiative transfer models, canopy structure, *HyPlant*, airborne

1. Introduction

Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF) has been effectively used as a signal for monitoring vegetation physiology, because of its functional connection to photosynthesis. The physiological mechanisms that regulate the fluorescence emission by photosystems also affect the SIF signals measured by remote sensing techniques (Rascher et al., 2015). This is the basis for using SIF as an indicator of plant physiological status and stress (Ač et al., 2015; Rossini et al., 2015). SIF is also an indicator of gross primary production (GPP) as it contains information on both absorption of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and energy partitioning in photosystems (Guanter

11 et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2015; Migliavacca et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2017).

12 Besides physiological regulation, vegetation biochemical composition and
13 structure also strongly affect SIF observations. Top-of-canopy (TOC) SIF is
14 an outcome of three processes: absorption of incident PAR by chlorophylls
15 (Zhang et al., 2018), emission of fluorescence by photosystems (Van der Tol
16 et al., 2014), and scattering and re-absorption of emitted fluorescence (Yang
17 and Van der Tol, 2018). The SIF emission depends on physiological mech-
18 anisms, which regulate the partitioning of PAR absorbed by chlorophylls
19 (APAR_{chl}) into three different de-excitation pathways: heat dissipation, pho-
20 tochemistry and fluorescence (Maxwell and Johnson, 2000; Baker, 2008). The
21 incident PAR absorption and SIF scattering, however, are mainly determined
22 by non-physiological factors, including vegetation biochemistry (e.g., leaf pig-
23 ments, water and dry matter), structure, illumination angles (Grace et al.,
24 2007; Porcar Castell et al., 2014) and observation angles (Liu et al., 2016;
25 Köhler et al., 2018).

26 Consequently, variations in TOC SIF can not be directly interpreted as
27 changes in plant physiological status. Studies have shown that a substantial
28 portion of SIF variation at different spatial and temporal scales is due to
29 vegetation biochemistry and structure rather than changes in energy parti-
30 tioning in photosystems (Van der Tol et al., 2016; Migliavacca et al., 2017).
31 A part of observed variation in TOC SIF is also caused by the different view-
32 ing angles (Liu et al., 2016; Köhler et al., 2018). Both canopy structure, leaf
33 biochemistry and observational conditions largely affect the observed linear
34 relationship between SIF and GPP (Migliavacca et al., 2017; Yang et al.,
35 2018). Therefore, it is essential to first account for the non-physiological

36 effects, before plant physiological changes can be inferred from TOC SIF.

37 Several simple approaches have been applied to account for variation in
38 PAR absorption and fluorescence scattering (and re-absorption). The varia-
39 tion in PAR absorption of a canopy caused by different illumination condi-
40 tions can be effectively corrected by normalizing SIF by incident PAR (Dau-
41 mard et al., 2012). Normalizing SIF by $APAR_{chl}$ further takes variation in
42 light absorption caused by different vegetation biochemistry and structure
43 into account (Miao et al., 2018). Viewing angles have no impact on the
44 light absorption process, but strongly affect the scattering of SIF into the
45 viewing direction. The variation of SIF scattering caused by different view-
46 ing angles can be partly removed by angular normalization of SIF. He et al.
47 (2017) demonstrated that the normalization improves the SIF-GPP corre-
48 lation. However, these methods are not always sufficient to retrieve plant
49 physiological status. First, $APAR_{chl}$ measurements are not always avail-
50 able. Second, the scattering and re-absorption of SIF vary significantly with
51 canopy structure and leaf properties (e.g., leaf area index (LAI) and chloro-
52 phyll content) apart from viewing angles (Yang and Van der Tol, 2018). More
53 general and explicit approaches to separate non-physiological (e.g., the vege-
54 tation biochemical, structural and observational condition) and physiological
55 effects are required.

56 Vegetation radiative transfer models (RTMs) have been successfully used
57 to evaluate the effects of vegetation biochemistry and structure on TOC
58 SIF. RTMs offer an explicit connection between TOC SIF observations and
59 vegetation biochemical and structural parameters, by modelling the light
60 absorption and fluorescence re-absorption processes (Porcar Castell et al.,

2014). Sensitivity analyses of RTMs have provided general information on the impact of biochemical and structural effects on SIF (Koffi et al., 2015; Verrelst et al., 2016). Nonetheless, applying RTMs for interpreting field measurements of SIF remains challenging, because it requires canopy structure and leaf properties as inputs, which are generally not known a priori.

The use of reflectance spectra to parametrize an RTM for SIF is a promising strategy to resolve this problem. Studies have shown that several key leaf properties and canopy structure parameters can be retrieved from reflectance by inverting an RTM (Jacquemoud, 1993; Van der Tol et al., 2016; Verhoef et al., 2018). The retrieved parameters controlling the leaf and canopy radiative transfer may be used to estimate vegetation biochemical and structural effects on SIF. For example, Zhang et al. (2014) estimated leaf parameters (e.g., leaf water, chlorophyll and dry matter content) from satellite reflectance indices. The resulting parameters, together with estimates of leaf area index (LAI) and leaf angles, constrained the non-physiological factors in an RTM (i.e., the SCOPE model (Van der Tol et al., 2009)) and allowed the derivation of empirical relationships between seasonal photosynthetic capacity and TOC SIF.

The present study aims to assess the use of TOC reflectance and RTMs to infer vegetation biochemical and structural effects on TOC SIF. We used a unique airborne dataset comprising TOC reflectance and SIF taken before and during a heat event in 2015 with the *HyPlant* system (Rascher et al., 2015). The TOC reflectance was used to estimate canopy structure and leaf properties by inverting an RTM. The resulting vegetation parameters were further used to estimate vegetation biochemical and structural effects on SIF

86 by using SCOPE.

87 **2. Study area and materials**

88 *2.1. Study area*

89 All analyses were performed in a 3 ha (100 m $\times$ 300 m) experimental
90 field (Fig. 1). The field is located in the agricultural experimental research
91 station Campus Klein Altendorf of the University of Bonn, Germany (50°37'
92 N, 6°59' E). The average altitude of the field is 65 m above mean sea level.
93 The mean annual precipitation is 603 mm and the mean annual temperature
94 is 9.4°C. There are two weather stations within the research station continu-
95 ously recording meteorological data, such as air temperature and precipita-
96 tion. The study area faced a heat event which started on July 1st and lasted
97 to July 5th in 2015 with maximum temperatures exceeding 30°C on each of
98 these days (Dong et al., 2016).

99 At the study site, four crop types, notably corn (*Zea mays* L.), winter
100 wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.), winter barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) and rape-
101 seed (*Brassica napus* L.), were grown using common field rotation practices.
102 These four crops are the main crop types in western Germany. The soil and
103 crops in the study area were treated according to the agricultural practices
104 of the region with the aim to obtain spatially homogeneous crops. Corn,
105 however, was planted with two different densities resulting one sparse and
106 another dense canopy. To constrain airborne data processing, three (black,
107 grey and white) reference panels were placed next to the experimental field.

Figure 1: Overview of the study area and the flight plan before (June 30th, day 1) and during (July 2nd, day 2) the heat event. The crops investigated in the study and three reference panels are marked with polygons. The background image was acquired on 24th August 2016 (from Google Earth).

2.2. Airborne experiment

The airborne campaigns were conducted on June 30th (day 1, one day before the heat event) and on July 2nd (day 2, during the heat event). Both flights were carried out between 15:00 and 16:00 (local time, UTC+2) at an altitude of 512 m above sea level. Flights were carried out at similar solar zenith angles (i.e., 38° and 34°) under clear sky conditions. At the time that the airborne data were collected, the incident photosynthetically active radiation (iPAR) was similar on the two days (i.e., 1278.8 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ and 1366.2 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$), while the air temperatures were markedly different (i.e. 26.6°C on day 1 and 33.7°C on day 2) due to the heat event.

