

# Use of Selected Spectral Ratios to Assess the Response of Pineapple to Potassium Nutrition

Siva K. Balasundram<sup>1\*</sup>, Yen Mee Chong<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agriculture Technology, Faculty of Agriculture, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

Received: 20-06-2021;  
Accepted: 30-07-2021;  
Published: 30-09-2021

\*Correspondence  
Email: [siva@upm.edu.my](mailto:siva@upm.edu.my)  
(Siva K. Balasundram)

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by UiTM Press. This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



## Abstract

Potassium (K) nutrition in pineapple grown on tropical peat can be problematic due to high precipitation which encourages leaching losses. Non-destructive tools that can assess K deficiency and the accompanying changes in biophysical and biochemical properties within pineapple is a good strategy to employ. In this study, we assessed the biophysical changes in pineapple (var. MD2) in response to different K rates by using a hyperspectral approach. K deficiency was detected at 171 days after planting. Shortage of K also exhibited a shift in red edge towards shorter wavelengths between 500-700 nm. In addition, spectral ranges of 430-680 nm, as well as 680-752 nm were found to be most effective in differentiating spectral response to varying K rates. Three vegetation indices, i.e. Normalized Pigment Chlorophyll Index (NPCl), Plant Senescence Index (PSRI) and Red-edge Vegetation Index (RVSI) were found to best describe K treatment effects on pineapple canopy reflectance. This study could be extended further to include pineapple varieties other than MD2, and also key nutrients, such as N and P, for better fertilizer management in peat-grown pineapple.

## Keywords

K response; Spectral indices; Pineapple canopy reflectance

## 1 Introduction

Suboptimal soil fertility is one of the key factors which affect pineapple growth and yield in Malaysia. This is mainly due to the fact that pineapple in Malaysia is largely cultivated on peat and not on mineral soils like in other producer countries such as Thailand and the Philippines. Cultivation on peat brings upon nutrient leaching problems which rarely occur on mineral soils. This problem is most evident with potassium (K), a very mobile nutrient that is more prone to washout especially in the tropical region where precipitation can be as high as 3500 mm<sup>1,2</sup>. In addition, low clay content and the absence of mineral matter in peat makes K fixation very difficult even

with abundant exchangeable K in the soil<sup>3</sup>. Pineapple deficient in K can have problems such as reduced fruit mass, lesser fruit aroma, and decreased slip production which usually leads to leaf tip death and necrosis<sup>4</sup>.

Given the severity of K leaching on peat, many pineapple plantations have resorted to excessive fertilizer application to compensate for low K recovery, which may eventually get washed out from the soil and contaminate ground water and the environment<sup>5</sup>. The traditional approach of monitoring plant nutritional status, i.e., detailed sampling followed by laboratory chemical analyses, is economically and environmentally challenging given the large plantation acreage. The use of non-destructive remote sensing tools is a

promising approach to complement the monitoring of plant nutritional status. These tools have the ability to assess nutrient deficiency and the accompanying changes in biophysical and biochemical properties within crops. Studies of physiological alterations caused by nutrient stress can be effectively ascertained by comparing the spectral reflectance of healthy and nutrient-deficient plants. Stressed plants generally show a higher reflectance at the Photosynthetic Active Radiation (PAR) region (400-700 nm) and a much lower reflectance at the Near-Infrared (NIR) region (700-1200 nm)<sup>6</sup>. In a study conducted by Selvaraja et al.<sup>7</sup>, it was reported that reflectance ratios of 400-428 nm, 520-703 nm and 739-924 nm wavelength correlated strongly with K content in oil palm leaves.

With these reflectance ratios, vegetation indices that best describe crop nutritional status can be determined. Despite the abundance of studies on vegetation indices, an improvement of K-specific indices and its efficiency have not been a major focus of researchers in the past. This work was aimed at evaluating how vegetation indices correspond to different K rates in pineapple. Moreover, pineapple variety MD2 is a new hybrid which may not be suited to local peat soil and its response to fertilizer input can be different from that of the other varieties. Hence, this work has the potential to improve fertilizer recommendation by optimizing K use in pineapple cultivation. This is timely given the ever-increasing cost of K fertilizers. The approach undertaken in this study, however, may not allow for direct field implementation due to spatial and temporal variability in K response that can be commonly impacted by the crop-soil-environment continuum.

