

# Hyperspectral measurements of yellow rust and fusarium head blight in cereal crops: Part 1: Laboratory study

Rebecca L Whetton<sup>a</sup>, Kirsty L Hassall<sup>b</sup>, Toby W Waine<sup>a</sup>, and Abdul M Mouazen<sup>c\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Cranfield Soil and AgriFood Institute, Cranfield University, Bedfordshire MK43 0AL, UK.

<sup>b</sup>Department of Computational and Analytical Sciences, Rothamsted research, Harpenden, Hertfordshire AL5 2JQ

<sup>c</sup>Department of Soil Management, Ghent University, Coupure 653, 9000 Gent, Belgium.

E-mail of corresponding author: [Abdul.Mouazen@UGent.be](mailto:Abdul.Mouazen@UGent.be)

## Abstract

This paper assesses the potential use of a hyperspectral camera for measurement of yellow rust and fusarium head blight in wheat and barley canopy under laboratory conditions. Scanning of crop canopy in trays occurred between anthesis growth stage 60, and hard dough growth stage 87. Visual assessment was made at four levels, namely, at the head, at the flag leaves, at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> leaves, and at the lower canopy. Partial least squares regression (PLSR) analyses were implemented separately on data captured at four growing stages to establish separate calibration models to predict the percentage coverage of yellow rust and fusarium head blight infection. Results showed that the standard deviation between 500 and 650 nm and the squared difference between 650 and 700 nm wavelengths were found to be significantly different between healthy and infected canopy particularly for yellow rust in both crops, whereas the effect of water-stress was generally found to be unimportant. The PLSR yellow rust models were of good prediction capability for 6 out of 8 growing stages, a very good prediction at early milk stage in wheat and a moderate prediction at the late milk development stage in barley. For fusarium, predictions were very good for seven growing stages and of good performance for anthesis growing stage in wheat, with best performing for the milk development stages. However, the root mean square error of predictions for yellow rust were almost half of those for fusarium, suggesting higher prediction accuracies for yellow rust measurement under laboratory conditions.

## Key words

Yellow rust (*Puccinia striiformis*), fusarium head blight (*Fusarium graminearum*), wheat, barley, crop canopy, partial least squares regression.

## 291 Introduction

30 With the world's population estimated to reach 9 billion by 2050, sustainable approaches to increase  
31 crop yield are a necessity (Hole *et al.*, 2005; Godfray *et al.*, 2010). Current farming practices are  
32 unsustainable, relying on external inputs and high-yield varieties susceptible to disease (Hole *et al.*,  
33 2005). Site specific management of inputs would reduce the amount required (Wittery and Mallarino  
34 2004; Maleki *et al.*, 2007). Among these resources, fungicide application may well be reduced by  
35 targeted site specific spraying (FRAC 2010). However, accurate measurement of fungal diseases is a  
36 main requirement for sustainable application of fungicides, and expected to contribute to the reduction  
37 and prevention of the spread of crop disease and the losses of quantity and quality incurred from them.

38 Fungal disease control is a large task for a successful production of cereals worldwide. Both yellow  
39 rust and fusarium are fungal diseases which infect small cereal crops, and are responsible for causing  
40 severe yield losses (De Vallavieille-Pope *et al.*, 1995; Bravo *et al.*, 2003). Yellow rust caused by  
41 *Puccinia striiformis* is a foliar disease, which can reduce crop yields by up to 40%. Alternatively known  
42 as stripe rust, the pathogen produces yellow uredo spores on the leaves. Infection starts with chlorosis  
43 occurring parallel to leaf veins, in a narrow 2 mm wide stripe, which develops later into multiple yellow  
44 coloured rust pustules (De Vallavieille-Pope *et al.*, 1995). Disease presence can vary considerably  
45 between plants. In severe epidemics the yield can be reduced by up to 7 tonne ha<sup>-1</sup> (Bravo *et al.*, 2003).  
46 Fusarium head blight is one of the most important pre-harvest diseases worldwide, reducing yield  
47 quantity and quality. The most aggressive and prevalent fusarium strain is *Fusarium graminearum*,  
48 which is a highly pathogenic strain producing mycotoxins, which can become a significant threat to  
49 both humans and animals. Fusarium head blight symptoms in wheat and barley appear in the head and  
50 peduncle tissues, causing discolouration and early senescence. Disease presence can vary considerably  
51 between plants (Desjardin, 2006; Brennan *et al.*, 2005; Leslie and Summerell, 2006; Rotter *et al.*, 1996),  
52 hence, it is required to adopt site specific treatments of fungal diseases.

53 Advanced methods for disease detection in crops are vital for improving the efficacy of treatment,  
54 reducing infection and minimising the losses to yield and quality. Traditionally, disease detection is  
55 carried out manually, which is costly, time consuming and requires relevant expertise (Schmale &  
56 Bergstrom, 2003; Bock *et al.*, 2010a). Alternative methods of detection are needed to enable mapping  
57 the spatial distribution of yellow rust and fusarium head blight. Among those methods, optical sensing  
58 methods are recommended candidates since they are non-destructive and allow for fast and repeated data  
59 acquisition throughout the growing season without inhibiting crop growth. It was recognised by West *et al.*,  
60 (2003) that although optical technologies are available for development into suitable disease

61 detection systems, many challenges are still needed to be overcome, and this is still arguably the case.  
62 Spectroscopy and imaging techniques have been used in disease and stress monitoring (Hahn, 2009).  
63 One of the optical methods reportedly used to measure disease in crops is hyperspectral imaging in  
64 the visible (vis) and/or the near infrared (NIR) spectral ranges. The reflectance at visible wavelength  
65 range is relevant to leaf pigmentation whilst the infrared wavelength range provides information  
66 on the physiological condition of the plant. The wavelength function for light intensity in  
67 hyperspectral imaging adds to the brightness information of the spectral image, providing a rapid  
68 image-contrast (Huang *et al.*, 2007). Within the visible spectrum, the radiation reflectance from an  
69 environmentally stressed plant will increase. This is due to an increase in the incidence reflection  
70 within the leaf of a stressed plant (Cibula and Carter, 1992). Bélanger *et al.*, (2008) showed that disease  
71 could be quantified on detached leaves, and reported that the ratio of blue (near 440 nm) over green (near  
72 520 nm) intensities between the healthy and diseased tissue was significantly different shortly after  
73 inoculation. Using a vis-NIR imaging, Bravo *et al.*, (2003) detected early symptoms of yellow rust on  
74 winter wheat, with a quadratic discriminant model analysis, reporting a correct discrimination accuracy  
75 of 92–98%. To our knowledge none of the above studies incorporated the effect of water stress, in the  
76 prediction model of yellow rust and fusarium head blight intensity in cereal crops. Some studies have  
77 focused on bringing the technology to the field. However, the first step towards field application is to  
78 test the accuracy of the methods under laboratory conditions (allowing more control and observation  
79 of the crop), where disease and water stress are accounted for simultaneously.

80 The aim of this paper is to assess the potential implementation and performance of a hyperspectral  
81 imager for recognition of yellow rust and fusarium head blight diseases in winter wheat and winter  
82 barley under laboratory conditions, with the intention to establish calibration models and a spectral library  
83 for potential use under mobile on-line measurement conditions. Both diseases (yellow rust and fusarium  
84 head blight) and water stress were introduced and accounted for.

85

## 86 **2 Materials and methods**

### 87 **2.1 Wheat and Barley cultivation and inoculation**

88 Treated seeds of winter wheat *Triticum sativum* (Solstice variety) and winter barley *Hordeum*  
89 *vulgare* L. (Carat Variety) were grown outdoors in 600 x 400 mm trays (depth of 120 mm), with 100  
90 seeds evenly sown and spaced in 5 parallel lines. After seeding the trays were predominantly rain fed,  
91 to reduce input of excess salts from treated tap water. Three treatments were adopted, where each  
92 treatment was triplicated in three separate trays. A total of 18 trays of wheat, and 18 trays of barley  
93 were grown for each of the following three treatments:

94 1) Treatment 1 – Healthy: consisting of six trays of each that were kept healthy by applying a broad  
95 spectrum fungicide (Rubric and Epoxiconazole, at a rate of 1 l ha<sup>-1</sup>).