To obtain the necessary data, a hyperspectral imaging spectrometer and a thermal camera were employed in the airborne campaigns. The hyperspectral spectrometer used in this study was *HyPlant*, which is a novel air-

borne spectrometer dedicated to vegetation functional monitoring (Rascher
et al., 2015). It consists of a dual-channel (DUAL) module and a fluorescence (FLUO) module. These two modules allow measuring red SIF at 687 nm (F_{687}) and far-red SIF at 760 nm (F_{760}), and reflectance from 400 nm to 2500 nm. Specifically, the DUAL module measures contiguous spectra from 380 to 2500 nm with a spectral resolution of 3 nm in visible and near infrared region, and 10 nm in the short-wave infrared region. The FLUO module measures in 1024 contiguous spectral bands from 670 to 780 nm, with a spectral resolution of 0.25 nm. A set of representative measurements of the two modules is shown in Fig. S1 in the supplementary materials. The thermal camera used here was the VarioCAM (InfraTec, Germany). The thermal camera was connected to a laptop via GigaEthernet and processed with the IRBIS®3 software (InfraTec, Germany). The system allows real-time tracking of the measurements and correction of the absolute temperature by setting emissivity (i.e. 0.98 was assumed in this study), background temperature, ambient air temperature, air humidity and objects distance. Both the DUAL and FLUO module (i.e., two imagers), together with the thermal camera, were properly mounted on a single platform with the mechanical capability to align the field of view (FOV).

Supporting atmospherical parameters were acquired to support airborne data processing. They were measured with a sun photometer MICROTOPS II (Solar Light, the USA) at the same site every 5 minutes during the time of airborne flights. Additional meteorological parameters from the weather stations are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: The meteorological conditions during the airborne campaigns before and during the heat event.

Parameters	30th June (Day 1)	2nd July (Day 2)
DOY (day of year)	182	184
Acquisition time (local)	15:51	15:16
Solar zenith (θ_s , degree)	38	34
Solar azimuth (ψ_s , degree)	237	224
Air temperature (T_a , °C)	26.6	33.7
Shortwave radiation (W m^{-2})	756	808
Wind speed (m s^{-1})	3	2
Air pressure (hPa)	997	996

2.3. Measurements of reflectance, SIF and temperature

TOC reflectance was calculated from data measured by the DUAL module, and TOC SIF was calculated from data measured by the FLUO module. *HyPlant* data processing and TOC reflectance calculation have been described in detail by [Rascher et al. \(2015\)](#). Details of SIF retrieval can be found in [Damm et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Wieneke et al. \(2016\)](#). In the following, we outline the main procedure.

Data preprocessing included several steps: First, measured raw data (digital numbers) of both modules were converted to calibrated at-sensor radiance data using the radiometric calibration coefficients provided by the manufacturer. Second, resulting at-sensor radiance images were then geometrically rectified using navigation data recorded by the GPS/IMU unit and resized to a spatial grid of $0.5 \text{ m} \times 1 \text{ m}$. Afterwards, the geometrically rectified

158 at-sensor radiance images from the DUAL module and the FLUO module
 159 were used differently to obtain TOC reflectance and TOC SIF, respectively.

160 To obtain TOC reflectance, the preprocessed DUAL images were atmo-
 161 spherically corrected using an atmospheric and topographic correction ap-
 162 proach for flat terrain (ATCOR-4) (Richter and Schlapfer, 2012). ATCOR-4
 163 is based upon the atmospheric radiative transfer code MODTRAN-5 (Berk
 164 et al., 2005) to pre-calculate look-up tables (LUT) of atmospheric functions
 165 such as transmission, spherical albedo and path scattered radiance. The at-
 166 mosphere type and aerosol model were set to mid-latitude summer and a
 167 rural aerosol model. Solar position, ground elevation, and sensor elevation
 168 were parameterized exactly to the actual measurements during data acqui-
 169 sition. This parameterization was combined with estimates of atmospheric
 170 water vapor and aerosol optical thickness from MICROTOPS II to better
 171 account for atmospheric absorption and scattering effects.

Figure 2: Reflectance measurements on day 1 and day 2 in the spectral region of 400 – 2500 nm and 400 – 700 nm. The buffers represent the standard deviation of the measurements.

172 TOC SIF was retrieved from the preprocessed FLUO images by using an
 173 FLD-based approach. SIF in the two oxygen absorption bands (i.e., O₂-A
 174 and O₂-B) located at 687 nm (F_{687}) and 760 nm (F_{760}) was retrieved. The
 175 SIF retrieval was based on the iFLD method introduced by [Alonso et al.](#)
 176 (2008) as a modification of the original FLD method ([Plascyk, 1975](#)). We
 177 further updated the method to make it applicable to airborne use. The main
 178 update comprises the use of non-fluorescent reference surfaces (i.e., the ref-
 179 erence panels) to correct potential inaccuracies in estimating atmospheric
 180 functions. Such errors can occur if atmospheric parameters are not exactly
 181 known or slight sensor artifacts remain (cf. [Damm et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Wieneke](#)
 182 [et al. \(2016\)](#) for details). The reliability of obtained SIF using this method
 183 was confirmed by validation activities considering ground fluorescence mea-
 184 surements ([Rossini et al., 2015](#); [Rascher et al., 2015](#)).

185 The reflectance measurements and SIF at 687 nm and 760 nm, together
 186 with the measurements of brightness temperature are shown in Fig. 2 and
 187 3. Both reflectance, SIF and temperature varied among the four crops and
 188 between two days.

189 2.4. The SCOPE model

190 The SCOPE model ([Van der Tol et al., 2009](#)) was used to retrieve veg-
 191 etation parameters from TOC reflectance and to estimate the biochemical
 192 and structural effects on TOC SIF. SCOPE consists of one leaf RTM ([Vilfan](#)
 193 [et al., 2016](#)), three canopy RTMs ([Verhoef, 1984](#); [Van der Tol et al., 2009](#)),
 194 a biochemical model ([Van der Tol et al., 2014](#)), a soil reflectance model
 195 ([Verhoef et al., 2018](#)), an aerodynamic model and an energy balance model
 196 ([Van der Tol et al., 2009](#)). These models are internally connected. We briefly

Figure 3: RGB, temperature, SIF at 687 nm F_{687} and at 760 nm F_{760} images of the experiment area before and during the heat event. Crops are marked in the RGB image: 1: rapeseed; 2a: corn (sparse); 2b corn (dense); 3: barley; 4: wheat.

197 introduce the models (combinedly) used in this study.

198 The Brightness-Shape-Moisture (BSM) model simulates soil reflectance.
 199 BSM separates the effects of soil brightness, soil moisture and spectral shape
 200 on soil reflectance and requires soil brightness (B), soil moisture (SM_p),
 201 and two spectral-shape related parameters (φ and λ) (Table 2) (Verhoef
 202 et al., 2018). Fluspect (Vilfan et al., 2016), which is based on PROSPECT
 203 (Jacquemoud and Baret, 1990), simulates leaf reflectance, transmittance, and

204 fluorescence emission of both forward (shaded) and backward (illuminated)
 205 side. Simulation of SIF emission of a leaf requires the input of incident
 206 radiation to the leaf and fluorescence emission efficiency (ϵ_F). The overall
 207 efficiency is estimated with the biochemical model of [Van der Tol et al. \(2014\)](#)
 208 and distributed over different wavelengths following [Vilfan et al. \(2016\)](#).

209 At the canopy level, RTMo, RTMf and RTMt, which are three SAIL
 210 ([Verhoef, 1984](#)) based models, compute the radiative transfer of incident
 211 radiation, emitted fluorescence and thermal radiation, respectively. RTMo
 212 provides TOC reflectance simulations, and APAR_{chl} of each leaf in different
 213 positions in the canopy. RTMf simulates the radiative transfer of emitted
 214 SIF by leaves in a canopy and TOC SIF. SIF emission from each leaf can
 215 be simulated by Fluspect, using leaf APAR_{chl} from RTMo and fluorescence
 216 emission efficiency from the biochemical model. RTMt calculates absorbed
 217 and emitted thermal radiation of each leaf. Simulation of the thermal radi-
 218 ation requires the temperatures of all leaves as input, on the other hand the
 219 temperatures in turn depend on the absorbed thermal radiation. Therefore
 220 it is necessary to iterate in order to obtain energy balance closure.