## 2 Materials and Method

### 2.1 Experimental Work

This work was conducted at an open farm space within Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. The area had a relative humidity ranging from 73 to 81% and a mean temperature of up to 27°C from

October, 2014 to January, 2015. All suckers of MD2 variety were pre-treated with fungicide before being potted on raised beds in double row, spaced at 0.6 × 0.6 m on the bed and 0.9 m apart within row in a randomized complete block design. The potting media used was commercial grade raw 'Peatgro' that had almost 95% similarity in terms of pH, total carbon, and bulk density under a decomposition regime of 'hemic' to the peat soil sampled from a commercial pineapple plantation located at Simpang Renggam, Johor (1° 49.909' N, 103° 4.053' E). Four different levels of K were applied as muriate of potash (60% K<sub>2</sub>O). Treatments comprised of the following: K0 (control with no fertilizer), K1(256 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), K2 (366 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and K3 (476 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Fertilizer K was applied in three splits at 3, 5 and 8 months after planting. The K rates used in this work conform to the commercial plantation practice, whereby 366 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> is the normal rate while 256 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> represents one standard deviation below the mean and 476 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> represents one standard deviation above the mean. Other nutrients were applied adequately for all pots via broadcast (Nitrogen = 110 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, Phosphorus = 50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) were applied in the form of urea (46% N) and triple superphosphate (46% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>), respectively.

### 2.2 Canopy Reflectance Measurement and Leaf K Determination

Plant canopy reflectance was measured once every week for a period of one month after the second and third fertilizer applications. A handheld spectroradiometer (Field Spec Pro; Analytical Spectral Devices, Boulder, Co, USA) was used to take spectral measurements at a height of 50 cm above plant canopy and 25° field of view under favorable weather conditions between 11.00 and 14.00 local time. Every ten reflectance measurements were averaged and recorded as the value of reflectance per plant. At the same time, the instrument was calibrated against a reference panel alternately using a white spectralon board mounted on a tripod. Spectral readings were processed using ViewSpec™ and

transferred to MS Excel for computation of six vegetation indices (formula given in Table 1). Following spectral measurements, the D-leaves of the same plant for each treatment were sampled and brought to the laboratory for analysis. The D-leaf is typically referred to as the most recently matured leaf with maximum physiological activity and is sampled during vegetative growth only. The D-leaf is usually the longest leaf and selected by gathering the upper blades with both hands. Usually, there are two to three leaves of similar length, commonly referred to as D-leaves. All samples were oven dried at 70°C until constant weights were obtained before determining the dry weights. Then K was extracted from the tissues by the dry ash method and K concentration was determined via atomic absorption spectrophotometry<sup>8</sup>. All data were subjected to analysis of variance and Duncan's New Multiple Range Test using SAS software. Normality of the distribution of standardized residuals for each variable was tested by using Shapiro-Wilk test at the 0.05 level of significance using Statistix software (Version 8.1).

### 3 Results and Discussion

The mean total K in pineapple leaves was compared across all treatments (Table 2). Results indicated that K concentration in pineapple leaves was significantly different on all three sampling dates ranging from 120 to 254 days after planting (DAP), with slight variation found in the K rates. K2 or the recommended rate by the plantation was found to be the optimum and was easily differentiated from the rest. Among the six vegetation indices evaluated in this study, three indices were found to be the best for discrimination of K rates (Table 3). The three best indices were Normalized Pigment Chlorophyll Ratio Index (NPCl), Plant Senescence Reflectance Index (PSRI) and Red-edge Vegetation Stress Index (RVSI). Descriptive statistics of these indices are given in Table 4.

From Table 3, it is clear that the performance of vegetation indices was

influenced by crop growth stage. Maximum differences in reflectance due to varied degree of K stress were observed at 157, 171 and 247 DAP for the three best indices mentioned above. The spectral range of 430-680 nm, as well as 680-752 nm showed the largest difference in crop response to K rates. Thus, these ranges are suitable in quantifying K stress in pineapple. The mean canopy reflectance of pineapple at 171 DAP was examined for reflectance patterns corresponding to different K treatments. Figure 1 shows the typical spectral reflectance of pineapple in response to K treatments, with striking similarity to that of N treatment effects (data not included in this paper). The reflectance is generally low in the visible spectrum, while K1 and K0 showed a much higher reflectance than the other two treatments. The reflectance started to rise rapidly in the near infrared region (700-1000 nm).