96 2) Treatment 2 – Naturally (non-inoculated) yellow rust infected: consisting of six trays that were  
97 not treated with fungicide, as these were to represent the more heavily infected yellow rust trays, and  
98 were not inoculated with fusarium.

99 3) Treatment 3 – Fusarium inoculated: consisting of six trays of each that were infected with fusarium  
100 as the crop first reached anthesis growing stage (Figure 1).

101 When the crop growth reached ‘booting’ growth stage 45 on the Zadoks scale (Zadoks *et al.*, 1974),  
102 half of trays in each treatment were water stressed using a transparent tarpaulin and water content was  
103 monitored throughout the growing season using a moisture-probe ML3 Thetakit (Delta-T Devices Ltd,  
104 Cambridge, UK). Yellow rust occurred naturally in the crops as early as growth stage 30. Therefore,  
105 half of the crop trays were treated early with fungicide to fulfil treatments 2 and 3. This allowed for a  
106 difference in intensity of yellow rust disease. Fusarium inoculation was applied to trays in treatment  
107 3 at the anthesis crop growth stage. The spores were first cultivated in the laboratory by using the  
108 following method. A 2% wheat agar was produced using 100 ml distilled water, with 2 g agar and 2 g  
109 milled wheat. This was autoclaved at 120°C. Plates were poured to a consistent depth, and  
110 inoculated with *Fusarium graminearum*. The plates were grown for 5-7 days under UV light as this  
111 was shown to help cause sporulation (Leach, 1967). The agar plates were subsequently agitated with  
112 distilled water to suspend the spores with the concentration increased as necessary by gentle use  
113 of the centrifuge. Spore concentrations were standardised at approximately 10<sup>6</sup> ml<sup>-1</sup> using  
114 serial dilutions and a haemocytometer. Every 1 m<sup>2</sup> of crop ear was inoculated with 100 ml of the  
115 suspension, which is an adapted method from Lacey (1999). These trays were then kept under a high  
116 humidity conditions for 24 hours.

117  
118 **2.2 Disease assessments**

119 A common approach for disease assessments and general crop health is by visual inspection known as  
120 diagnosis (Oberti *et al.*, 2014 ). Chiarappa (1981) defined two distinct quantitative disease  
121 measurements: 1) Disease incidence, which is the percentage of infected plants to the healthy and 2)  
122 Disease severity, which is the amount of expressed disease tissue of a plant. These disease parameters  
123 can be assessed objectively, with some potential risk of subjectivity. In the current work, we  
124 considered the disease severity measured as % coverage. Each tray was assessed for both diseases at

four levels, namely, at the head (when present), at the flag leaves, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> leaves (mid canopy), and at the lower canopy, as explained next;

1) For fusarium infection, only the head of the crop was assessed, since fusarium head blight symptoms in wheat and barley usually only appear in the head and peduncle tissues, causing discolouration and early senescence. Earlier visual symptoms consist of a characteristic purple/pink discolouration. The seed from fusarium head blight affected crop is often shrunken, with a bleached appearance (Andersen, 1948; Goswami and Kistler, 2004; McMullen *et al.*, 1997; Parry *et al.*, 1995). Impey (2012) confirmed the presence of fusarium leaf lesions in Herefordshire, the leaf lesions are very unusual, and found only in heavy infections.

The assessment of fusarium head blight considered both early and later symptoms. During the course of the study the wheat and barley ears were categorized as healthy (0% infected), early infection, where ears showed early symptoms with half the ears expressing late symptoms (around 50% infected), high infection (around 75% infected) and full infection, where all the ears in the inoculated trays showed late symptoms (around 100% infected).

2) For yellow rust infection, the three foliar levels were assessed for percent coverage of yellow rust lesions. Infection starts with chlorosis occurring parallel to leaf veins, in a narrow 2 mm wide stripe, developing into multiple yellow coloured rust pustules (De Vallavieille-Pope *et al.*, 1995). Average disease coverage was given for all the plants in the assessment area at the three different stages. As it's needed for each ground truth plot to have a singular assessment for the later analysis, the data from each stage was combined and weighted appropriately according to HGCA (2008) recommendations; that 80% of a wheat yield can be calculated from the top 3 leaves (Figure 2).

### 2.3 Hyperspectral data capture

A push broom hyperspectral imager (spectrograph) (HS spectral camera model from Gilden Photonics Ltd., UK) was used to capture high-resolution (1,608 pixels) line images over 1 second, using a diode array detector. It is a 12 bit Basler piA 1600-35 gm camera, with Schneider-Kreuznach XNP1.4/23 lens and has a pixel pitch of 7.4  $\mu\text{m}$  interpolated/averaged to 0.6 nm readings with a spectral range of 400 - 1000 nm. The reflected light from the target travels through the lens, past an entrance slit through a series of inspector optics in the spectrograph and then split by the prism dispersing element into different wavelengths. This sensor was chosen for its potential for being applied to crop canopy measurements, and was of a lower price compared to comparable sensors, commercially available in the market.

157 The spectral data was captured at three separate places along the crop tray at slightly different positions.  
158 Captured in the form of a line array, each pixel has a spectrum and one detector per pixel across the  
159 swath. In order to compile a full image, every line across a target must be captured (Gilden  
160 Photonics Ltd, Glasgow, UK). When configured on a consistent moving platform, the imager  
161 sweeps across an area to build up an image. Due to practical constraints of applying a consistent  
162 moving platform, the spectraSENS v3.3 (Gilden Photonics Ltd, Glasgow, UK) software was adapted  
163 to record a single line array, which required an additional RGB photo taken by a 5 megapixel camera  
164 with a 3.85 mm f/2.8 lens at the same time of image capture, so that the scanned area could be  
165 comprehended. Two laser pointers were added at each side of the hyperspectral imager to indicate the  
166 area of the canopy to be scanned (Figure 3). The laser pointers were shut off when the spectral image  
167 was captured to remove any interference. The collected scans were corrected by means of a dark  
168 and a white reference (spectralon 99% white reflectance panel) providing the relative reflectance. The  
169 latter was used before spectral capture, and at 10 minute intervals until scanning was completed. The  
170 optimal configuration of the push broom hyperspectral imager including light sources was  
171 optimised in the laboratory (Whetton *et al.*, 2016). A schematic illustration of the configurations can be  
172 observed in Figure 3, where two 500 watt diffused broad spectrum halogen lamps were positioned at  
173 either end of the crop sample tray. Light angle was kept constant at 45°, which is suggested as the optimal  
174 angle to provide the strongest response (Huadong, 2001). The optimal configuration adopted included  
175 integration time, light height, light distance, camera height, and camera angle, of 50 ms, 1.2 m, 1.2 m,  
176 0.3 m and 10°, respectively (Whetton *et al.*, 2016). These configurations were used in the current work,  
177 for crop canopy scanning that started at booting growth stage 60 on Zadok's scale and continued until  
178 reaching ripening at growth stage 87. Four scans collected at four growth stages are considered in this  
179 study for both wheat and barley: 1) at anthesis (GS 60), 2) at kernel development; early milk (GS 72),  
180 3) at kernel development; late milk (GS 77), and 4) hard dough (GS 87) (Table 1).

