

**Analyses of canopy photosynthesis derived from
three-dimensional model simulations of
sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence**

Sicong Gao

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Faulty of Science
University of Technology Sydney

January 2020

Certificate of original authorship

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis. This research is supported by Australian Government Research Training Program.

Production Note:

Signature of student: Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 31-01-2020

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program.

First of all, I would like to thank my principle supervisor Distinguished Professor Alfredo Huete for his support during my three and a half years of PhD study. My major was not remote sensing before I came to UTS. I truly appreciate Professor Huete's trust and guide to enter the remote sensing area. He offered a free research environment and his professional suggestions encouraged me to discovery scientific questions.

Secondly, I would like to say thank you to Dr. Hideki Kobayashi for providing the FLiES model and giving suggestions to my study, Professor Jim Tang for providing field measured SIF data at Harvard forest and Professor Elise Pendall for providing the LiDAR data.

Also, many thanks to Professor Qiang Yu, Professor Derek Eamus, Dr. James Cleverly, Dr. Xuanlong Ma, Dr. Zunyi Xie, Dr. Xiaolu Tang and Dr. Weiwei Liu for their help and share of their experience. Thanks to Jie He, Dr. Wenjie Zhang, Song Leng, Dr. Xunhe Zhang, Dr. Qinggaozi Zhu and Dr. Zheyuan Du, Minxi Zhang, Hong Zhang for their encouragement, delicious food and joyful mahjong parties. I am also grateful to my team members Dr. Rakhesh Devadas, Dr. Leandro Giovannini, Ekena Rangel, Dr. Nguyen Ngoc Tran, and Dr. Paras Sidiqi for their help and all my friends in China, Dr. Xin Li, Chao Zhang, Weihong Wang, and Dr. Xianghu Ji for encouraging me to finish my study.

Additionally, I would like to especially thank my wife Man Bao. Thank you for your love, trust, encouragement and 100% support. Every time when I am stressful, you always stay with me and give me confidence. And our pet Mascarpone (the cutest and most gorgeous cat in the world), thank you for waking me up early in the morning and being my motivation to work hard.

Lastly, I would like to deeply thank my parents for their cultivation and education. Your love gives me the courage to face all difficulties in my life and get through the tough times. And my brother and his wife, thank you for your support throughout my study.

Publications

Wu, J., Kobayashi, H., Stark, **S.C.**, Meng, R., Guan, K., Tran, N.N., **Gao, S.**, Yang, W., Restrepo-Coupe, N., Miura, T. and Oliviera, R.C., 2018. Biological processes dominate seasonality of remotely sensed canopy greenness in an Amazon evergreen forest. *New Phytologist*, 217(4), pp.1507-1520.

Table of contents

Certificate of original authorship	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Publications.....	III
Table of contents	IV
List of Figures	VIII
List of Tables	XIV
Abbreviations	XV
Abstract.....	XVIII
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Research background	2
1.1.1. Global carbon cycle under climate change	2
1.1.2. Photosynthesis and Chlorophyll fluorescence	5
1.2. Objectives and research questions.....	18
Chapter 2. Enabling the three-dimensional FLiES model to simulate seasonal scale sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence	21
Abstract.....	22
2.1. Introduction.....	22
2.2. Study area and Data.....	25
2.2.1. Study area.....	25
2.2.2. LiDAR data.....	25
2.2.3. Landsat reflectance	26
2.2.4. Eddy covariance GPP	26
2.2.5. Measured Canopy SIF.....	26
2.3. Methodology	27
2.3.1. FLiES SIF module	27
2.3.2. Machine learning	29
2.3.3. Model simulations.....	30
2.3.4. Statistical Analysis.....	32
2.4. Results	33
2.4.1. Retrieved biochemical parameters in two years	33