### 4 Conclusion

This work showed that K sufficiency/deficiency in pineapple can be effectively determined based on crop spectral response. Crop biophysical changes in response to different K rates were captured in the hyperspectral reflectance data. K deficiency with the highest variation was found at 171 DAP. The lack of K also showed a shift in the red edge towards shorter wavelengths between 500-700 nm. In addition, spectral ranges of 430-680 nm, as well as 680-752 nm were found to be the most effective in differentiating spectral response of varying K rates. By identifying these wavelengths, three vegetation indices including Normalized Pigment Chlorophyll Index (NPCl), Plant Senescence Index (PSRI) and Red-edge Vegetation Index (RVSI) were found to be the best in describing K treatment effects on crop canopy reflectance. This study could be extended further to include pineapple varieties other than MD2, and also key nutrients, such as N and P, for better fertilizer management in peat-grown pineapple.

Table 1. Spectral indices used in this study

Abbreviation	Index	Formulae	Reference
NPCI	Normalized Pigment Chlorophyll Ratio Index	$(R680 - R430)/(R680 + R430)$	Peñuelas et al. (1994) <sup>9</sup>
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index	$(RNIR - RR)/(RNIR + RR)$ , RNIR indicates 775-825 nm, RR indicates 650-700 nm	Rouse et al. (1973) <sup>10</sup>
NBNDVI	Narrow-band Normalized Difference Vegetation Index	$(R850 - R680)/(R850 + R680)$	Thenkabil et al. (2000) <sup>11</sup>
PSRI	Plant Senescence Reflectance Index	$(R680 - R500)/R750$	Merzlyak et al. (1999) <sup>12</sup>
RVSI	Red-edge Vegetation Stress Index	$[(R712 + R752)/2] - R732$	Merton and Huntington (1999) <sup>13</sup>
NDRE	Normalized Difference Red Edge Index	$(R790 - R720)/(R790 + R720)$	Barnes et al. (2000) <sup>14</sup>

Table 2. Treatment effects on leaf total K

Treatment	First Sampling (120 DAP)	Second Sampling (233 DAP)	Third Sampling (254 DAP)
K0	0.63 <sup>c</sup>	0.63 <sup>c</sup>	0.62 <sup>c</sup>
K1	0.87 <sup>b</sup>	0.85 <sup>b</sup>	0.71 <sup>c</sup>
K2	1.45 <sup>a</sup>	1.45 <sup>a</sup>	1.37 <sup>a</sup>
K3	0.89 <sup>b</sup>	0.91 <sup>b</sup>	0.89 <sup>b</sup>

\*Values followed by the same letters in the same column are not significantly different at  $p=0.05$

Table 3. Spectral vegetation indices across different treatments at different crop growth stages