221 3. Methods

222 Our approach was to use reflectance to quantify soil, leaf and canopy prop-
 223 erties, before using SCOPE to simulate vegetation biochemical and structural
 224 (i.e., non-physiological) effects on the measured SIF. As summarized in Fig.
 225 4, we first retrieved vegetation parameters from TOC reflectance by invert-
 226 ing the reflectance routine of SCOPE (i.e., RTMo). Afterwards, we used
 227 the retrieved properties to simulate TOC SIF by using RTMf with a fixed

Table 2: The ranges and initial values of the key parameters used in SCOPE .

Parameter	Interpretation	Unit	Range	Initial value
Soil: BSM (Verhoef et al., 2018)				
B	Soil brightness	-	0-0.9	0.5
latitude (φ)	Soil spectral latitude	-	10-60	45
longitude (λ)	Soil spectral longitude	-	10-50	40
SM_p	Soil moisture volume percentage	-	5-55	20
Leaf model: Fluspect (Vilfan et al., 2016)				
C_{ab}	Chlorophyll $a + b$ content	$\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$	0-80	40
C_{dm}	Leaf mass per unit area	g cm^{-2}	0-0.02	0.01
C_w	Equivalent water thickness	cm	0-0.1	0.02
C_s	Brown pigments	a.u.	0-1	0.5
C_{ca}	Carotenoid content	$\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$	0-30	10
N	Leaf structure parameter	-	0-3	1.5
Canopy models: RTMo and RTMf (Van der Tol et al., 2009)				
LAI	Leaf area index	$\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}$	0-7	3
LIDFa	Leaf inclination determination a	-	-1-1	-0.35
LIDFb	Leaf inclination determination b	-	-1-1	-0.15

228 fluorescence emission efficiency (ϵ_F). Finally, we inferred the impact of vege-
 229 tation biochemistry and structure on the variation of SIF by comparing the
 230 measured SIF with modelled SIF. The approach was evaluated by an error
 231 propagation analysis. For further completely independent validation of the
 232 SCOPE forward modelling, we compared the measured brightness tempera-
 233 ture to simulated brightness temperature.

234 *3.1. Retrieving soil, leaf and canopy parameters from reflectance*

235 *3.1.1. Characterizing soil background*

236 Soil background information of the canopies were partially obtained from
 237 bare soil pixels. We assumed that in the study area soil beneath the canopies
 238 differentiate from the bare soil only by moisture (SM_p). In other words, the
 239 other three soil parameters, B , φ and λ were assumed to be the same for
 240 vegetation-covered soil and of bare soil. By assuming this, we retrieved B ,
 241 φ and λ from the reflectance spectra of the bare soil, and used the retrieved
 242 parameters to characterize vegetation-covered soil. To obtain the values of
 243 these three parameters, twenty soil spectra were taken from the images on
 244 each day. For the retrieval of the parameters from each of these reflectance
 245 spectra, we used the numerical optimization method. The numerical opti-
 246 mization method aims at minimizing a cost function, which quantifies the
 247 differences between measured and simulated signals by successive changes of
 248 the input parameters. The cost function is

$$f_{soil} = (R_s - R_m)^T (R_s - R_m) \quad (1)$$

249 where R_s is simulated (soil) reflectance, and R_m is the measured (soil) re-
 250 flectance in all bands of the spectra between 400 and 2500 nm (i.e., 623

Figure 4: Flowchart of estimating the impact of vegetation biochemistry and structure effects on TOC SIF. Note: 'R', 'F', 'T' and 'P' refer to reflectance, fluorescence, temperature and vegetation parameters, respectively. '1' and '2' represent day 1 and day 2, respectively. RTMo, RTMf and RTMt are three submodels in SCOPE.

bands). The reflectance spectra of bare soil are shown in Fig. S2 in the supplementary materials. We used the function 'lsqnonlin' of the optimization toolbox of Matlab R2017a, selecting a Trust Region algorithm for updating parameter values within the ranges shown in Table 2. The BSM model was iteratively executed and iteration stopped when the improvement of the cost

function (f_{soil}) was less than 10^{-3} .

3.1.2. Retrieving leaf and canopy parameters

We retrieved the leaf and canopy parameters on the two days independently from the TOC reflectance spectra of vegetation canopies. We again used the numerical optimization method and minimized the cost function (Eq. 1), but now using the reflectance of vegetation canopies and the canopy reflectance model (i.e., coupling RTMo and BSM) instead of the bare soil reflectance and BSM.

We selected several representative measurements from the reflectance and SIF images to perform the retrieval as the numerical optimization method is computationally demanding. The average of reflectance or SIF within a randomly selected patch consisting of 5 by 5 pixels was taken as one measurement of a crop. We sampled 16 patches for every crop except wheat, for which only eight patches were chosen due to the small size of the wheat field. Eight patches were sampled from each of the two corn fields. There were 112 patches (i.e., 56 for each day) selected in total.

Prior information is crucial to reduce the ill-posedness of the inverse problems. The soil parameters, B , φ and λ , were kept to the average values retrieved from the reflectance of bare soil, while SM_p of each canopy was treated as an unknown parameter and was estimated from TOC reflectance. In addition to the soil background, the observational conditions were predefined. The solar zenith angles were calculated according to the acquisition time and location as 38° for day 1 and was 34° for day 2. We assumed the sensor view angle as spatially constant on a single image and in nadir direction although the *HyPlant* field of view ranged from $\pm 14^\circ$. For a nadir

view, the azimuth angle is arbitrary. Furthermore, the spectra of incoming direct solar light and diffuse light were directly obtained from MODTRAN 5 (Berk et al., 2005). With this prior information, fitting one reflectance spectrum eventually requires tuning 10 parameters, notably SM_p , C_{ab} , C_{dm} , C_w , C_{ca} , N , LAI, LIDFa and LIDFb in Table. 2.

3.2. Simulating TOC SIF and temperature

We simulated the vegetation biochemistry and structure effects on TOC SIF by modelling SIF with RTMf. The retrieved soil, leaf and canopy parameters characterized the canopy, and the incident irradiance and sun-observer geometry defined the observational conditions. These factors controlled the light absorption and fluorescence re-absorption processes.

The other process, fluorescence emission, is parametrized by the fluorescence emission efficiency (ϵ_F), which describes the efficiency of the dissipation of $APAR_{chl}$ as fluorescence radiation. This efficiency, referred to as the 'physiological factor' in this study, is mainly determined by (1) $APAR_{chl}$, (2) leaf temperature, (3) the maximum rate of carboxylation (V_{cmax}), and (4) other ambient environmental conditions, such as relative air humidity, air pressure and concentration of O_2 and CO_2 in the leaf boundary layer (Van der Tol et al., 2014).

To estimate the impact of the non-physiological factors, we treated the physiological status (ϵ_F) of the plants as a constant in all simulations. The value of ϵ_F was set to 0.014 (i.e. 40% above the default value of 0.01 in SCOPE for a dark adapted leaf), which is a realistic value for steady state fluorescence during daytime (Van der Tol et al., 2014). The spectral distribution of the efficiency followed Vilfan et al. (2016). We ran the whole SCOPE

306 model to simulate TOC SIF (an output of RTMf) and canopy temperature
 307 (an output of RTMt and the energy balance model). We set the emissivity
 308 of leaves of all crops to 0.98. The brightness temperature from SCOPE was
 309 compared to the measurements for validation of the model inversion process.

310 3.3. Error propagation analysis

311 We analysed the propagation of noise in the measured reflectance spectra
 312 to the uncertainties (i.e., the standard deviations) in the retrieved parameters
 313 and further to the simulated TOC SIF. We used the spectrally averaged stan-
 314 dard deviation of reflectance measurements of each reference panel (black,
 315 grey and white) (see Fig. S3 in the supplementary materials) as the noise
 316 of reflectance measurements ($\sigma_R = 0.012$). This uncertainty was comparable
 317 to the spectrally average change in reflectance of these panels between the
 318 two days, which was 0.014. This approach provides a spectrally independent
 319 estimate of the reflectance uncertainty due to instrumental noise.