2.4.2. Comparison of simulated SIF with field measured canopy SIF under different sunlit & cloudy light conditions.....	35
2.4.3. The correlation between GPP _{EC} and SIF in sunny or cloudy days	38
2.5. Discussion	39
2.5.1. Model sensitivity.....	39
2.5.2. The relationship between GPP and scattered vs emitted SIF	40
2.5.3. Uncertainties of seasonal SIF simulations	42
2.6. Conclusions	43
Chapter 3. Partitioning sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence into overstory and understory layers by using a three-dimensional model.....	45
Abstract.....	46
3.1. Introduction	46
3.2. Study area and Data.....	49
3.2.1. Study area.....	50
3.2.2. LiDAR data.....	51
3.2.3. GOME-2 SIF.....	51
3.2.4. Sentinel-2 reflectance.....	51
3.2.5. MODIS EVI data	52
3.2.6. Eddy covariance data	52
3.3. Methodology	53
3.3.1. FLiES SIF model	53
3.3.2. Machine learning	54
3.3.3. Structure of model simulations	55
3.4. Results	56
3.4.1. Compare model simulated SIF, MODIS EVI, eddy covariance GPP and GOME2 SIF	57
3.4.2. The relationship between GPP _{EC} and overstory SIF _{FLiES} , understory SIF _{FLiES}	61
3.4.3. Predicted overstory GPP and understory GPP	63
3.5. Discussion.....	64
3.5.1. Vegetation structure and PAR effect SIF on overstory and understory layer for different vegetation types.	64
3.5.2. Uncertainties of SIF simulation in overstory and understory layers.....	67
3.6. Conclusion.....	68
Chapter 4. OCO-2 sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence normalised by a three dimensional radiative transfer model is better correlated with vegetation productivity.....	70

Abstract	71
4.1. Introduction	71
4.2. Study area and Data	74
4.2.1. Study area.....	74
4.2.2. OCO-2 SIF	75
4.2.3. MODIS data.....	75
4.2.4. LiDAR data.....	76
4.2.5. Eddy covariance data	76
4.3. Methodology	76
4.3.1. Definitions of OCO-2 observation directions	77
4.3.2. FLiES model	77
4.3.3. Normalised APAR and SIF yield.....	77
4.3.4. Structure of model simulations	78
4.3.5. Relative importance method	79
4.4. Results	79
4.4.1. OCO-2 SIF observations in multi-angles.....	79
4.4.2. The relationship between GPP and OCO-2 SIF over nadir, hot spot and dark spot observations	80
4.4.3. The correlation between normalised APAR and SIF for nadir, hot spot, and dark spot directions.....	82
4.4.4. The correlation between LUE and normalised SIF yield for the nadir, hot spot and dark spot viewing directions.....	83
4.5. Discussion	85
4.5.1. View zenith angle effects on the SIF variations	85
4.5.2. Normalised SIF of OCO-2 data	86
4.5.3. Relationship between environmental factors and SIF observations in different view observations	88
4.5.4. Applications of remotely sensed SIF observations.....	90
4.6. Conclusion	92
Chapter 5. Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence is influenced by the understory reflectance based on two scenarios	93
Abstract	94
5.1. Introduction	94
5.2. Definition for two scenarios	97
5.2.1. Scenario I	97
5.2.2. Scenario II.....	98

5.3. Theoretical basis	98
5.3.1. Incident radiation on canopy and understory.....	98
5.3.2. Formula description for the scenario I.....	99
5.3.3. Formula description for Scenario II.....	99
5.4. FLIES SIF simulation method	100
5.4.1. FLIES SIF model and ray-tracing frame	100
5.4.2. Database generation.....	101
5.5. Results	102
5.5.1. The variation of SIF with C_{ab} , d_{leaf} , ρ_u and FVC.....	102
5.5.2. Environmental factors effects on red and far-red SIF for scenarios I and II	105
5.5.3. Canopy layer's properties affect SIF at the scenario I and II	109
5.5.4. Regression model for SIF and vegetation structures	114
5.6. Discussion	116
5.6.1. Scattering SIF and soil SIF	116
5.6.2. Soil effects in savanna	117
5.6.3. Understory reflection effects in mature forest	118
5.6.4. Applications for remote sensing	118
5.7. Conclusion	119
Chapter 6. Conclusions	120
6.1. Summary of key methodology and conclusions	121
6.1.1. The development and validation of the new three-dimensional SIF model	121
6.1.2. Partition SIF signal to tree and grass layers.....	122
6.1.3. Normalized OCO-2 SIF by 3D SIF model	123
6.1.4. SIF signal affected by understory layer	123
6.2. Research limitations and future research directions	124
6.3. Conclusions	125
Chapter 7. Bibliography	126