Treatment	Growth Stage (DAP)							
	143	157	164	171	178	233	247	254
Normalized Pigment Chlorophyll Ratio Index (NPCI)								
K0	0.177 <sup>ab</sup>	0.134 <sup>c</sup>	0.037 <sup>d</sup>	0.118 <sup>c</sup>	0.014 <sup>c</sup>	0.013 <sup>b</sup>	0.040 <sup>c</sup>	0.042 <sup>a</sup>
K1	0.134 <sup>b</sup>	0.207 <sup>b</sup>	0.070 <sup>c</sup>	0.142 <sup>bc</sup>	0.076 <sup>b</sup>	0.039 <sup>bc</sup>	0.114 <sup>b</sup>	0.054 <sup>a</sup>
K2	0.197 <sup>a</sup>	0.253 <sup>ab</sup>	0.112 <sup>b</sup>	0.181 <sup>b</sup>	0.110 <sup>b</sup>	0.083 <sup>b</sup>	0.170 <sup>a</sup>	0.071 <sup>a</sup>
K3	0.144 <sup>b</sup>	0.261 <sup>a</sup>	0.165 <sup>a</sup>	0.285 <sup>a</sup>	0.231 <sup>a</sup>	0.149 <sup>a</sup>	0.214 <sup>a</sup>	0.107 <sup>a</sup>
Plant Senescence Reflectance Index (PSRI)								
K0	0.009 <sup>d</sup>	0.051 <sup>c</sup>	0.002 <sup>b</sup>	0.006 <sup>c</sup>	0.004 <sup>c</sup>	0.004 <sup>b</sup>	0.008 <sup>b</sup>	0.003 <sup>a</sup>
K1	0.012 <sup>c</sup>	0.059 <sup>bc</sup>	0.003 <sup>b</sup>	0.015 <sup>b</sup>	0.013 <sup>b</sup>	0.009 <sup>ab</sup>	0.011 <sup>ab</sup>	0.009 <sup>a</sup>
K2	0.018 <sup>a</sup>	0.071 <sup>a</sup>	0.006 <sup>a</sup>	0.028 <sup>a</sup>	0.025 <sup>a</sup>	0.018 <sup>a</sup>	0.012 <sup>ab</sup>	0.007 <sup>a</sup>
K3	0.015 <sup>b</sup>	0.064 <sup>ab</sup>	0.008 <sup>a</sup>	0.017 <sup>b</sup>	0.018 <sup>ab</sup>	0.010 <sup>ab</sup>	0.021 <sup>a</sup>	0.009 <sup>a</sup>
Narrow Band Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NBNDVI)								
K0	0.872 <sup>a</sup>	0.688 <sup>a</sup>	0.869 <sup>b</sup>	0.773 <sup>a</sup>	0.845 <sup>a</sup>	0.853 <sup>a</sup>	0.850 <sup>b</sup>	0.902 <sup>a</sup>
K1	0.870 <sup>a</sup>	0.679 <sup>a</sup>	0.894 <sup>a</sup>	0.800 <sup>a</sup>	0.886 <sup>a</sup>	0.884 <sup>a</sup>	0.887 <sup>a</sup>	0.867 <sup>a</sup>
K2	0.880 <sup>a</sup>	0.777 <sup>a</sup>	0.896 <sup>a</sup>	0.802 <sup>a</sup>	0.872 <sup>a</sup>	0.880 <sup>a</sup>	0.890 <sup>a</sup>	0.884 <sup>a</sup>
K3	0.876 <sup>a</sup>	0.752 <sup>a</sup>	0.890 <sup>ab</sup>	0.788 <sup>a</sup>	0.891 <sup>a</sup>	0.892 <sup>a</sup>	0.895 <sup>a</sup>	0.869 <sup>a</sup>
Red-edge Vegetation Stress Index (RVSI)								
K0	-0.024 <sup>a</sup>	-0.135 <sup>a</sup>	-0.045 <sup>b</sup>	-0.052 <sup>a</sup>	-0.025 <sup>a</sup>	-0.036 <sup>b</sup>	-0.040 <sup>b</sup>	-0.033 <sup>a</sup>
K1	-0.026 <sup>a</sup>	-0.152 <sup>ab</sup>	-0.036 <sup>a</sup>	-0.030 <sup>a</sup>	-0.026 <sup>a</sup>	-0.028 <sup>a</sup>	-0.031 <sup>ab</sup>	-0.038 <sup>a</sup>
K2	-0.035 <sup>b</sup>	-0.174 <sup>b</sup>	-0.045 <sup>ab</sup>	-0.041 <sup>a</sup>	-0.035 <sup>b</sup>	-0.030 <sup>ab</sup>	-0.032 <sup>ab</sup>	-0.035 <sup>a</sup>
K3	-0.034 <sup>b</sup>	-0.165 <sup>b</sup>	0.038 <sup>ab</sup>	-0.014 <sup>a</sup>	-0.032 <sup>ab</sup>	-0.027 <sup>a</sup>	-0.026 <sup>a</sup>	-0.040 <sup>a</sup>
Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)								
K0	0.876 <sup>a</sup>	0.704 <sup>a</sup>	0.873 <sup>b</sup>	0.823 <sup>a</sup>	0.850 <sup>a</sup>	0.855 <sup>a</sup>	0.858 <sup>b</sup>	0.906 <sup>a</sup>
K1	0.874 <sup>a</sup>	0.695 <sup>a</sup>	0.899 <sup>a</sup>	0.844 <sup>a</sup>	0.892 <sup>a</sup>	0.886 <sup>a</sup>	0.895 <sup>a</sup>	0.871 <sup>a</sup>
K2	0.883 <sup>a</sup>	0.792 <sup>a</sup>	0.900 <sup>a</sup>	0.847 <sup>a</sup>	0.877 <sup>a</sup>	0.882 <sup>a</sup>	0.897 <sup>a</sup>	0.887 <sup>a</sup>
K3	0.879 <sup>a</sup>	0.767 <sup>a</sup>	0.893 <sup>ab</sup>	0.837 <sup>a</sup>	0.894 <sup>a</sup>	0.893 <sup>a</sup>	0.901 <sup>a</sup>	0.873 <sup>a</sup>
Normalized Difference Red Edge Index (NDRE)								
K0	0.225 <sup>b</sup>	0.097 <sup>b</sup>	0.232 <sup>b</sup>	0.292 <sup>b</sup>	0.221 <sup>b</sup>	0.229 <sup>b</sup>	0.221 <sup>b</sup>	0.325 <sup>a</sup>
K1	0.301 <sup>a</sup>	0.154 <sup>a</sup>	0.308 <sup>a</sup>	0.389 <sup>a</sup>	0.335 <sup>a</sup>	0.339 <sup>a</sup>	0.339 <sup>a</sup>	0.271 <sup>a</sup>
K2	0.280 <sup>a</sup>	0.185 <sup>a</sup>	0.336 <sup>a</sup>	0.365 <sup>a</sup>	0.297 <sup>a</sup>	0.320 <sup>a</sup>	0.328 <sup>a</sup>	0.291 <sup>a</sup>
K3	0.314 <sup>a</sup>	0.176 <sup>a</sup>	0.343 <sup>a</sup>	0.379 <sup>a</sup>	0.328 <sup>a</sup>	0.339 <sup>a</sup>	0.342 <sup>a</sup>	0.197 <sup>b</sup>