## 181 **2.4 Data pre-processing and modelling**

182

183 If the spectral data are too noisy there is a risk that key features of the spectrum are hidden, which  
184 necessitates smoothing to remove noise. But, aggressive smoothing can also remove significant  
185 features (Dasu & Johnson, 2003), hence the need for a gentle smoothing to avoid losing of useful  
186 spectral features. Furthermore, a noisy spectrum can result in poor model performance, due to noise  
187 being considered a feature. Thus, the first step towards successful measurement should be to obtain a  
188 good quality spectrum. This was ensured in the current work by adopting the optimal configurations  
189 established in Whetton *et al.*, (2016). The three lines of captured spectral data from each tray at each

190 time were averaged first, before they were linked with the visual crop assessment. The spectral range  
191 outside of the 400 to 750 nm range was removed as it was noisy. The first and last 320 pixels from each  
192 line scan were removed due to variation and risk of overlapping the crop to the surrounding background.  
193 Both these pre-processing steps of the data are in line with Whetton *et al.*, (2016). The spectral data  
194 was averaged to reduce the number of wavelengths (variables), which was successively followed by  
195 maximum normalisation, Savitzky–Golay first derivative and smoothing (Mouazen *et al.*, 2006).  
196 Maximum normalisation is typically used to get all data to approximately the same scale, or to get a  
197 more even distribution of the variances and the average values. The maximum normalisation is a  
198 normalisation that “polarizes” the spectra. The peaks of all spectra with positive values scale to +1,  
199 while spectra with negative values scale to -1. Since all soil spectra in this study have positive values,  
200 the peaks of these spectra scaled to +1. This scaled spectra between 0 and +1. Using the Savitzky–  
201 Golay first derivative enables the computation of the first or higher-order derivatives, including a  
202 smoothing factor, which determines how many adjacent variables will be used to estimate the  
203 polynomial approximation used for derivatives. A second order polynomial approximation was  
204 selected. A 2:2 smoothing was carried out after the first derivative to decrease noise from the measured  
205 spectra. All pre-processing steps were carried out using Unscrambler 10 software (Camo Inc.; Oslo,  
206 Norway).

207 Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyse two spectral indices captured at growth stage  
208 72. A factorial treatment structure was incorporated to test for differences between disease type  
209 (healthy, fusarium, yellow rust), water treatment (watered, water-stressed) and crop type (barley,  
210 wheat). In addition, a contrast was used to test for differences between healthy and diseased trays and  
211 between the different diseases. Analysis of the index SD was done on a log scale, whilst analysis of  
212 SQdiff was done on a sqrt scale to ensure homoscedascity of variance. GenStat 18<sup>th</sup> Edition (© VSN  
213 International Ltd, Hemel Hempstead, UK) was used to compute the ANOVA tables.

214 Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to investigate the multivariate hyperspectral  
215 response over the different scanning intervals for barley and wheat data separately. The first two  
216 principal components accounted for 92% of the variation in both the barley and wheat data.  
217 Consequently, for both crops, PCA provides a reasonable summary of the hyperspectral response  
218 in two dimensions.

219 Separate PLSR analyses were applied to each of the four scanning intervals to establish quantitative  
220 models to predict yellow rust and fusarium head blight infection (Table 1). This means that for  
221 each crop four PLSR analyses were carried out. Before PLSR analysis, data were divided into two sets  
222 of 80% (e.g., 43 samples) and 20% (e.g., 11 samples), representing the calibration and prediction

223 data sets (Tables 2 and 3), respectively. The pre-processed spectra and visual assessments of yellow  
224 rust and fusarium head blight of the calibration dataset were subjected to PLSR with leave-one-out  
225 full cross-validation to establish calibration models. The performance of these models was  
226 evaluated by predicting crop disease using the prediction dataset. Separate models for wheat and  
227 barley were developed and evaluated for yellow rust and fusarium head blight. The following models  
228 were developed and validated:

229 1) Yellow rust prediction in wheat and barley, estimated as % of disease symptoms spread on the leaves.  
230 This was referred to as yellow rust % coverage.

231 2) Fusarium head blight prediction in wheat and barley, estimated as % of infected ears. This was  
232 referred to as fusarium % coverage.

233 For both models, a logit transformation of the % coverage response was applied to ensure  
234 homoscedascity of variance. The inverse LOGIT function ( $\exp(p)/(1+\exp(p))$ ) was applied before  
235 assessment of the prediction results. PLSR analysis was carried out using Unscrambler 10 software  
236 (Camo Inc.; Oslo, Norway). Outliers were detected, and removed to a maximum of 5% of the total  
237 input data. The model performance was evaluated in cross-validation and prediction by means of  
238 coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), root mean square error of prediction (RMSEP) and ratio of  
239 prediction deviation (RPD), which equals standard deviation divided by the RMSEP. In order to  
240 compare between the performances of the developed models we proposed classifying RPD values into  
241 the classes mentioned in Table 4. The entire pre-processed spectrum was used in both the PCA and  
242 PLSR analyses.

### 243 **3 Results and discussion**

#### 244 **3.1 Crop canopy spectra**

245  
246 Example of crop canopy spectra for wheat and barley are shown in Figure 4. The spectral signatures  
247 were selected to demonstrate clearly the variations in shape. An arrows have been added to highlight  
248 wavelengths that define spectrum regions containing the most visible variation between the two crops.  
249 In Figure 4, wheat has higher reflectance. This may be due to the particular spectrum selected, as  
250 generally the reflectance intensities of wheat and barley were witnessed to be similar. However, it may  
251 also be attributed to the larger leaf area of wheat, which reflected more light than barley, which has  
252 smaller surface area. Within the visible range of 400–550 nm, there is low reflectance due to larger



253 absorption of the light, attributed to the photosynthetic pigments of the plant leaves, governed by the  
254 abundance of chlorophyll, which absorbs most of the light radiation (Gates *et al.*, 1965; Thomas &  
255 Gausman, 1977). Both plant chlorophylls and carotenoids have strong absorption at 480 nm, the  
256 waveband associated with blue colour (Hunt *et al.*, 2013). Another interesting band at 670 nm  
257 (associated with red colour band at 680 nm) can be linked with chlorophyll a absorption that also  
258 appears at 550 nm (Hunt *et al.*, 2013). The latter wavelength is designated as the green leaf reflectance  
259 (Buscaglia and Varco, 2002 and Zhao *et al.*, 2005). The strongest absorption wavelength band appears  
260 at the red edge around 715 nm, with deeper absorption in the barley spectrum than in wheat. Raper  
261 and Varco (2015) found that the strongest wavelength correlations with leaf nitrogen concentration,  
262 yield and plant total nitrogen content are near 700 nm. Further analysis of these bands as linked with  
263 crop diseases studied is discussed below.

264 Average spectra of healthy, yellow rust and fusarium head blight infected wheat crop canopies at growth  
265 stage 72 are plotted in Figure 5. While plots a, b and c juxtapose irrigated and water stressed spectra, plot  
266 d compares between healthy and infected canopies under irrigated conditions. Generally, all spectra  
267 are similar, although slight differences can be observed by close examination of individual plots  
268 (Figure 5, b and c). The water-stressed spectra are less reflective than watered spectra, particularly  
269 for yellow rust (Figure 5a). Slight differences in spectral shape can be observed in the healthy canopy  
270 (a), which is in line with the findings from Earl and Davis (2003) who attributed these differences to  
271 alterations in leaf internal structure, variations in leaf angle (due to wilting) and leaf area index. Lower  
272 reflectance at the green edge (500-570 nm) and red edge (670-750 nm) can be attributed to water  
273 stress. However, these slight differences may indicate that water-stress has only slight influence on crop  
274 canopy, hence, on the performance of PLSR models in predicting yellow rust and fusarium head blight.  
275 The influence of water stress on yellow rust infected crop canopy is more obvious, where the water-  
276 stressed spectrum is consistently of lower reflectance (higher absorption) than the watered spectrum  
277 throughout the entire waveband (Figure 5b). This indicates that water stress may have a considerable  
278 influence on yellow rust prediction. However, spectra pre-processing e.g., maximum normalization used  
279 in this study will eliminate difference in reflectance e.g., due to scattering, as all spectra will be scaled  
280 between 0-1. Only a small deviation is observed between fusarium head blight infected spectra  
281 (Figure 5c), indicating little effect of water stress on fusarium head blight prediction. This is supported  
282 by the statistical analysis of the indices discussed below (Table 6).