List of Figures

Figure 1.1. The global carbon cycle (https://www.sciencelearn.org.nz/resources/689-the-ocean-and-the-carbon-cycle , 2019).....	2
Figure 1.2. The process of photosynthesis (Rasmussen & Minter 2014).....	5
Figure 1.3. The generation of fluorescence from leaf to canopy scale (Porcar-Castell et al. 2014).	7
Figure 1.4. The fluorescence quantum yield (Schlau-Cohen & Berry 2015)	9
Figure 1.5. The relationship between SIF and photosynthesis (Gu et al. 2019a)	10
Figure 1.6. Comparison between TROPOMI, GOME-2, and OCO-2 SIF in the Nile region (Köhler, Frankenberg, et al. 2018).....	12
Figure 2.1. Flowchart of simulations	31
Figure 2.2. Seasonal and annual changes in retrieved biochemical parameters for years 2013 and 2014. N is the leaf structure, Cab is the total chlorophyll content, Cca is the carotenoid content, Cd is the dry matter of leaf and Cw is the leaf water content.	33
Figure 2.3. Correlation between the green chlorophyll index, CI_{green} , and total chlorophyll content.	34
Figure 2.4. The seasonal change of field measured canopy SIF, with $FLiES_{SIF}$, $DART_{SIF}$ and $SCOPE_{SIF}$ at 760 nm from 2013 to 2014.	35
Figure 2.5. Box plot for SIF annual mean and range of SIF_{Field} , $FLiES_{SIF}$, $DART_{SIF}$ and $SCOPE_{SIF}$	36
Figure 2.6. The correlation between SIF_{Field} and $FLiES_{SIF}$, $DART_{SIF}$, $SCOPE_{SIF}$. (a) Correlation between $FLiES_{SIF}$ and SIF_{Field} . (b) Correlation between $DART_{SIF}$ and SIF_{Field} . (c) Correlation between $SCOPE_{SIF}$ and SIF_{Field} . The red dash line is the 1:1 symmetric line, all p-value < 0.001.	37

Figure 2.7. The correlation between daily GPP_{EC} and model simulated daily SIF under different light conditions (a) – (d). Black lines, red lines and blue lines are regression line for total SIF, SIF in sunny days and cloudy days, respectively. Red points mean measurement in sunny days, blue points mean measurement in cloudy days. All p values are less than 0.001.	38
Figure 2.8. Correlation matrix between $FLiES_{SIF}$ and other factors, all p-values are less than 0.001.	39
Figure 2.9. Time series of PAR, APAR, LAI and field measured SIF from 2013 to 2014. PAR, APAR, LAI and SIF are all from field measurements.	40
Figure 2.10. At the seasonal scale, the relationship between and each part of $FLiES$ simulated SIF, LUE and APAR. Correlation of LUE and (a) daily SIF yield, (b) scattered SIF, (c) emitted SIF. Correlation of APAR and (d) daily SIF yield, (e) scattered SIF, (f) emitted SIF. Correlation of GPP_{EC} and (g) field measured SIF, (h) scattered SIF, (i) emitted SIF. Red points mean measurement in sunny days, blue points mean measurements in cloudy days. The black line is the total regression line, red and blue line means the sunny and cloudy regression line, respectively.	42
Figure 3.1 The land cover of three flux tower sites in Australia. The land cover data used MCD12C1.	50
Figure 3.2. Flowchart of simulations.	56
Figure 3.3. Time series of $FLiES$ model simulated SIF, MODIS EVI, eddy covariance GPP and GOME2 SIF from 2016 to 2017 for (a) AU-TTE, (b) AU-LIT and (c) AU-CUM.	61
Figure 3.4. Correlation between GPP and total SIF_{FLiES} , overstory SIF_{FLiES} , understory SIF_{FLiES} for (a) AU-TTE, (b) AU-LIT and (c) AU-CUM. The blue, brown and green	

points represent the total SIF, overstory SIF and understory SIF, respectively. The line is the linear regression line. All p-values are less than 0.0001..... 62