320 We first computed the Jacobians of SCOPE for TOC reflectance and SIF
 321 to simplify the local relationships among the measured reflectance, retrieved
 322 parameters and TOC SIF. The Jacobians ($\mathbf{J}_R$ and $\mathbf{J}_F$) were computed for
 323 each set of optimized parameters and for each crop as:

$$\mathbf{J}_R = \begin{bmatrix} \partial R_{\lambda_1}/\partial p_1 & \dots & \partial R_{\lambda_1}/\partial p_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \partial R_{\lambda_b}/\partial p_1 & \dots & \partial R_{\lambda_b}/\partial p_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

324

$$\mathbf{J}_F = \begin{bmatrix} \partial F_{640}/\partial p_1 & \dots & \partial F_{640}/\partial p_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \partial F_{850}/\partial p_1 & \dots & \partial F_{850}/\partial p_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{J}_R$ is the local model sensitivity of reflectance at each wavelength of the b bands of the *HyPlant* DUAL module ($b = 623$) to each of the 10 optimized parameters, and $\mathbf{J}_F$ is the local model sensitivity of TOC SIF spectra at each fluorescence wavelength (i.e., 640 nm - 850 nm, 1 nm resolution) to each parameter. In total, we had 56 reflectance spectra on each day (i.e., 16 for rapeseed, barley and corn, and 8 for wheat), and thus 56 sets of optimized parameters and Jacobians. We analysed the Jacobians for measurements on day 1 only, because the Jacobians on day 2 were very similar to those on day 1.

Using the Jacobians the reflectance model is described with a locally linear approximation by $\Delta \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{J}_R \Delta \mathbf{p}$, where $\mathbf{p}$ is a matrix of the model parameters and $\mathbf{R}$ is reflectance spectra. The inverse model is given by

$$\Delta \mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{J}_R^T \mathbf{J}_R)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_R^T \Delta \mathbf{R}. \quad (4)$$

Therefore, the covariance matrix of $\mathbf{p}$ as a result of noise in reflectance can be obtained as:

$$\begin{aligned} E(\Delta \mathbf{p} \Delta \mathbf{p}^T) &= E[(\mathbf{J}_R^T \mathbf{J}_R)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_R^T \Delta \mathbf{R} \Delta \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{J}_R (\mathbf{J}_R^T \mathbf{J}_R)^{-1}] \\ &= (\mathbf{J}_R^T \mathbf{J}_R)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_R^T E(\Delta \mathbf{R} \Delta \mathbf{R}^T) \mathbf{J}_R (\mathbf{J}_R^T \mathbf{J}_R)^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $E(\Delta \mathbf{R} \Delta \mathbf{R}^T)$ is the covariance matrix of the reflectance measurements. We assumed this covariance matrix is diagonal and uniform (all diagonal elements equal), characterized by a variance σ_R^2 , and computed the covariance matrix of the retrieved parameters due to measurement noise as:

$$E(\Delta \mathbf{p} \Delta \mathbf{p}^T) = (\mathbf{J}_R^T \mathbf{J}_R)^{-1} \sigma_R^2 \quad (6)$$

We further estimated the propagation of uncertainties in the retrieved parameters caused by noise in reflectance into the model simulation of TOC

345 SIF.

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\Delta \mathbf{F} \Delta \mathbf{F}^T) &= E(\mathbf{J}_F \Delta \mathbf{p} \Delta \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{J}_F^T) = \mathbf{J}_F E(\Delta \mathbf{p} \Delta \mathbf{p}^T) \mathbf{J}_F^T \\
&= \mathbf{J}_F (\mathbf{J}_R^T \mathbf{J}_R)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_F^T \sigma_R^2
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

346 The standard deviation (uncertainty) of the simulated TOC SIF (σ_F) was
347 then found as the square roots of the diagonal elements of this matrix
348 ($E(\Delta \mathbf{F} \Delta \mathbf{F}^T)$).

349 4. Results

350 4.1. Results of retrieved vegetation parameters from TOC reflectance

351 Table 3 lists the retrieved key parameter values. Among the four crops,
352 there was considerable variation in the retrieved leaf chlorophyll and leaf wa-
353 ter content. For example, the retrieved chlorophyll content of rapeseed was
354 only half of that of corn, and the retrieved leaf water content of rapeseed was
355 twice as high as that of corn. The retrieved canopy structure parameters LAI
356 and average leaf angle (ALA), of which the latter one was calculated from
357 LIDFa as $ALA^\circ = 45 - 360 \times LIDFa \frac{1}{\pi^2}$ (Verhoef, 1998), varied moderately
358 among the crops. LAI was clearly different for the two types of corn canopy,
359 while, as expected, the other vegetation parameters showed no appreciable
360 differences between the two corn fields. Besides the differences among the
361 crops, the parameters retrieved from reflectance changed between the two
362 days as well. For example, there were some changes in ALA and C_{ab} . In gen-
363 eral, the model reproduced the measured TOC reflectance well with RMSE
364 between 0.006 and 0.01 (for the comparison of the measured and modelled
365 reflectance spectra, see Fig. S4 in the supplementary materials).

Table 3: The retrieved values of soil moisture (SM_p) leaf chlorophyll content (C_{ab}), leaf water content (C_w), canopy LAI and canopy average leaf angle (ALA) before and during the heat event. Note: the values are presented as 'mean (std)'.

Parameter	Rapeseed		Barley		Wheat		Corn (sparse)		Corn (dense)	
	day 1	day 2	day 1	day 2	day 1	day 2	day 1	day 2	day 1	day 2
$SM_p(\%)$	14.6 (7.3)	12.5 (8.4)	14.0 (4.2)	10.8 (5.4)	14.0 (6.7)	9.4 (8.4)	5.7 (5.4)	8.4 (3.4)	7.7 (6.3)	10.4 (4.6)
$C_{ab} (\mu\text{g cm}^{-2})$	22.9 (0.3)	21.7 (1.6)	32.6 (2.3)	27.4 (3.0)	50.2 (1.8)	49.4 (2.6)	39.1 (1.3)	45.5 (2.0)	42.8 (1.0)	51.5 (1.8)
$C_w (\text{cm}^{-1})$	0.07 (0.001)	0.065 (0.003)	0.04 (0.002)	0.036 (0.002)	0.038 (0.002)	0.036 (0.0019)	0.021 (0.001)	0.025 (0.001)	0.024 (0.001)	0.029 (0.001)
LAI	4.1 (0.18)	4.0 (0.16)	4.3 (0.20)	4.3 (0.21)	3.7 (0.20)	3.6 (0.19)	2.5 (0.17)	2.7 (0.16)	3.4 (0.16)	3.4 (0.17)
ALA ($^\circ$)	51.6 (4.6)	58.0 (3.2)	64.8 (2.6)	67.0 (2.8)	66.3 (1.6)	69.1 (2.1)	71.6 (1.7)	67.4 (2.2)	70.0 (1.8)	64.7 (2.2)
RMSE of refl	0.01 (0.007)	0.01 (0.007)	0.008 (0.005)	0.006 (0.007)	0.007 (0.004)	0.006 (0.007)	0.007 (0.003)	0.006 (0.003)	0.007 (0.003)	0.006 (0.004)

4.2. Comparison between modelled and measured temperature

Using the retrieved parameters in 4.1 as input, we modelled the brightness temperature with RTMt and the energy balance model in SCOPE. Fig. 5 shows a comparison between the measured and modelled brightness temperature. The simulated values were close to the measurements with $R^2 = 0.92$ and $\text{RMSE} = 0.76^\circ\text{C}$. We also compared the modelled and measured differences between air temperature and canopy temperature ($T_c - T_a$). The model predicted these differences well with $R^2 = 0.71$ and $\text{RMSE} = 0.7^\circ\text{C}$.