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for the three best spectral indices at different growth stages

Date	DAP	Min	Max	Mean	Std Error	CV (%)
<b>Normalized Pigment Chlorophyll Ratio Index (NPCI)</b>						
14/1/2015	143	0.116	0.244	0.163	0.010	25
28/1/2014	157	0.108	0.306	0.214	0.010	27
4/2/2015	164	0.023	0.191	0.096	0.013	54
11/2/2015	171	0.065	0.351	0.182	0.018	40
18/2/2015	178	0.003	0.294	0.108	0.021	79
14/4/2015	233	0.004	0.207	0.071	0.015	84
28/4/2015	247	0.025	0.264	0.134	0.018	54
5/5/2015	254	0.016	0.195	0.069	0.013	75
<b>Plant Senescence Reflectance Index (PSRI)</b>						
14/1/2015	143	0.007	0.020	0.014	0.001	26
28/1/2015	157	0.040	0.075	0.061	0.002	14
4/2/2015	164	0.001	0.012	0.005	0.001	66
11/2/2015	171	0.003	0.037	0.017	0.002	56
18/2/2015	178	0.002	0.030	0.015	0.002	61
14/4/2015	233	0.0003	0.024	0.010	0.002	77
28/4/2015	247	0.004	0.034	0.013	0.002	61
5/5/2015	254	0.001	0.016	0.007	0.001	75
<b>Red-edge Vegetation Stress Index (RVSI)</b>						
14/1/2015	143	-0.038	-0.021	-0.030	0.001	20
28/1/2015	157	-0.205	-0.116	-0.157	0.005	13
4/2/2015	164	-0.051	-0.028	-0.041	0.001	14
11/2/2015	171	-0.101	-0.007	-0.034	0.008	35
18/2/2015	178	-0.047	-0.023	-0.029	0.002	22
14/4/2015	233	-0.040	-0.019	-0.030	0.001	19
28/4/2015	247	-0.043	-0.009	-0.032	0.002	28
5/5/2015	254	-0.049	-0.028	-0.037	0.001	14




Figure 1. Canopy reflectance of pineapple under four rates of K at 171 days after planting

## Conflict of Interest

The authors report no financial or any other conflicts of interest in this work.