Figure 3.5. Prediction of GPP for AU-TTE, AU-LIT and AU-CUM from 2016 to 2017. 63

Figure 3.6. Correlation between SIF and PAR in overstory and understory layers for (a) AU-TTE, (b) AU-LIT and (c) AU-CUM..... 65

Figure 3.7. Correlation between SIF and canopy cover for AU-TTE, AU-LIT and AU-CUM. The line means a linear regression line. All p-value is less than 0.0001. 66

Figure 3.8. Generalised pattern from our results: (a) the relationship between overstory SIF and PAR, canopy cover; (b) the relationship between understory SIF and PAR, canopy cover. The arrows indicate values from low to high. 67

Figure 4.1. Flow chart of simulation methods. 79

Figure 4.2. (a) – (d). Instantaneous OCO-2 SIF observations at 757 nm in different days. (a) and (b) shows the hot spot effect, (c) and (d) shows the dark spot effect. The red five-point star identifies the sun position at OCO-2 passing time. The numbers inside the circle are zenith angle. The numbers on the outermost circle represent the azimuth angle..... 80

Figure 4.3. The relationship between eddy covariance GPP and OCO-2 SIF in nadir, hot spot and dark spot views for (a) US-PFa, (b) US-WCr and (c) US-NR1. Coloured lines mean the linear regression line..... 81

Figure 4.4. The relationship between normalised APAR and OCO-2 SIF at 757 nm in nadir, hot spot and dark spot views for (a) US-PFa, (b) US-WCr and (c) US-NR1. Coloured lines mean the linear regression line for each direction. 83

Figure 4.5. The relationship between LUE and normalised OCO-2 SIF yield in the nadir, hot spot and dark spot directions for (a) US-PFa, (b) US-WCr and (c) US-NR1. Coloured lines mean the linear regression line for each view direction. 84

Figure 4.6. FLiES-SIF model simulated SIF at 757 nm at the solar principal plane, and solar zenith angle was set to 20°. SIF value has been scaled from 0 to 1 mW/m ² /sr/nm. Negative values of the VZA mean a backward direction, the positive values signify a forward direction.	85
Figure 4.7. (a) The correlation between OCO-2 SIF and GPP _{EC} for three study sites. (b) The correlation between GPP and normalised SIF by SZA for three study sites. The black line means the linear regression line.	86
Figure 4.8. (a) The correlation between OCO-2 SIF yield and LUE for three study sites. (b) The correlation between normalised LUE and normalised SIF yield by APAR for three study sites. The black line means the linear regression line.	88
Figure 4.9. Relative importance of VPD, Ta, SWC, PAR and NEE for SIF viewing in nadir, hot spot and dark spot direction.	90
Figure 5.1. Descriptions for scenario I and II.	97
Figure 5.2. FLiES-SIF model simulated total SIF, scatter SIF, emit SIF based on the variation of total chlorophyll content at (a) 680 nm and (b)740 nm.	102
Figure 5.3. FLiES-SIF model simulated total SIF, scatter SIF, emit SIF based on the variation of leaf density at (a) 680 nm and (b) 740 nm.	103
Figure 5.4. FLiES-SIF model simulated total SIF, scatter SIF, emit SIF based on the variation of understory reflectance at (a) 680 nm and (b) 740 nm.	103
Figure 5.5. FLiES-SIF model simulated total SIF, scatter SIF, emit SIF based on the variation of total chlorophyll content at (a) 680 nm and (b)740 nm.	104
Figure 5.6. The scenario I and II's understory reflectance influence on the SIF variation (a)-(d) and its proportion of total and emit SIF (e)-(h) at 680 nm and 740 nm.	106