4.3. Simulation of biochemical and structural effects on SIF

Fig. 6 shows the modelled and measured TOC SIF of the four crops. Although the physiological factors were assumed to be constant for four crops (i.e., $\epsilon_F = 0.014$), the SIF variation among the four crops was reproduced well using the non-physiological information (i.e., the vegetation parameters retrieved in 4.1). Between the modelled and measured SIF, R^2 was 0.76 for F_{687} and was 0.84 for F_{760} . The RMSE was 0.10 for F_{687} and 0.12 $\text{mWm}^{-2}\text{nm}^{-1}\text{sr}^{-1}$ for F_{760} . In both modelled and measured SIF, there was a common tendency for F_{687} and F_{760} to be higher in rapeseed and barley than in wheat and corn.

Figure 5: Modelled and measured canopy brightness temperature (T_c) and canopy-air temperature differences ($T_c - T_a$).

Figure 6: Modelled and measured red fluorescence (F_{687}) and far-red fluorescence (F_{760}).

Nevertheless there were some discrepancies between the measured and modelled SIF. In particular on day 2, clear differences in F_{687} between the simulations and measurements were found. The measured F_{687} of barley on day 2 was much lower than the modelled values, while that of rapeseed was higher than the modelled values.

Fig. 7 shows SIF variation between the two days from the *HyPlant* measurements and from the model simulation. Although the fluorescence emission efficiency was set to the same on two days, the model simulation explained the changes in F_{687} of wheat and in F_{760} of rapeseed, corn and barley. Only for wheat a substantial discrepancy (over 60%) between the model predicted and measured change in F_{760} was found. The change in the measured F_{760} was much better modelled than the change in F_{687} . For

example, the measured F_{687} of barley decreased on day 2, but the modelled values increased. The simulated change in F_{687} was higher than the measured change in both rapeseed and corn.

Figure 7: Modelled and measured variation of SIF on two days (day 2 - day 1).

4.4. Uncertainties from the error propagation analysis

Table. 4 lists the uncertainties of the inferred parameters from the error propagation analysis. The average values and standard deviations of the 56 simulations on day 1 are presented. High uncertainties appeared in the retrieval of SM_p and LIDFb. The uncertainties were 81% and 50% of their ranges in Table. 2, respectively. The inferred leaf structure parameter N and ALA had moderate uncertainties. The remainder of the parameters had considerably lower uncertainty.

Fig. 8 shows the uncertainty of TOC SIF from the error propagation analysis. We took the values of 'measured SIF' of the reference panels (i.e.,

Table 4: The uncertainties of parameters estimated from the error propagation analysis. Note: the mean and standard derivation of the uncertainty in the 56 sets of retrieved parameters are presented, as well as the mean uncertainty relative to its range in Table. 2

Parameter	mean uncertainty	std uncertainty	mean uncertainty (relative to its range)
SM_p [%]	40.5	29.4	81.0%
C_{ab} [$\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$]	6.1	2.5	7.6%
C_{dm} [g cm^{-2}]	0.0085	0.001	40%
C_w [cm^{-1}]	0.0009	0.0001	0.9%
C_s [-]	0.030	0.005	3%
C_{ca} [$\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$]	4.3	2.4	14.3%
N [-]	0.49	0.07	16.3%
LAI [-]	0.7175	0.1	10.1%
ALA [$^\circ$]	24.7	6.8	27.4%
LIDFb [-]	1.0	(0.4)	50.0%

non-fluorescent targets) as the noise in the SIF measurements. The noise was 0.05 and 0.10 $\text{mWm}^{-2}\text{nm}^{-1}\text{sr}^{-1}$ for F_{687} and F_{760} respectively. The uncertainties in the simulated SIF resulting from the measurement uncertainty in the reflectance were 0.00044 and 0.0037 $\text{mWm}^{-2}\text{nm}^{-1}\text{sr}^{-1}$ at 687 nm and 760 nm, respectively. These values were rather minor compared with the noise in the measured SIF.

5. Discussion

5.1. Modelling biochemical and structural effects on SIF

We simulated TOC SIF by using the vegetation parameters retrieved from TOC, while keeping the fluorescence emission efficiency (ϵ_F) constant.

Figure 8: The uncertainty of TOC SIF simulation from error propagation analysis. The line and buffer represent the mean and standard deviation.

419 In this way, the simulated differences among crops and between the days
 420 in SIF were exclusively caused by differences in the absorption of PAR and
 421 the re-absorption of SIF, and they were fully independent of the fluorescence
 422 emission efficiency.

423 The variation in observed SIF among the crops and between the two
 424 days could be largely explained by the effects of different biochemical and
 425 structural properties. These effects explained 76% and 84% variation among
 426 the four crops for observed F_{687} and F_{760} , respectively (Fig. 6). They also
 427 explained 40% and 73% variation between the two days for observed F_{687} and
 428 F_{760} (Fig. 7). These findings match with the results from a global sensitivity
 429 analysis conducted by Verrelst et al. (2015), which shows that over 80% of
 430 both red and far-red SIF variability is due to variation in biochemistry and
 431 structure.

432 The unexplained part of change in SIF may well be caused by changes in
 433 plant physiology, as represented in the model by the parameter ϵ_F . On day 1,

434 the simulated SIF matched very well with the modelled SIF for all crops, but
 435 on day 2 there were clear differences between the modelled and simulated F_{687}
 436 (Fig. 6A). By keeping the physiological factor constant, we overestimated
 437 F_{687} in barley, but underestimated F_{687} in rapeseed (Fig. 6A) and F_{760} in corn
 438 (Fig. 6B). This would imply (assuming that our estimation of the structural
 439 effects on SIF was correct), that ϵ_F differed among the crops on day 2, and
 440 that ϵ_F changed between the two days. An estimate of the canopy effective
 441 ϵ_F can be obtained by normalizing measured by modelled SIF. The good
 442 match between the model simulations and measurements on day 1 for both
 443 red and far-red SIF implies that ϵ_F of the crops was all close to 0.014 and
 444 the spectrum of the efficiency was close to the one in [Vilfan et al. \(2016\)](#).
 445 On day 2, the overestimation and underestimation mentioned above suggest
 446 that ϵ_F of the crops diverged from this priori value of 0.014. In addition, the
 447 over- and underestimation of red SIF were inconsistent with those for far-red
 448 SIF, which could be either to a model representation errors (i.e. the shape of
 449 the emission spectrum) or SIF retrieval errors. The surface temperature on
 450 the second measurement day was well above the optimum for crops of the C3
 451 photosynthetic pathway, and was in the range where temperature effects on
 452 enzyme kinetics may affect the light saturated carboxylation rates and thus
 453 the dissipation of energy over three pathways. However, in view of the lack
 454 of ground truth data for the fluorescence emission efficiency in this study,
 455 we were unable to substantiate the hypothesis that the remaining variability
 456 of SIF is indeed due to the physiological regulation of the energy dissipation
 457 pathways. With our methodology we nevertheless demonstrate that there
 458 is remaining variability in SIF after correction for the dominant biochemical

459 and structure effects.

460 Comparing SIF at 687 nm and 760 nm, we found that the non-physiological
461 factors explained the variation in F_{760} much better than the variation in F_{687}
462 (Fig. 7). This indicates that ϵ_F at the two bands changed differently and
463 the spectral shape of ϵ_F varied between the two days. The physiological
464 variation caused more variation in F_{687} than in F_{760} . This is consistent with
465 the general understanding that physiological information is most profound in
466 red SIF (Rossini et al., 2015; Verrelst et al., 2016). The different sensitivity
467 of red and far-red SIF to the photosynthetic activity offers the approach of
468 using red/far-red SIF ratio to better infer physiological status.