283 A close examination of Figure 5d indicates notable differences in spectra between healthy, yellow rust  
284 and fusarium head blight infected crop canopies under watered conditions. The healthy spectrum is of  
285 lower reflectance than both infected spectra in the range between 400 to 700 nm. This could be  
286 attributed to larger photosynthetic pigments of the plants associated with chlorophyll (Gates *et al.*,

287 1965; Thomas and Gausman, 1977). Cibula and Carter (1992) reported larger reflectance in infected  
288 leaves than healthy leaves, which is in line with findings of the current study. Indeed, after crop  
289 infection from foliar diseases, such as yellow rust, noteworthy visual symptoms can usually be  
290 observed. Early symptoms such as chlorosis, associated with a reduction in chlorophyll results in  
291 increasing reflectance due to a reduction in light absorption (Lorenzen and Jensen, 1989). Therefore,  
292 the sharpest increase in reflectance from 650 to 700 nm takes place in the healthy spectrum. Figure 6  
293 compares between the average spectra of healthy, yellow rust and fusarium head blight infected barley  
294 canopy at growth stage 72. The water-stressed canopy spectrum shows more reflection or less  
295 absorption than the watered canopy spectrum for the healthy canopy in Figure 6a. This may reflect  
296 the darker (greener) canopy of the watered canopy resulting in larger absorption of light. This is in  
297 line with findings of other researchers, who have attributed the increased reflectance of the healthy  
298 canopy to early senescence caused by drought, and a reduction in chlorophyll absorption (Jamieson  
299 *et al.*, 1995; Hunt *et al.*, 2013). With yellow rust infected canopy (Figure 6b), the opposite trend can  
300 be observed, where higher reflectance is shown for the water-stressed canopy. This trend is observed  
301 in both the wheat (Figure 5b) and barley (Figure 6b) canopies, indicating a larger influence of yellow  
302 rust on crop canopy when combined with water stress, compared to fusarium (Figures 5c and 6c),  
303 where the differences between watered and water-stressed are minimal. As for wheat canopy, yellow  
304 rust infected canopy has again the highest reflectance, compared to those of fusarium head blight and  
305 healthy canopies (Figure 6d). The % coverages of yellow rust and fusarium head blight is larger in  
306 wheat than in barley. In wheat, yellow rust watered canopy have an average infection of 42%, yellow  
307 rust water stressed 45%, fusarium watered 83%, fusarium water stressed 86%, whereas in barley,  
308 these are 36%, 33%, 48% and 52%, respectively.

309 In order to quantify differences between healthy, yellow rust and fusarium head blight infected spectra  
310 two indices were taken into account in this study, namely, standard deviation (SD) of all wavelengths in  
311 the 500-650 nm range and squared difference (SQdiff) of 650 and 700 nm (Table 5). Moshou *et al.*,  
312 (2004) recommended the use of wavelength range between 460 and 900 nm for successful yellow rust  
313 detection. Bauriegel (2011) recommends spectral analysis using the range intervals of 500–533 nm  
314 (green), 560–675 nm (yellow), 682–733 nm (red) and 927–931 nm (red edge) for recognition of  
315 Fusarium head blight infection (in growth stages 71–85, according to zadoks scale). Krishna, *et al.*,  
316 (2014), suggested particularly useful spectra wavelengths of 428, 672, and 1399, for quantitative  
317 detection of yellow rust from healthy crop.

318 These two proposed indices show clear differences in response both in the different crops and the  
319 different treatments. The largest differences are observed between infection type, a significant F statistic

320 of  $F_{1,24}=1199$  ( $p<0.001$ ) and  $F_{1,24}=33$  ( $p<0.001$ ) was observed for the comparison between fusarium  
321 infection and yellow rust infection, for index SD and SQdiff respectively.

322 Analysis of the index SD revealed significant differences in response in barley and wheat ( $F_{1,24}=94.59$ ,  
323  $p<0.001$ ) and big differences between healthy and diseased trays ( $F_{1,24}=874.11$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). The largest  
324 differences were observed between fusarium infection and yellow rust infection ( $F_{1,24}=1199.23$ ,  
325  $p<0.001$ ). In contrast, there was no evidence of a significant main effect of water stress ( $F_{1,24}= 1.79$ ,  
326  $p=0.193$ ), meaning that on average (over all disease types and crops) there is no evidence of a difference  
327 in the SD index for watered and water stressed trays. However, analysis of the index SD does  
328 demonstrate a significantly different response to water stress both within different crops and under  
329 different disease infections (full ANOVA table is given in Table 6), i.e. the response to water stress is  
330 not the same in the different conditions.

331 Analysis of the index SQdiff revealed significant differences between healthy and diseased trays  
332 ( $F_{1,24}=12.66$ ,  $p=0.002$ ) and also significant differences between fusarium infection and yellow rust  
333 infection ( $F_{1,24}=33.29$ ,  $p <0.001$ ). Moreover, different responses in the different crops was observed  
334 ( $F_{1,24}=7.61$ ,  $p=0.011$ ) with a significant interaction between crop type and disease type indicating the  
335 index SQdiff responds differently to disease type in the different crops ( $F_{1,24}=9.88$ ,  $p=0.004$ ). There was  
336 no evidence to suggest a differing response to water treatment ( $F_{1,24}=0.07$ ,  $p=0.799$ ).

337 Although the largest SQdiff in reflectance between 650 and 700 nm is observed for the healthy canopy  
338 (both watered and water-stressed) of wheat, the smallest SD is observed for yellow rust (Table 5). For  
339 the barley canopy, the largest SD and SQdiff can be observed for fusarium head blight infected  
340 canopies, indicating that these proposed two indices respond differently for different crops (Table 5).  
341 Consequently, the two indices adopted in the current work highlight a distinguishable difference  
342 between the yellow rust, fusarium head blight and healthy wheat and barley crop canopies. It is  
343 important to mention that whilst these indices have worked in establishing a difference between  
344 yellow rust, fusarium and a healthy canopy at growth stage 72 in this paper, it may be specific to the  
345 method and equipment used. Further work should be undertaken to assess the reliability of such  
346 indices, if captured at different growth stages, under different circumstances, with alternative  
347 equipment. This is an important point to make as a strong correlation of time to spectral change was  
348 observed through PCA. The first two PCs (principal components) are shown in Figure 7 (for wheat)  
349 and figure 8 (for barley). The separation of observations in this two-dimensional representation is  
350 strongly associated with the time of scanning. Moreover, very little association with disease  
351 coverage could be discerned. This demonstrates that in the captured data when all timings are  
352 considered, the strongest influence on the canopies reflectance is time. These results supported the  
353 decision to split the scans per time of capture, for the PLSR of yellow rust and fusarium predictions.

354

### 355 **3.2 Model performance for yellow rust detection**

356 The PLSR cross-validation and prediction results for yellow rust detection in are shown in Table 7.  
357 Separate PLSR were carried out for each time intervals of T1, T3, T5 and T7 for barley and T2, T4,  
358 T6 and T8 for wheat (Table 1). The cross-validation results indicate good model performance for yellow  
359 rust % coverage in wheat and barley ( $R^2$  values for wheat are 0.82, 0.92, 0.77 and 0.84, for T2, T4, T6  
360 and T8 and barley 0.88, 0.78, 0.76 and 0.83 for T1, T3, T5 and T7, respectively), showing low root  
361 mean square errors of cross-validation (RMSECV) ranging from 3.3 to 8.8%. In general, the barley  
362 cross-validation results for yellow rust, have a slightly lower  $R^2$  values and larger RMSECV than the  
363 corresponding values for wheat (Table 7). As yellow rust is a foliar disease, this reduction in prediction  
364 performance for barley may be attributed to the crop having a smaller flag leaf, and due to density of  
365 the crop, causing a smaller foliar area to be captured by the hyperspectral imager.

366 When the developed PLSR models where used to predict the yellow rust % coverage of 20% of samples  
367 (11 samples) in the prediction set, the RMSEP values in both wheat and barley show larger values in the  
368 predictions than in the cross-validations. However, RMSEP is a valuable index for assessing individual  
369 model performance, but is not recommended to compare the performance between different models  
370 (e.g., those for wheat and barley and between different growing stages), due to the different data range.  
371 To compare between the performances of different models, RPD was used in this work, according  
372 to the RPD classes proposed in the current work (Table 4). The RPD values for prediction of each  
373 timing (growth stage), shown in Table 7, suggest good prediction capability for 6 out of 8 growing  
374 stages (RPD ranges of 2.16-2.49 in wheat and 2.18-2.43 in barely), a very good prediction for T4  
375 (kernel development, early milk (GS 72) in wheat (RPD = 2.79) and a moderate prediction capability  
376 for T5 (kernel development; late milk (GS 77) in Barely (RPD) = 1.83).