Figure 5.7. The scenario I and II's fraction of vegetation cover influenced on the SIF variation (a)-(d) and its proportion of total and emitted SIF (e)-(h) at 680 nm and 740 nm. 107

Figure 5.8. The scenario I and II's leaf density influenced on the SIF variation (a)-(d) and its proportion of total and emitting SIF (e)-(h) at 680 nm and 740 nm. 108

Figure 5.9. Scenario I and II's total chlorophyll content influence on the SIF variation (a)-(d) and its proportion of total and emitted SIF (e)-(h) at 680 nm and 740 nm. 108

Figure 5.10. Variations of Red SIF as influenced by FVC, understory reflectance, and leaf density in scenario I. The points represent the average SIF value of given conditions. 110

Figure 5.11. Variations of Red SIF as influenced by FVC, understory reflectance and leaf density in scenario II. The points represent the average SIF value of given conditions. 110

Figure 5.12. Variations of far-red SIF was influenced by FVC, understory reflectance, and leaf density in scenario I. The points represent the average SIF value of given conditions. 111

Figure 5.13. Variations of far-red SIF was influenced by FVC, understory reflectance and leaf density in scenario II. The points represent the average SIF value of given conditions. 111

Figure 5.14. Variations of Red SIF was influenced by FVC, understory reflectance and total chlorophyll content in scenario I. The points represent the average SIF value of given conditions. 112

Figure 5.15. Variations of Red SIF as influenced by FVC, understory reflectance and total chlorophyll content in scenario II. The points represent the average SIF value of given conditions. 113

Figure 5.16. Variations of far-red SIF as influenced by FVC, understory reflectance and total chlorophyll content in scenario I. The points represent the average SIF value of given conditions.	113
Figure 5.17. Variations of far-red SIF as influenced by FVC, understory reflectance and total chlorophyll content in scenario II. The points represent the average SIF value of given conditions.	114
Figure 5.18. Relative importance analysis for Scenarios I and II	116

List of Tables

Table 1.1. Summary of SIF satellite data available	13
Table 2.1. The R ₂ and RMSE of the training group and validation group, which predicted by GPR model	29
Table 2.2. Settings for FLiES, SCOPE and DART model	30
Table 2.3. Correlation of determination of FLiES model, DART model, and SCOPE model simulated SIF with field measured SIF for sunny days and cloudy days, all p-value are less than 0.001.	37
Table 3.1. GPR trained and validated results	54
Table 3.2. Settings for FLiES-SIF model	55
Table 3.3. The PAR, SIF and Canopy cover for overstory and understory in AU-TTE, AU-LIT and AU-CUM.	66
Table 5.1. Database for FLiES-SIF model simulations	101
Table 5.2. The regression model for SIF and canopy structures and understory properties. X indicates red SIF or far-red SIF. SIF was the total of scenario I and II. All the p-value was less than 0.01.....	115

Abbreviations

1D	1 Dimensional
3D	3 Dimensional
APAR	Absorbed Photosynthetic Active Radiation
Biome-BGC	Biome BioGeochemical Cycles
BRDF	Bidirectional Reflectance Distribution Function
Cab	total chlorophyll content
Cca	Carotenoid content
Cd	leaf dry matter
CHM	Canopy Height Model
CI _{green}	green Chlorophyll Index
Cw	leaf water thickness
DART	Discrete Anisotropic Radiative Transfer
EF-matrix	Excited Fluorescence Matrices
ESA	European Space Agency
EVI	Enhanced Vegetation Index
FLD	Fraunhofer Line Discrimination
FLiES	Forest light environmental simulator
FluorWPS	Fluorescence model with Weighted Photon Spread method
FOV	Field Of View
fPAR	Fraction of Photosynthetically Active Radiation
fqeI	fluorescence quantum efficiency for photosystem I
fqeII	fluorescence quantum efficiency for photosystem II
FVC	Fraction of Vegetation Cover
GOME-2	Global Ozone Monitoring Experiment–2
GOSAT	Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite
GPP	Gross Primary Productivity
GPR	Gaussian Processes Regression
IA	Inner Antenna
LAI	Leaf Area Index
IGBP	International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme

LiDAR	Light Detection And Ranging
LUE	Light Use Efficiency
MODIS	MOderate resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer
N	leaf structure
NEE	Net Ecosystem Exchange
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index
NPQ	NonPhotochemical Quenching
OA	Outer Antenna
OCO-2	Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2
PAR	Photosynthetic Active Radiation
PRI	Photochemical Reflectance Index
PPFD	Photosynthetic Photon Flux Density
PSI	Photosystem I
PSII	Photosystem II
RBF	Radial-Basis Function
RMSE	Root Mean Square Error
RTM	Radiation Transfer Model
SAA	Solar Azimuth Angle
SCIAMACHY	SCanning Imaging Absorption SpectroMeter for Atmospheric CHartography
SCOPE	Soil Canopy Observation, Photochemistry and Energy fluxes
SFM	Spectral Fitting Method
SI	Scenario I
SIF	Sun-Induced chlorophyll Fluorescence
SII	Scenario II
SWC	Soil Water Content
SZA	Solar Zenith Angle
Ta	air Temperature
TOC	Top Of Canopy
TROPOMI	TROPOspheric Monitoring Instrument
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicles
VAA	View Azimuth Angle
VI	Vegetation Indices

V _{max}	Maximum Carboxylation Velocity
VPD	Vapour Pressure Deficit
VPM	Vegetation Photosynthesis Models
VZA	View Zenith Angle

Abstract

Recently, measurements of sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF) has become a new approach to estimate vegetation photosynthetic activity and detect vegetation stress. However, the environmental factors controlling SIF largely remain unknown for different vegetation biome types. In addition, SIF measured at the top of canopy (TOC) is confounded by interactions between solar radiation and vertical canopy structures. Hence, development of three-dimensional (3-D) radiative transfer models, capable of simulating SIF, would be of immense benefit to test and verify various hypotheses.

The goal of this thesis is to develop a new 3-D SIF model and apply it to assess the relationship between SIF and plant photosynthetic activity across different spatial and temporal scales. Specifically, I (1) developed a new SIF module for FLiES (Forest Light Environmental Simulator) model (FLiES-SIF) and validated it with SIF observations at the seasonal scale; (2) partitioned SIF signals to overstory and understory layers by using FLiES-SIF, and then analysed the impact of solar radiation and canopy structure on understory SIF; (3) normalized the OCO-2 SIF dataset at nadir, hotspot and darkspot viewing directions by using the FLiES model, and assessed the relationship between SIF and GPP; and (4) identified that SIF observed at the top of canopy was strongly influenced by understory reflectance and canopy structure.

Results showed (1) the TOC SIF simulated by FLiES-SIF was closely correlated with SIF observations at a forest test site, and its performance was better than a 1-D model (Soil Canopy Observation, Photochemistry and Energy fluxes, SCOPE) and 3-D model (Discrete anisotropic radiative Transfer, DART); (2) the SIF emitted from understory contributed more than 51 % to the total SIF in the wet season of a tropical savanna site, however, it only accounted for less than 10% of total SIF in an evergreen forest site; (3) SIF was most correlated with GPP in the hotspot direction, and the normalised SIF yield could better explain the variations of light use efficiency (LUE); (4) compared to canopy structure and leaf properties, the understory reflectance was the primary factor influencing the observed SIF at the top of the canopy.

This thesis highlights the advantage of FLiES-SIF in capturing vegetation photosynthetic activities of ecosystems with complex canopy structures. This will significantly improve

our understanding of vegetation responses to climate change, and this model can be implement for numerous related purposes.