469 5.2. Uncertainty and simulation accuracy

470 Ill-posedness of retrievals is a common problem in model inversions. Pa-
471 rameters that have little influence on reflectance may not be accurately re-
472 trieved. The high uncertainties in the retrieved SM_p and LIDFb (Table. 4)
473 found in the error propagation analysis are directly related to their small
474 contribution to TOC reflectance compared to for example LAI and LIDFa
475 (Jacquemoud et al., 1995; Verrelst et al., 2015). As a consequence, soil in-
476 formation and LIDFb cannot be accurately retrieved from TOC reflectance.
477 Fortunately, it appears that TOC SIF is not sensitive to these parameters
478 either (Verrelst et al., 2016; Van der Tol et al., 2016). The uncertainties of
479 these parameters will have little effect on uncertainties in the simulation of
480 the vegetation biochemical and structural effects on SIF. In contrast, SIF is
481 more sensitive to LAI and C_{ab} , of which the retrievals from reflectance are
482 usually reliable (Weiss et al., 2004; Houborg et al., 2007; Darvishzadeh et al.,
483 2008). Earlier findings by Van der Tol et al. (2016) and Verrelst et al. (2015)

484 showed that for both reflectance and SIF the most influential parameters
485 were C_{ab} , C_{dm} , LIDFa and LAI. The shared sensitivities of reflectance and
486 SIF to most vegetation parameters lead to low error in simulated SIF (σ_F)
487 (Fig. 8).

488 The rationale for using reflectance to estimate biochemical and structural
489 effects on SIF is a close relationship between reflectance and SIF. TOC SIF
490 and reflectance are connected through their common dependence on radiative
491 transfer processes. On the one hand, the scattering of SIF is directly linked
492 with TOC reflectance (Yang and Van der Tol, 2018). Reflectance measure-
493 ments can be used to estimate the scattering effects on observed SIF (Liu
494 et al., 2018). On the other hand, PAR absorption can be estimated from
495 TOC reflectance as well. For example, the reflectance indices NDVI and EVI
496 appear to be good measures of fPAR (Bartlett et al., 1989; Myneni et al.,
497 2002). The vegetation biochemistry and structure affect TOC SIF through
498 the process of PAR absorption and SIF scattering, and both processes can
499 be characterized by reflectance directly.

500 A more intuitive way of understanding the similarity of reflectance and
501 fluorescence changes over the two days is by considering the absorption as
502 the complementary part of the reflectance. The increase of visible reflectance
503 in rapeseed, barley and wheat (Fig. 2) indicates that these crops absorbed
504 less radiation on day 2. The reduction of absorption of incident light is one
505 of the causes for the decrease of F_{687} and F_{760} of the three crops in Fig. 7.

506 Other studies have reported a correlation between SIF and reflectance
507 as well. Konings et al. (2017) showed that NDVI and SIF of grassland were
508 strongly correlated with $R^2 = 0.67$. Badgley et al. (2017) reported that there

509 was a strong correlation between satellite measurements of near-infrared re-
 510 flectance index and SIF. The direct connection between SIF and reflectance
 511 could explain the low uncertainty in modelled SIF (σ_F), although there were
 512 high uncertainties in some retrieved parameters (σ_p). What matters more is
 513 the sensitivity of TOC SIF to reflectance than the sensitivity of reflectance
 514 to the individual model parameters.

515 The changes in some retrieved parameters between the two days were
 516 not significant compared with the uncertainties from the error propagation
 517 analysis (Table. 3 and 4). This does not necessary mean that the model failed
 518 to predict the changes in SIF from reflectance. In the error propagation
 519 analysis, we assumed the noise in reflectance was spectrally independent.
 520 This assumption may lead to overestimation of uncertainties in the retrieved
 521 parameters. Moreover, some systematic errors in reflectance on the two days,
 522 which were not considered in the error propagation, may cancel out errors in
 523 the inferred parameters.

524 The changes in retrieved C_{ab} between the two days comply with qualita-
 525 tive knowledge on the growth stage of the crops. Rapeseed, barley and wheat
 526 were in beginning of their senescent stages and they decreased in C_{ab} . Corn,
 527 in contrast, was in the the vegetative stage V9 (i.e. before tasseling) and
 528 showed an increase in C_{ab} due to growing. Moreover, the difference in LAI
 529 between the two corn plots complied with the different planting densities.
 530 According to the inferred LIDF (i.e. leaf inclination distribution function)
 531 parameters, the LIDFs of the four crops were subjected to either the pla-
 532 giophile (i.e. ALA=45°) or erectophile type (i.e. ALA=81°). The inferred
 533 LIDFs are consistent with the literature, e.g. De Wit (1965); Zou et al.

(2014) and Fang (2015). In addition, the estimated C_{ab} values are within range of published data, e.g. Daughtry et al. (2000) for corn and Hamblin et al. (2014) for wheat. However, the lack of in-situ measurements for direct validation is a limitation of our study.

As an additional validation of our results, we compared modelled to measured brightness temperature. The model predicted the brightness temperature well by using the retrieved parameters and measured meteorological data (Fig. 5A). More importantly, the differences between brightness and above-canopy air temperature were predicted well (Fig. 5B). This provides confidence in the accuracy of the model and the retrieved parameters. The air-canopy temperature differences are determined by the latent and sensible heat exchange, which are affected by both canopy structure and stomatal conductance. The model predicted the temperature less well on day 2 probably due to the model misrepresentation of temperature dependence of stomatal aperture (i.e. the Ball-Berry parameter) or temperature dependence of rate coefficients and/or V_{cmax} in the photosynthesis model.

5.3. Implications

The combination of reflectance and SIF enables us to advance the analysis SIF observations. *HyPlant* is a unique airborne system that measures reflectance spectra and fluorescence simultaneously with a very high spatial resolution. Several satellite missions also provide opportunities to explore the applications on larger scales, such as TROPOMI and GOME-2 (Joiner et al., 2013; Guanter et al., 2015). The planned Fluorescence Explorer (FLEX) satellite will orbit in tandem with one of the Sentinel-3 (S3) satellites taking advantage of its optical and thermal sensors to provide an integrated pack-

age of measurements (Drusch et al., 2017). Verhoef et al. (2018) showed with synthetic scenarios that it was promising to retrieve vegetation biochemical and structural parameters from FLEX/S3 multi-sensor data. Although we did not provide an explicit study on heat stress detection due to a lack of supporting in-situ measurements, the approach we proposed has the potential in retrieving plant physiological and structural response to stress.

6. Conclusions

The physiological, biochemical and structural factors jointly control TOC fluorescence. We show that hyperspectral reflectance alone explains a large portion of the SIF variation across space and time. This is due to the information contained in TOC reflectance about leaf and canopy structure properties. RTMs are a useful tool to not only retrieve the leaf and canopy parameters from reflectance, but also to estimate their effects on TOC SIF. The estimation is reliable because SIF and reflectance are directly connected through vegetation biochemical and structural properties. In our view, hyperspectral reflectance combined with RTMs provide exciting opportunities for the quantitative use of SIF observations and a comprehensive set of information to assess physiological, biochemical, and structural variation.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by the China Scholarship Council (CSC) to P.Y. under Grant 201406040058, and by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, grant ALWGO.2017.018. Part of this work (common experiment and part of airborne acquisition) was performed within the German-Plant-Phenotyping Network which is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (project identification num-

ber: 031A053). Airborne acquisition and data analysis were financed by the European Space Agency (ESA) in the frame of the HyFLEX campaign (ESA contract no. 4000107143/12/NL/FF/If CCN3) and the FLEX Bridge study (ESA Contract No. 4000112341/14/NL/FF/gp) and the by the SFB/TR 32 Patterns in Soil-Vegetation-Atmosphere Systems: Monitoring, Modelling, and Data Assimilation subproject D2 (www.tr32.de), funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). Additional financial support was provided by the Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH supporting the development and operation of *HyPlant*. The authors thank Jing Liu and Anatoly Gitelson for providing valuable advice and assistance on the manuscript. The authors thank Patrick Rademske for acquiring the airborne data and for assistance with the data processing.