377 It is well known in spectral analysis that successful measurement of a concentration, be it soil properties  
378 or other, depends on presence of variability of that said concentration. For example, Kuang and  
379 Mouazen (2011) reported that although larger  $R^2$  and RPD can be obtained with larger variability in  
380 soil analysis, larger RMSEP is to be expected. Furthermore, with a small variability, weak or even no  
381 correlation can be established with PLSR, so that no models can be developed. Having said that, we  
382 believe that the scale of variability in % coverage of yellow rust is rather small (Tables 2 & 3), although  
383 a reasonably high infection is recorded at few points (see the mean and SD values). The small  
384 variability may be due to the experiment being run in trays under rather controlled conditions, where  
385 only water is varied artificially. These controlled conditions may lead to small variability in yellow  
386 rust (Tables 2 & 3). The percentage of disease coverage which is a method discussed by Chiarappa

387 (1981) and defined as “disease severity”, is the amount of expressed disease tissue of a plant. This  
388 method can be objective, but is definitely not free of subjectivity. In the current study all  
389 assessments are made by the same individual, which decreases the between assessment variability due  
390 to the subjective nature of the measurement. The more spectral wavelength indices captured and  
391 accounted for, the greater understanding of the object (Gilchrist, 2006). However, for noisy spectra  
392 there is a need to minimise noise in the signal, by adopting an optimised measurement configuration  
393 (Whetton *et al.*, 2016) and suitable spectra pre-processing. Furthermore, stresses in the field are  
394 combined and might include water stress, nitrogen stress, disease stress, and other stresses that are  
395 mainly reflected on crop canopy as a yellowing of the leaves. In the current work we have combined  
396 water stress and yellow rust infection in the tray experiments, to evaluate the prediction accuracy  
397 of the yellow rust models.

398 The results obtained in this study for yellow rust prediction encourage exploring the ultimate goal of  
399 the current study, which is on-line measurement of yellow rust in the field using the hyperspectral  
400 imager (400 – 750 nm). However, additional affecting parameters exist in the field on top of the water  
401 stress accounted for in the current study, and these should also be evaluated. Using wheat trays under  
402 glass house controlled conditions, Moshou *et al.* (2014) reported successful discrimination of water-  
403 stressed from healthy plants with 99% accuracy. Their approach was based on a combination of  
404 hyperspectral (460–900 nm) and fluorescence imagery and machine learning models. The early  
405 success in field studies for hyperspectral imager’s detection of yellow rust disease such as Moshou *et*  
406 *al.* (2004) and Bravo *et al.* (2003) focused on the presence of yellow rust in the field, not necessarily  
407 the intensity. Typically disease recognition attempts with hyperspectral and multispectral imaging are  
408 targeted to leaves rather than the canopy (Bock *et al.*, 2010b). Whilst recent attempts using lower cost  
409 solutions for disease quantification in wheat based on RGB images (Zhou *et al.*, 2015) provided larger  
410 error margins. Compared to other studies the current work achieved moderate to very good accuracy  
411 based only on a relatively cost-effective hyperspectral camera in the visible range only. In addition, we  
412 have accounted for the effect of water stress in the experimental trial, hence, this effect was included  
413 in the PLSR prediction models.

414

### 415 **3.3 Model performance for fusarium head blight detection**

416 The cross-validation results for % coverage of fusarium head blight indicate good model performance  
417 in both wheat and barley ( $R^2$  values for wheat are 0.84, 0.89, 0.81 and 0.83, for T2, T4, T6 and T8 and  
418 barley 0.95, 0.83, 0.75 and 0.79 for T1, T3, T5 and T7, respectively), with RMSECV range of 8.6 to  
419 29 % in wheat and 14 to 25 % in barley (Table 7). However these RMSECV ranges are higher than

420 those calculated for yellow rust. The lowest  $R^2$  for cross-validation was once again for the late milk  
421 stage. Due to the method of inoculation explained-above, there was little variability observed in fusarium  
422 head blight disease intensity per timing (growing stage). Although the relatively low variability recorded  
423 for fusarium, the cross-validation results for both wheat and barley indicate good model performances  
424 (Table 7).

425 The prediction results indicate larger RMSEP values for fusarium head blight (RMSEP = 7.9 – 16.1 %  
426 for wheat and 10.4 – 15.1 % for barley) are calculated than those for yellow rust (RMSEP = 7.2 – 8.8 %  
427 for wheat and 7.2 – 8.1 for barley). However, for RPD, the opposite case is true. According to RPD values,  
428 good (for one growing stage) to very good (for three growing stages) predictions are recorded for fusarium  
429 in wheat, whereas very good predictions are calculated for the four growing stages in barley (Table 7).  
430 Also, higher RPD values are calculated for the prediction of fusarium head blight in both crops. The lower  
431 RMSEP values calculated for yellow rust than those for fusarium suggest higher prediction accuracy for  
432 yellow rust (smaller error). This means that yellow rust can be detected with higher accuracy than  
433 fusarium head blight, an observation to be taken into account for future variable rate applications or  
434 relevant fungicides.

435 Fusarium head blight symptoms appear on crop heads at a late stage in the crop growing season  
436 (normally only after anthesis, but potentially at head emergence), allowing for limited number of  
437 scans to be collected. Bauriegel *et al.* (2011) claimed that *fusarium* head blight can be detected by  
438 spectral analysis in the spectral range of 400–1000 nm, with an identification accuracy of 87%. These  
439 authors advised that the ideal timing for measurement at the medium milk stage (growth stage 75),  
440 though the scans were based on the crop ears against a black background. Delwiche *et al.* (2011)  
441 successfully differentiated between healthy kernels from fusarium head blight infected,  
442 reporting a 95% classification accuracy. The results reported in the current study support the previous  
443 findings, as the highest prediction performance is recorded for the kernel development stages, at both  
444 the early and late milk. Bauriegel *et al.* (2011) have also reported the highest measurement accuracy  
445 of fusarium in the milk kernel development stage. However, the relatively lower RPD scores in the  
446 earlier scans (T1 for barley and T2 for wheat), may be attributed to a smaller standard deviation of the  
447 data sets (Tables 2 and 3).

448 In order to account for the temporal dependence in observations over the different scanning intervals  
449 collected at the four growing stages in this study (Table 1), it was necessary to run a separate PLSR  
450 analysis for each growing stage. This has resulted in a rather small number of samples for each PLSR  
451 analysis (e.g., 43 and 11 for the calibration and prediction sets, respectively). Therefore, it is necessary  
452 to consider a larger dataset in the PLSR analysis in a future work, and to explore new methods of data

453 analysis based on machine learning and/or image processing, or adopt a modelling approach that can  
454 explicitly account for temporal dependence/repeated measures structure. It is also suggested to adopt a  
455 data fusion approach of both spectra and images, which is expected to provide more reliable model  
456 prediction performance. However, the results reported in this work are successful and encouraging  
457 to suggest testing the proposed hyperspectral technique in the visible range of 400-750 nm, coupled  
458 with PLSR as a potential tool for on-line measurement of the named two fungal diseases. However,  
459 there are other affecting parameters in the field than water stress that should be accounted for,  
460 which include within field variability in soil properties, varying ambient light, sensor-to-crop  
461 canopy height and angle.

## 463 **4 Conclusions**

464 The study explored the potential of a hyperspectral line imager (400-750 nm) for the detection of  
465 yellow rust and fusarium head blight in wheat and barley, based on partial least squares regressing  
466 (PLSR) analysis. The experiment was carried out in the laboratory under partially controlled  
467 environmental conditions where water stress effect was introduced. The results reported allowed the  
468 following five main points to be concluded:

- 469 1) The standard deviation of the wavelength range from 500 to 650 nm and the squared difference  
470 between 650 nm and 700 nm are of interest in discrimination between healthy, from yellow  
471 rust or fusarium head blight infected wheat and barley canopy.
- 472 2) The principle component analysis run on canopy spectral data collected on healthy, yellow rust  
473 and fusarium infected crops at multiple growth stages, reveal temporal pattern and time serial  
474 autocorrelations, which suggested the need for separate PLSR for each growing stage.
- 475 3) The best PLSR prediction performance for yellow rust in wheat was at the early milk of the  
476 kernel development stage, whereas for barley the best performance was at the anthesis and the  
477 early milk stages.
- 478 4) The best PLSR prediction performance for fusarium was at both the early and late milk of the  
479 kernel development stages in both wheat and barley.
- 480 5) Although higher ratio of prediction deviations were calculated for fusarium head blight, the  
481 smaller root mean square error of prediction for yellow rust suggested more accurate  
482 measurement of the latter under laboratory conditions.