## Acknowledgment

We are grateful to Peninsula Plantation, Simpang Renggam, Johor and Soil Fertility Laboratory, Department of Land Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia for the contribution of MD2 suckers and soil analyses, respectively.

## References

1. Ahmed, O. H., Ahmad, H. M., Musa, H. M., Rahim, A. A., & Rastan, S. O. (2005). Applied K fertilizer uses efficiency in pineapples grown on tropical peat soil under residue removal. *Scientific World Journal*, 5, 42-49.
2. Ahmed, O. H., Ahmad, H. M., Rahim, A. A., & Musa, M. H. (2013). *Sustainable production of pineapples on tropical peat soils*. Universiti Putra Malaysia Press, Serdang, Selangor.
3. Ahmed, O. H., Husni, M. H. A., Hanafi, M. M., Anuar, A. R., & Omar, S. R. Syed (2007). Phosphorus fertilizer use in pineapple cultivation with *in situ* residues burning on organic soils, *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, 38(9-10), 1243-1254.
4. Hawkesford, M., Horst, W., Kichey, T., Lambers, H., Schjoerning, J., Møller, I. S., & White, P. (2012). Chapter 6-Functions of Macronutrients. In *Marschner's Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants* (Third ed., pp. 135-189). Academic Press, San Diego.
5. Zhao, R. F., Chen, X. P., Zhang, F. S., Zhang, H. I., Schroder, J., & Römheld, V. (2006). Fertilization and nitrogen balance in a wheat-maize rotation system in North China. *Agronomy Journal*, 98(4), 938-945.
6. Xu, H. R., Ying, Y. B., Fu, X. P., & Zhu, S. P. (2007). Near-infrared spectroscopy in detecting leaf miner damage on tomato leaf. *Biosystems Engineering*, 96(4), 447-454.
7. Selvaraja, S., Balasundram, S. K., Vadamalai, G., & Husni, M. H. A. (2013). Use of spectral reflectance to discriminate between potassium deficiency and orange spotting symptoms in oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis*). *Life Science Journal*, 10(4), 947-951.
8. Walsh, L. M., Dinaeur, R. C., & Wilson, B. B. (1971). *Instrumental Methods for Analysis of Soils and Plant Tissue*. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, Wisconsin USA.
9. Peñuelas, J., Gamon, J. A., Fredeen, A. L., Merino, J., & Field, C. B. (1994). Reflectance indices associated with physiological changes in nitrogen- and water-limited sunflower leaves. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 48(2), 135-146.
10. Rouse, J. W., Haas, R. H., Schell, J. A., & Deering, D. W. (1974). Monitoring vegetation systems in the Great Plains with ERTS. Paper presented at *the Third Earth Resources Technology Satellite-1 Symposium- Vol. I*, Technical Presentations. NASA SP-351, Stanley C. Fredeen, Enrico P. Mercanti, and Margaret A. Becker (eds), pp.309, NASA, Washington, D.C.
11. Thenkabil, P. S., Smith, R. B., & De Pauw, E. (2000). Hyperspectral vegetation indices and their relationships with agricultural crop characteristics. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 71(2), 158-182.
12. Merzlyak, M. N., Gitelson, A. A., Chivkunova, O. B., & Rakitin, V. Y. U. (1999). Non-destructive optical detection of pigment changes during leaf senescence and fruit ripening. *Physiologia Plantarum*, 106(1), 135-141.
13. Merton, R. N., & Huntington, J. (8-14 February 1999). Early simulation results of the ARIES-1 satellite sensor for multi-temporal vegetation research derived from AVIRIS. In *the Eighth Annual JPL Airborne Earth Science Workshop*, NASA Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, USA.
14. Barnes, E., Clarke, T., Richards, S., Colaizzi, P., Haberland, J., Kostrzewski, M., Waller, P., Choi, C., Riley, E., & Thompson, T. (2000). Coincident detection of crop water stress, nitrogen status and canopy density using ground based multispectral data. In *the 5th International Conference on Precision Agriculture*, Bloomington, Minnesota, USA.