References

- Ač, A., Malenovsky, Z., Olejníčková, J., Gallé, A., Rascher, U., Mohammed, G., 2015. Meta-analysis assessing potential of steady-state chlorophyll fluorescence for remote sensing detection of plant water, temperature and nitrogen stress. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 168, 420–436.
- Alonso, L., Gomez-Chova, L., Vila-Frances, J., Amoros-Lopez, J., Guanter, L., Calpe, J., Moreno, J., 2008. Improved Fraunhofer Line Discrimination method for vegetation fluorescence quantification. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters* 5 (4), 620–624.
- Badgley, G., Field, C. B., Berry, J. A., 2017. Canopy near-infrared reflectance and terrestrial photosynthesis. *Science advances* 3 (3), e1602244.

- 606 Baker, N. R., 2008. Chlorophyll fluorescence: a probe of photosynthesis in
607 vivo. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* 59, 89–113.
- 608 Bartlett, D. S., Whiting, G. J., Hartman, J. M., 1989. Use of vegetation
609 indices to estimate indices to estimate intercepted solar radiation and net
610 carbon dioxide exchange of a grass canopy. *Remote Sensing of Environment*
611 30 (2), 115–128.
- 612 Berk, A., Anderson, G. P., Acharya, P. K., Bernstein, L. S., Muratov, L.,
613 Lee, J., Fox, M., Adler Golden, S. M., Chetwynd, J. H., Hoke, M. L.,
614 et al., 2005. MODTRAN 5: a reformulated atmospheric band model with
615 auxiliary species and practical multiple scattering options: update. En:
616 Defense and Security. International Society for Optics and Photonics, pp.
617 662–667.
- 618 Damm, A., Guanter, L., Laurent, V., Schaepman, M., Schickling, A.,
619 Rascher, U., 2014. FLD-based retrieval of sun-induced chlorophyll fluores-
620 cence from medium spectral resolution airborne spectroscopy data. *Remote*
621 *Sensing of Environment* 147, 256–266.
- 622 Darvishzadeh, R., Skidmore, A., Schlerf, M., Atzberger, C., 2008. Inversion of
623 a radiative transfer model for estimating vegetation LAI and chlorophyll
624 in a heterogeneous grassland. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 112 (5),
625 2592–2604.
- 626 Daughtry, C., Walthall, C., Kim, M., De Colstoun, E. B., McMurtrey Iii, J.,
627 2000. Estimating corn leaf chlorophyll concentration from leaf and canopy
628 reflectance. *Remote sensing of Environment* 74 (2), 229–239.

629 Daumard, F., Goulas, Y., Champagne, S., Fournier, A., Ounis, A., Olios, A.,
630 Moya, I., 2012. Continuous monitoring of canopy level sun-induced chloro-
631 phyll fluorescence during the growth of a sorghum field. *IEEE Transactions*
632 *on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 50 (11), 4292–4300.

633 De Wit, C. T., 1965. Photosynthesis of leaf canopies. Tech. rep., Pudoc.

634 Dong, B., Sutton, R., Shaffrey, L., Wilcox, L., 2016. The 2015 European heat
635 wave. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 97 (12), S57–S62.

636 Drusch, M., Moreno, J., Del Bello, U., Franco, R., Goulas, Y., Huth, A.,
637 Kraft, S., Middleton, E. M., Miglietta, F., Mohammed, G., et al., 2017.
638 The FLuorescence EXplorer Mission Concept—ESA’s Earth Explorer 8.
639 *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 55 (3), 1273–1284.

640 Fang, F., 2015. The retrieval of leaf inclination angle and leaf area index in
641 maize. University of Twente, Masters Thesis.

642 Grace, J., Nichol, C., Disney, M., Lewis, P., Quaife, T., Bowyer, P., 2007. Can
643 we measure terrestrial photosynthesis from space directly, using spectral
644 reflectance and fluorescence? *Global Change Biology* 13 (7), 1484–1497.

645 Guanter, L., Aben, I., Tol, P., Krijger, J., Hollstein, A., Köhler, P., Damm,
646 A., Joiner, J., Frankenberg, C., Landgraf, J., 2015. Potential of the TRO-
647 POSpheric Monitoring Instrument (TROPOMI) onboard the Sentinel-5
648 Precursor for the monitoring of terrestrial chlorophyll fluorescence. *At-
649 mospheric Measurement Techniques* 8 (3), 1337–1352.

650 Guanter, L., Zhang, Y., Jung, M., Joiner, J., Voigt, M., Berry, J. A., Franken-
651 berg, C., Huete, A. R., Zarco Tejada, P., Lee, J.-E., et al., 2014. Global and

652 time-resolved monitoring of crop photosynthesis with chlorophyll fluores-
653 cence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111 (14), E1327–
654 E1333.

655 Hamblin, J., Stefanova, K., Angessa, T. T., 2014. Variation in chlorophyll
656 content per unit leaf area in spring wheat and implications for selection in
657 segregating material. *PLoS One* 9 (3), e92529.

658 He, L., Chen, J. M., Liu, J., Mo, G., Joiner, J., 2017. Angular normalization
659 of GOME-2 sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence observation as a better
660 proxy of vegetation productivity. *Geophysical Research Letters* 44 (11),
661 5691–5699.

662 Houborg, R., Soegaard, H., Boegh, E., 2007. Combining vegetation index
663 and model inversion methods for the extraction of key vegetation biophys-
664 ical parameters using Terra and Aqua MODIS reflectance data. *Remote*
665 *Sensing of Environment* 106 (1), 39–58.

666 Jacquemoud, S., 1993. Inversion of the PROSPECT + SAIL canopy re-
667 flectance model from AVIRIS equivalent spectra: theoretical study. *Re-*
668 *mote Sensing of Environment* 44 (2-3), 281–292.

669 Jacquemoud, S., Baret, F., 1990. PROSPECT: A model of leaf optical prop-
670 erties spectra. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 34 (2), 75–91.

671 Jacquemoud, S., Baret, F., Andrieu, B., Danson, F., Jaggard, K., 1995.
672 Extraction of vegetation biophysical parameters by inversion of the
673 PROSPECT + SAIL models on sugar beet canopy reflectance data. *Appli-*

674 cation to TM and AVIRIS sensors. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 52 (3),
675 163–172.

676 Joiner, J., Guanter, L., Lindstrot, R., Voigt, M., Vasilkov, A., Middleton, E.,
677 Huemmrich, K., Yoshida, Y., Frankenberg, C., 2013. Global monitoring of
678 terrestrial chlorophyll fluorescence from moderate-spectral-resolution near-
679 infrared satellite measurements: methodology, simulations, and applica-
680 tion to GOME-2. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* 6 (10), 2803–2823.

681 Koffi, E., Rayner, P., Norton, A., Frankenberg, C., Scholze, M., 2015. In-
682 vestigating the usefulness of satellite-derived fluorescence data in inferring
683 gross primary productivity within the carbon cycle data assimilation sys-
684 tem. *Biogeosciences* 12 (13), 4067–4084.

685 Köhler, P., Guanter, L., Kobayashi, H., Walther, S., Yang, W., 2018. Assess-
686 ing the potential of sun-induced fluorescence and the canopy scattering
687 coefficient to track large-scale vegetation dynamics in Amazon forests. *Re-
688 mote Sensing of Environment* 204, 769 – 785.

689 Konings, A., Williams, A., Gentine, P., 2017. Sensitivity of grassland pro-
690 ductivity to aridity controlled by stomatal and xylem regulation. *Nature
691 Geoscience* 10 (4), 284.

692 Liu, L., Liu, X., Wang, Z., Zhang, B., 2016. Measurement and analysis of
693 bidirectional SIF emissions in wheat canopies. *IEEE Transactions on Geo-
694 science and Remote Sensing* 54 (5), 2640–2651.

695 Liu, X., Guanter, L., Liu, L., Damm, A., Malenovsky, Z., Rascher, U., Peng,
696 D., Du, S., Gastellu-Etchegorry, J.-P., 2018. Downscaling of solar-induced

chlorophyll fluorescence from canopy level to photosystem level using a
random forest model. *Remote Sensing of Environment*.

Maxwell, K., Johnson, G. N., 2000. Chlorophyll fluorescencea practical guide.
Journal of experimental botany 51 (345), 659–668.