483 The laboratory trials in this study have been designed to emulate a field. The data used in the models  
484 was all collected from the wheat and barley trays, designed to simulate a field canopy, so the variance  
485 of reflectance due to canopy is included in the models. Whilst other properties such as illumination  
486 angle, view positions, shadows, plant species, maturity and phenology can be controlled under  
487 laboratory conditions, these parameters will have considerable influences under field conditions, which  
488 need to be evaluated with a future work planned in Part 2 of this study.

489

## 490 **Acknowledgement**

491 We acknowledge the funding received for FarmFUSE project from the ICT-AGRI under the European  
492 Commission's ERA-NET scheme under the 7th Framework Programme, and the UK Department of  
493 Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (contract no: IF0208). The corresponding author acknowledges  
494 the FWO funded Odysseus SiTeMan Project (Nr. G0F9216N).

495

## 496 **References**

- 497 Andersen AL. (1948). The development of *Gibberella zeae* head blight of wheat.  
498 *Phytopathology* 38:595–611.
- 499 Bauriegel, E., Giebel, A., Geyer, M., Schmidt, U. and Herppich, W.B. (2011). Early detection of  
500 *Fusarium* infection in wheat using hyper-spectral imaging. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*,  
50175 (2), pp.304-312.
- 502 Bélanger M.C., Roger J.M., Cartolaro P., Viau A.A., Bellon-Maurel V., Detection of powdery mildew  
503 in grapevine using remotely sensed UV-induced fluorescence, *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, 29 (2008), pp. 1707–  
504172
- 505
- 506 Bock, C.H., Poole, G.H., Parker, P.E. and Gottwald, T.R. (2010a). Plant disease severity  
507 estimated visually, by digital photography and image analysis, and by hyperspectral  
508 imaging. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, 29(2), pp.59-107
- 509 Bock, C. H., Graham, J. H., Gottwald, T. R., Cook, A. Z., & Parker, P. E. (2010b). Wind speed effects  
510 on the quantity of *Xanthomonas citri* subsp. *citri* dispersed downwind from canopies of grapefruit trees  
511 infected with citrus canker. *Plant Disease*, 94(6), 725-736.
- 512 Bravo, C., Moshou, D., West, J., McCartney, A., & Ramon, H. (2003). Early disease detection in wheat  
513 fields using spectral reflectance. *Biosystems Engineering*, 84(2), 137-145.



- 514 Brennan, J.M., Egan, D., Cooke, B.M, Doohan, F.M. (2005). Effect of temperature on head blight of  
515 wheat caused by *Fusarium culmorum* and *F. graminearum*. *Plant Pathology* 54, 156.
- 516 Buscaglia, H. J., & Varco, J. J. (2002). Early detection of cotton leaf nitrogen status using leaf  
517 reflectance. *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 25, 2067–2080.
- 518 Chiarappa L., ed. (1981). *Crop Loss Assessment Methods — Supplement 3*. Wallingford; CAB  
519 International Cibula WG, Carter GA. (1992). Identification of a far-red reflectance response  
520 to ectomycorrhizae in slash pine. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 13:925–32.
- 521 Dasu, T., & Johnson, T. (2003). *Exploratory data mining and data cleaning* (Vol. 479). John Wiley &  
522 Sons.
- 523 Delwiche, S.R., Kim, M.S. and Dong, Y. (2011). *Fusarium damage assessment in wheat kernels*  
524 *by Vis/NIR hyperspectral imaging. Sensing and instrumentation for food quality and safety*, 5(2):63  
525 71.
- 526 Desjardin, A.E. (2006). *Fusarium mycotoxins. Chemistry, Genetics, and Biology*. APS Press, St. Paul,  
527 MN.
- 528 de Vallavieille-Pope, C., Huber, L., Leconte, M. and Goyeau, H. (1995). Comparative effects of  
529 temperature and interrupted wet periods on germination, penetration, and infection of *Puccinia*  
530 *recondita* f. sp. *tritici* and *P. striiformis* on wheat seedlings. *Phytopathology*, 85(4), pp.409-415.
- 531 Earl, H.J. and Davis, R.F. (2003). Effect of drought stress on leaf and whole canopy radiation use  
532 efficiency and yield of maize. *Agronomy journal*, 95(3), pp.688-696.
- 533 Fungicide Resistance Action Committee, (2010). *FRAC Recommendations for Fungicide*  
534 *Mixtures Designed to Delay Resistance Evolution*.
- 535 Gates, D.M., Keegan, H.J., Schleter, J.C. and Weidner, V.R. (1965). Spectral properties of plants.  
536 *Applied optics*, 4(1): 11-20.
- 537 Gilchrist J. R. (2006). Gildden Photonics Ltd and Timo Hyvärinen, Spectral Imaging Ltd.  
538 *Hyperspectral Imaging Spectroscopy: A Look at Real-Life Applications. Photonics.com.*  
539 [Online].
- 540 Godfray, H.C.J., Beddington, J.R., Crute, I.R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J.F., Pretty, J.,  
541 Robinson, S., Thomas, S.M. and Toulmin, C., (2010). Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion  
542 people. *science*, 327(5967), pp. 812-818.
- 543 Goswami RS, Kistler HC. (2004). Heading for disaster: *Fusarium graminearum* on cereal crops.  
544 *Mol Plant Pathol* 5:515–525
- 545 Hahn, F., (2009). Actual pathogen detection: Sensors and algorithms—a review. *Algorithms* 2, 301–  
546 338.
- 547 Hole, D., Perkins, A., Wilson, J. D., Alexander, I. H., Grice, P. V., & Evans, A. (2005). Does organic  
548 farming benefit biodiversity? *Biological Conservation*, 122, pp. 113–130.
- 549 Home Grown Cereal Authority (HGCA) (2008). *The spring wheat disease management guide*.  
550 *Warwickshire: Home Grown Cereals Authority (HGCA Publication)*.

- 551 Huadong, G. (2001). Applications of Radar Remote Sensing in China. New York: Taylor and Francis  
552 inc. 56.
- 553 Huang, W., Lamb, D.W., Niu, Z., Zhang, Y., Liu, L. and Wang, J. (2007). Identification of yellow  
554 rust in wheat using in-situ spectral reflectance measurements and airborne hyperspectral imaging.  
555 *Precision Agriculture*,8(4-5), pp.187-197.
- 556 Hunt, E.R., Doraiswamy, P.C., McMurtrey, J.E., Daughtry, C.S., Perry, E.M. and Akhmedov, B., 2013.  
557 A visible band index for remote sensing leaf chlorophyll content at the canopy scale. *International  
558 Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, 21, pp.103- 112
- 559 Impey, L. (2012). Fusarium found on wheat leaves in western England. Available:  
560 <http://www.fwi.co.uk/articles/19/07/2012/134000/fusarium-found-on-wheat-leaves-in-western>  
561 [england.htm](http://www.fwi.co.uk/articles/19/07/2012/134000/fusarium-found-on-wheat-leaves-in-western). Last accessed 14/10/2013
- 562 Jamieson, P.D., Martin, R.J., Francis, G.S. and Wilson, D.R., 1995. Drought effects on biomass  
563 production and radiation-use efficiency in barley. *Field Crops Research*, 43(2), pp.77-86.  
564
- 565 Krishna, G., Sahoo, R.N., Pargal, S., Gupta, V.K., Sinha, P., Bhagat, S., Saharan, M.S., Singh, R. and  
566 Chattopadhyay, C. (2014). Assessing wheat yellow rust disease through hyperspectral remote sensing.  
567 *The International Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*,  
568 40(8), p.1413.  
569
- 570 Kuang, B.; Mouazen, A.M. (2011). Calibration of a visible and near infrared spectroscopy for soil  
571 analysis at field scales across three European farms. *European Journal of Soil Science*, 62(4): 629-  
572 636.
- 573 Lacey J, Bateman GL, Mirocha CJ. (1999). Effects of infection time and moisture on the  
574 development of ear blight and deoxynivalenol production by Fusarium species in wheat. *Ann Appl  
575 Biol* 134:277–283.
- 576 Leach, C. M. (1967). Interaction of near-ultraviolet light and temperature on sporulation of the fungi  
577 *Alternaria*, *Cercospora*, *Fusarium*, *Helminthosporium*, and *Stemphylium*. *Canadian Journal of  
578 Botany*, 45(11), 1999-2016.
- 579 Leslie, J.F., Summerell, B.A. (2006). *The Fusarium Laboratory Manual*. Blackwell Publishing, Ames,  
580 IA
- 581 Lorenzen, B. and Jensen, A., (1989). Changes in leaf spectral properties induced in barley by cereal  
582 powdery mildew. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 27(2), pp.201-209.
- 583 Maleki, M.R., Mouazen, A.M., Ramon, H. and De Baerdemaeker, J., (2007). Optimisation of soil  
584 VIS–NIR sensor-based variable rate application system of soil phosphorus. *Soil and Tillage  
585 Research*, 94(1), pp.239-250.
- 586 McMullen MP, Jones R, Gallenberg G (1997). Scab of wheat and barley: a re-emerging disease of  
587 devastating impact. *Plant Dis* 81:1340–1348
- 588 Moshou, D., Bravo, C., West, J., Wahlen, S., McCartney, A., Ramon, H. (2004). Automatic  
589 detection of ‘yellow rust’ in wheat using reflectance measurements and neural networks.  
590 *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 44 (3), 173–188.