Miao, G., Guan, K., Yang, X., Bernacchi, C. J., Berry, J. A., DeLucia,
E. H., Wu, J., Moore, C. E., Meacham, K., Cai, Y., et al., 2018. Sun-
induced chlorophyll fluorescence, photosynthesis, and light use efficiency
of a soybean field from seasonally continuous measurements. *Journal of*
Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences 123 (2), 610–623.

Migliavacca, M., Perez-Priego, O., Rossini, M., El-Madany, T. S., Moreno,
G., van der Tol, C., Rascher, U., Berninger, A., Bessenbacher, V., Burkart,
A., et al., 2017. Plant functional traits and canopy structure control the
relationship between photosynthetic CO₂ uptake and far-red sun-induced
fluorescence in a Mediterranean grassland under different nutrient avail-
ability. *New Phytologist* 214 (3), 1078–1091.

Myneni, R. B., Hoffman, S., Knyazikhin, Y., Privette, J., Glassy, J., Tian, Y.,
Wang, Y., Song, X., Zhang, Y., Smith, G., et al., 2002. Global products of
vegetation leaf area and fraction absorbed PAR from year one of MODIS
data. *Remote sensing of environment* 83 (1-2), 214–231.

Plascyk, J. A., 1975. The MK II Fraunhofer line discriminator (FLD-II)
for airborne and orbital remote sensing of solar-stimulated luminescence.
Optical Engineering 14 (4), 144339.

719 Porcar Castell, A., Tyystjärvi, E., Atherton, J., Van der Tol, C., Flexas,
720 J., Pfündel, E. E., Moreno, J., Frankenberg, C., Berry, J. A., 2014. Link-
721 ing chlorophyll a fluorescence to photosynthesis for remote sensing ap-
722 plications: mechanisms and challenges. *Journal of Experimental Botany*,
723 eru191.

724 Rascher, U., Alonso, L., Burkart, A., Cilia, C., Cogliati, S., Colombo, R.,
725 Damm, A., Drusch, M., Guanter, L., Hanus, J., et al., 2015. Sun-induced
726 fluorescence—a new probe of photosynthesis: First maps from the imaging
727 spectrometer HyPlant. *Global Change Biology* 21 (12), 4673–4684.

728 Richter, R., Schlapfer, D., 2012. Atmospheric/topographic correction for air-
729 borne imagery: Atcor-4 user guide. DLR IB, 565–02.

730 Rossini, M., Nedbal, L., Guanter, L., Ač, A., Alonso, L., Burkart, A.,
731 Cogliati, S., Colombo, R., Damm, A., Drusch, M., et al., 2015. Red and
732 far red sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence as a measure of plant photo-
733 synthesis. *Geophysical Research Letters* 42 (6), 1632–1639.

734 Sun, Y., Frankenberg, C., Wood, J. D., Schimel, D., Jung, M., Guanter,
735 L., Drewry, D., Verma, M., Porcar-Castell, A., Griffis, T. J., et al., 2017.
736 OCO-2 advances photosynthesis observation from space via solar-induced
737 chlorophyll fluorescence. *Science* 358 (6360), eaam5747.

738 Van der Tol, C., Berry, J., Campbell, P., Rascher, U., 2014. Models of fluores-
739 cence and photosynthesis for interpreting measurements of solar-induced
740 chlorophyll fluorescence. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*
741 119 (12), 2312–2327.

- 742 Van der Tol, C., Rossini, M., Cogliati, S., Verhoef, W., Colombo, R., Rascher,
743 U., Mohammed, G., 2016. A model and measurement comparison of diurnal
744 cycles of sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence of crops. *Remote Sensing*
745 *of Environment* 186, 663–677.
- 746 Van der Tol, C., Verhoef, W., Timmermans, J., Verhoef, A., Su, Z., 2009. An
747 integrated model of soil-canopy spectral radiances, photosynthesis, fluorescence,
748 temperature and energy balance. *Biogeosciences* 6 (12), 3109–3129.
- 749 Verhoef, W., 1984. Light scattering by leaf layers with application to canopy
750 reflectance modeling: the SAIL model. *Remote Sensing of Environment*
751 16 (2), 125–141.
- 752 Verhoef, W., 1998. Theory of radiative transfer models applied in optical
753 remote sensing of vegetation canopies. Wageningen: Landbouwniversiteit
754 Wageningen (LUW).
- 755 Verhoef, W., van der Tol, C., Middleton, E. M., 2018. Hyperspectral radiative
756 transfer modeling to explore the combined retrieval of biophysical
757 parameters and canopy fluorescence from FLEX–Sentinel-3 tandem mission
758 multi-sensor data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 204, 942–963.
- 759 Verrelst, J., Rivera, J. P., van der Tol, C., Magnani, F., Mohammed, G.,
760 Moreno, J., 2015. Global sensitivity analysis of the SCOPE model: What
761 drives simulated canopy-leaving sun-induced fluorescence? *Remote Sensing*
762 *of Environment* 166, 8–21.
- 763 Verrelst, J., Van der Tol, C., Magnani, F., Sabater, N., Rivera, J. P., Mohammed,
764 G., Moreno, J., 2016. Evaluating the predictive power of sun-

- induced chlorophyll fluorescence to estimate net photosynthesis of vegetation canopies: A SCOPE modeling study. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 176, 139–151.
- Vilfan, N., van der Tol, C., Muller, O., Rascher, U., Verhoef, W., 2016. Fluspect-B: A model for leaf fluorescence, reflectance and transmittance spectra. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 186, 596–615.
- Weiss, M., Baret, F., Smith, G., Jonckheere, I., Coppin, P., 2004. Review of methods for in situ leaf area index (LAI) determination: Part II. Estimation of LAI, errors and sampling. *Agricultural and forest meteorology* 121 (1-2), 37–53.
- Wieneke, S., Ahrends, H., Damm, A., Pinto, F., Stadler, A., Rossini, M., Rascher, U., 2016. Airborne based spectroscopy of red and far-red sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence: Implications for improved estimates of gross primary productivity. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 184, 654–667.
- Yang, K., Ryu, Y., Dechant, B., Berry, J. A., Hwang, Y., Jiang, C., Kang, M., Kim, J., Kimm, H., Kornfeld, A., et al., 2018. Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence is more strongly related to absorbed light than to photosynthesis at half-hourly resolution in a rice paddy. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 216, 658–673.
- Yang, P., Van der Tol, C., 2018. Linking canopy scattering of far-red sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence with reflectance. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 209, 456–467.

- 787 Yang, X., Tang, J., Mustard, J. F., Lee, J.-E., Rossini, M., Joiner, J., Munger,
788 J. W., Kornfeld, A., Richardson, A. D., 2015. Solar-induced chlorophyll flu-
789 orescence that correlates with canopy photosynthesis on diurnal and sea-
790 sonal scales in a temperate deciduous forest. *Geophysical Research Letters*
791 42 (8), 2977–2987.
- 792 Zhang, Y., Guanter, L., Berry, J. A., Joiner, J., Tol, C., Huete, A., Gitelson,
793 A., Voigt, M., Köhler, P., 2014. Estimation of vegetation photosynthetic
794 capacity from space-based measurements of chlorophyll fluorescence for
795 terrestrial biosphere models. *Global Change Biology* 20 (12), 3727–3742.
- 796 Zhang, Y., Xiao, X., Wolf, S., Wu, J., Wu, X., Gioli, B., Wohlfahrt, G.,
797 Cescatti, A., van der Tol, C., Zhou, S., et al., 2018. Spatio-temporal conver-
798 gence of maximum daily light-use efficiency based on radiation absorption
799 by canopy chlorophyll. *Geophysical Research Letters* 45 (8), 3508–3519.
- 800 Zou, X., Möttus, M., Tammeorg, P., Torres, C. L., Takala, T., Pisek, J.,
801 Mäkelä, P., Stoddard, F., Pellikka, P., 2014. Photographic measurement
802 of leaf angles in field crops. *Agricultural and forest meteorology* 184, 137–
803 146.