591 Moshou, D., Pantazi, X.E., Kateris, D. and Gravalos, I. (2014). Water stress detection based on optical  
592 multisensor fusion with a least squares support vector machine classifier. *Biosystems Engineering*,  
593 *117*, pp.15-22.

594 Mouazen, A., De Baerdemaeker, J. & Ramon, H. (2006). Effect of wavelength range on the  
595 measurement accuracy of some selected soil constituents using visual-near infrared  
596 spectroscopy. *Journal of Near Infrared Spectroscopy*, Volume 14, p. 189–199.

597 Oberti, R., Marchi, M., Tirelli, P., Calcante, A., Iriti, M., & Borghese, A. N. (2014). Automatic detection  
598 of powdery mildew on grapevine leaves by image analysis: Optimal view-angle range to increase the  
599 sensitivity. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 104, 1-8.

600 Parry DW, Jenkinson P, McLead L. (1995). Fusarium ear blight (scab) in small grain cereals- a review.  
601 *Plant Pathol* 44:207–238

602 Raper T. B. and Varco J. J. (2015) Canopy-scale wavelength and vegetative index sensitivities to cotton  
603 growth parameters and nitrogen status. *Precision Agriculture*, 16(1), pp 62–76

604 Rotter, B.A., Prelusky, D.B., Pestka, J.J. (1996). Toxicology of deoxynivalenol (vomitoxin). *Journal*  
605 *of Toxicology and Environmental Health* 48, 1–34.

606 Schmale, D.G., III, & Bergstrom, G.C. (2003). Fusarium head blight in wheat. *The Plant Health Instructor*.  
607 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHI-I-2003-0612-01>.

608 Thomas, J.R. and Gausman, H.W. (1977). Leaf reflectance vs. leaf chlorophyll and carotenoid  
609 concentrations for eight crops. *Agronomy journal*, 69(5), pp.799-802

610 West, J.S., Bravo, C., Oberti, R., Lemaire, D., Moshou, D. and McCartney, H.A. (2003). The potential  
611 of optical canopy measurement for targeted control of field crop diseases. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol*, 41,  
612 pp.593-614.

613 Whetton, R.L., Waive, T.W. and Mouazen, A.M. (2017). Optimising configuration of a  
614 hyperspectral imager for on-line field measurement of wheat canopy. *Biosystems engineering*, 155,  
615 pp.84-95.

616 Wittry, D.J. and Mallarino, A.P., (2004). Comparison of uniform-and variable-rate phosphorus  
617 fertilization for corn–soybean rotations. *Agronomy Journal*, 96(1), pp.26-33.

618 Zadoks, J.C.; T.T. Chang, C.F. Konzak (1974). "A decimal code for the growth stages of cereals.  
619 *Weed Research* 14 (6): 415–421. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3180.1974.tb01084.x.

620 Zhao, D., Reddy, K. R., Kakani, V. G., Read, J. J., & Koti, S. (2005). Selection of optimum reflectance  
621 ratios for estimating leaf nitrogen and chlorophyll concentrations of field-grown cotton. *Agronomy*  
622 *Journal*, 97, pp. 89–98.

623 Zhou, B., Elazab, A., Bort, J., Vergara, O., Serret, M.D. and Araus, J.L. (2015). Low-cost assessment  
624 of wheat resistance to yellow rust through conventional RGB images. *Computers and Electronics in*  
625 *Agriculture*, 116, pp.20-29.

626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631

632 **Figure captions**

633 **Figure 1:** Fusarium inoculation of wheat and barley trays in the laboratory. Inoculation took place at  
634 the anthesis crop growth stage.

635 **Figure 2:** Illustrating influence of foliar health on yield (HGCA, 2008). The weight given in this study  
636 was as follows; flag leaf 55%, mid canopy 40%, and lower canopy 5%. This allowed a single yellow  
637 rust assessment to be associated to a tray.

638 **Figure 3:** Schematic illustration of the laboratory configurations of hyperspectral camera and light  
639 source (Whetton *et al.*, 2016).

640 **Figure 4:** Example spectra of wheat and barley canopy, after white and dark corrections.

641 **Figure 5:** Comparison of an average wheat crop canopy (growth stage 72) spectra between watered  
642 (-) and water-stressed (----) treatments for healthy (a), yellow rust infected (b) and fusarium infected  
643 (c) crop canopy. Panel d compares canopy spectra under watered conditions of healthy (---), yellow  
644 rust (---) and fusarium (-). Watered yellow rust had an averaged infection of 42%, water stressed  
645 yellow 45%, watered fusarium 83%, and water stressed fusarium 86%.

646 **Figure 6:** Comparison of an average barley crop canopy (growth stage 72) spectra between watered  
647 (-) and water-stressed (----) treatments for a) healthy , b) yellow rust infected and c) fusarium infected  
648 crop canopy. Panel d compares canopy spectra under watered conditions of healthy (---), yellow rust  
649 (---) and fusarium (-). Watered yellow rust had an average infection of 36%, water stressed yellow  
650 rust 33%, watered fusarium 48%, and water stressed fusarium 52%.


651 **Figure 7:** Principal component analysis (PCA) similarity map of wheat canopy spectral data  
652 determined by principal components 1 (PC1) and 2 (PC2), showing separation of different spectra  
653 collected at Timing 2 (T2) of anthesis growth stage 60, T4 of early milk growth stage 72, T6 of late  
654 milk growth stage 77, and T8 of hard dough growth sage 87.

655 **Figure 8:** Principal component analysis (PCA) similarity map of barley canopy spectral data  
656 determined by principal components 1 (PC1) and 2 (PC2), showing separation of different spectra

657 collected at Timing 1 (T1) of anthesis growth stage 60, T3 of early milk growth stage 72, T5 of late  
658 milk growth stage 77, and T7 of hard dough growth sage 87.





Fusarium  
suspension




Inoculation tent

## 80% of wheat yield comes from the top three leaves












--- Wheat    — Barley




a)







b)





c)



d)







**Table 1:** Hyperspectral scanning intervals of the wheat and barley trays, at four growth stages (GS) according to Zadoks scale (Zadoks *et al.*, 1974).

---

	<b>Timing</b>	<b>Growth stage</b>
<b>Barley</b>	1 (T1)	Anthesis (GS 60)
	3 (T3)	Kernel development; early milk (GS 72)
	5 (T5)	Kernel development; late milk (GS 77)
	7 (T7)	Hard dough (GS 87)
<b>Wheat</b>	2 (T2)	Anthesis (GS 60)
	4 (T4)	Kernel development; early milk (GS 72)
	6 (T6)	Kernel development; late milk (GS 77)
	8 (T8)	Hard dough (GS 87)

---

**Table 2:** Statistics of % coverage of both fungal diseases of wheat samples used in the partial least squares regression (PLSR) analyses, with 80% and 20% of samples were considered for cross-validation and prediction, respectively, at four separate timings (growth stages).

	<b>Yellow rust</b>				<b>Fusarium</b>			
	T2	T4	T6	T8	T2	T4	T6	T8
<b><i>Cross-validation</i></b>								
Sample Nr.	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Maximum (%)	70	65	55	40	55	100	100	100
Minimum (%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean (%)	30.4	20.8	17.4	15.9	17.5	24.1	30.1	31.5
SD (%)	21.4	11.8	11	11.3	23.0	32.4	43.2	45.0
<b><i>Prediction</i></b>								
Sample Nr.	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Maximum (%)	70	70	50	60	50	100	100	100
Minimum (%)	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	0
Mean (%)	33.6	30	19.4	17.9	12	40	47	34
SD (%)	20.1	26.1	19	16.3	20.4	47.6	49.7	44.5

SD is standard deviation; T2 is anthesis growth stage 60; T4 is early milk growth stage 72; T6 is late milk growth stage 77; and T8 of hard dough growth sage 87 in wheat.

**Table 3:** Statistics of % coverage of both fungal diseases in barley samples used in the partial least squares regression (PLSR) models, with 80% and 20% of samples were considered for cross validation and prediction, respectively, at four separate timings (growth stages).

	<b>Yellow rust</b>				<b>Fusarium</b>			
	T1	T3	T5	T7	T1	T3	T5	T7
<b><i>Cross validation</i></b>								
Sample Nr.	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Maximum (%)	50	60	60	55	50	75	100	100
Minimum (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean (%)	15.6	14.3	13.2	9.5	16	22.3	26.8	29.2
SD (%)	9.5	10.7	13.3	13.5	22.1	31.6	39.2	41.2
<b><i>Prediction</i></b>								
Sample Nr.	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Maximum (%)	60	60	45	55	50	75	100	95
Minimum (%)	0	5	5	2	0	0	0	0
Mean (%)	17.7	18	17.3	14.3	16	17	31	24
SD (%)	18.8	15.4	14.2	16.4	22.1	30.4	45.5	37.1

SD is standard deviation; T1 is anthesis growth stage 60; T3 is early milk growth stage 72; T5 is late milk growth stage 77; T7 is hard dough growth stage 87 in barley.



**Table 4:** Classes of the ratio of prediction deviation (RPD) and their suitability for predicting yellow rust and fusarium head blight in cereal crops, and is based on the classifications..

<b>RPD range</b>	<b>Class and prediction capability</b>	<b>Prediction Category</b>
< 1	Poor model predictions - not useful.	A
1-1.5	Possibility to discriminate between low and high values	B
1.5-2.0	Moderate prediction capability	C
2.0-2.5	Good prediction capability	D
2.5-3.0	Very good prediction capability	E
>3.0	Excellent prediction capability	F

**Table 5:** Spectral differences indicated as standard deviation (SD) of the 500-650 nm range and squared difference (SQdiff) of 650 and 700 nm, calculated on the maximum normalised spectra for healthy, yellow rust, and fusarium infected wheat and barley canopies under watered and water-stressed conditions.

	<b>SD 500-650 (nm)</b>	<b>Squared difference of 650 &amp; 700 (nm)</b>
<i>Wheat</i>		
<b>Yellow rust watered</b>	0.089	0.062
<b>Yellow rust water-stressed</b>	0.081	0.076
<b>Healthy watered</b>	0.057	0.15
<b>Healthy water-stressed</b>	0.063	0.14
<b>Fusarium watered</b>	0.16	0.10
<b>Fusarium water-stressed</b>	0.15	0.11
<i>Barley</i>		
<b>Yellow rust watered</b>	0.056	0.08
<b>Yellow rust water-stressed</b>	0.061	0.077
<b>Healthy watered</b>	0.051	0.15
<b>Healthy water-stressed</b>	0.065	0.18
<b>Fusarium watered</b>	0.15	0.25
<b>Fusarium water-stressed</b>	0.13	0.18

**Table 6:** Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tables for the analysis of transformed spectral indices over the different treatments. Analysis of the index the squared difference of 650 and 700 nm (sqDiff) was done on the square root scale, whilst analysis of the index standard deviation (SD) is done on of the range 500-650 nm.

<b>log(SD)</b>					
	<b>d.f.</b>	<b>s.s.</b>	<b>m.s.</b>	<b>v.r.</b>	<b>F pr.</b>
Disease Status (Healthy vs Infected)	1	7.48442	7.48442	874.11	<.001
Water (Watered vs Water stressed)	1	0.015325	0.015325	1.79	0.193
Crop (Barley vs Wheat)	1	0.809884	0.809884	94.59	<.001
Disease Status: Disease Class (Fusarium vs Yellow rust)	1	10.26827	10.26827	1199.23	<.001
Disease Status:Water	1	0.273841	0.273841	31.98	<.001
Disease Status:Crop	1	0.233846	0.233846	27.31	<.001
Water:Crop	1	0.053444	0.053444	6.24	0.02
Disease Status:Disease Class:Water	1	0.054515	0.054515	6.37	0.019
Disease Status:Disease Class:Crop	1	0.323653	0.323653	37.8	<.001
Disease Status:Water:Crop	1	0.001909	0.001909	0.22	0.641
Disease Status:Disease Class:Water:Crop	1	0.051774	0.051774	6.05	0.022
Residual	24	0.205497	0.008562	1.05	
<b>sqrt(SQdiff)</b>					
Disease Status (Healthy vs Infected)	1	0.118056	0.118056	12.66	0.002
Water (Watered vs Water stressed)	1	0.000618	0.000618	0.07	0.799
Crop (Barley vs Wheat)	1	0.07096	0.07096	7.61	0.011
Disease Status:Disease Class (Fusarium vs Yellow rust)	1	0.310476	0.310476	33.29	<.001
Disease Status:Water	1	0.000456	0.000456	0.05	0.827
Disease Status:Crop	1	0.013211	0.013211	1.42	0.246
Water:Crop	1	0.001336	0.001336	0.14	0.708
Disease Status:Disease Class:Water	1	0.015536	0.015536	1.67	0.209
Disease Status:Disease Class:Crop	1	0.092105	0.092105	9.88	0.004
Disease Status:Water:Crop	1	0.012195	0.012195	1.31	0.264
Disease Status:Disease Class:Water:Crop	1	0.012502	0.012502	1.34	0.258
Residual	24	0.22381	0.009325	5.08	

**Table 7:** Summary of model prediction performance for yellow rust and fusarium head blight % coverage in wheat and barley in cross-validation and prediction. Results are shown for the determination coefficients ( $R^2$ ), root mean square error of the prediction (RMSEP) and cross validation (RMSECV), and the ratio of prediction deviation (RPD), which is the standard deviation divided by RMSEP

			Cross-validation		Prediction			
			RMSECV (%)	$R^2$	RMSEP (%)	$R^2$	RPD	PCat
Wheat	<i>fusarium</i>	Timing 2	8.6	0.84	7.9	0.84	2.45	D
		Timing 4	27.7	0.89	15.1	0.91	2.97	E
		Timing 6	22.0	0.81	16.1	0.91	2.92	E
		Timing 8	29.0	0.83	16.0	0.93	2.83	E
	<i>yellow rust</i>	Timing 2	6.2	0.82	7.7	0.86	2.49	D
		Timing 4	5.0	0.92	8.8	0.91	2.79	E
		Timing 6	3.3	0.77	8.3	0.91	2.17	D
		Timing 8	7.0	0.84	7.2	0.86	2.16	D
Barley	<i>Fusarium</i>	Timing 1	14.9	0.95	14.4	0.97	2.52	E
		Timing 3	14.0	0.83	10.4	0.86	2.69	E
		Timing 5	14.0	0.75	15.5	0.93	2.72	E
		Timing 7	25.0	0.79	15.1	0.88	2.62	E
	<i>yellow rust</i>	Timing 1	8.8	0.88	8.1	0.90	2.43	D
		Timing 3	4.8	0.78	5.8	0.92	2.41	D
		Timing 5	3.9	0.76	7.6	0.71	1.83	C
		Timing 7	4.4	0.83	7.2	0.86	2.18	D

PC at timings in prediction category, to those detailed in Table 4.