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**Abstract**

Recent development of sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF) technology is stimulating studies to remotely approximate canopy photosynthesis (measured as gross primary production, GPP). While multiple applications have advanced the empirical relationship between GPP and SIF, mechanistic understanding of this relationship is still limited. GPP:SIF relationship, using the standard light use efficiency framework, is determined by absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (APAR) and the relationship between photosynthetic light use efficiency (LUE) and fluorescence yield (SIF$_y$). While previous studies have found that APAR is the dominant factor of the GPP:SIF relationship, the LUE:SIF$_y$ relationship remains unclear. For a better understanding of the LUE:SIF$_y$ relationship, we deployed a ground-based system (FluoSpec2), with an eddy-covariance flux tower at a soybean field in the Midwestern U.S. during the 2016 growing season to collect SIF and GPP data simultaneously. With the measurements categorized by plant growth stages, light conditions, and time scales, we confirmed that a strong positive GPP:SIF$_y$ relationship was dominated by an even stronger linear SIF$_y$:APAR relationship. By normalizing both GPP and SIF by APAR, we found that under sunny conditions our soybean field exhibited a clear positive SIF$_y$:APAR relationship and a weak negative LUE:SIF$_y$ relationship, opposite to the positive LUE:SIF$_y$ relationship reported previously in other ecosystems. Our study provides a first continuous SIF record over multiple growth stages for agricultural systems and reveals a distinctive pattern related to the LUE:SIF$_y$ relationship compared with previous work. The observed positive relationship of SIF$_y$:APAR at the soybean site provides new insights of the previous understanding on the SIF’s physiological implications.

**1. Introduction**

During photosynthesis plants absorb sunlight in the 400–700 nm range of the electromagnetic spectrum, triggering the emission of light from leaves in the red and far-red (650–850 nm) known as sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF) (Papageorgiou & Govindjee, 2004). The strong link between SIF and photosynthesis has opened up a new approach of approximating gross primary productivity (GPP), the gross uptake of atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) through photosynthesis (Schlau-Cohen & Berry, 2015). Recent development of SIF technologies, including spaceborne (Frankenberg, Butz, et al., 2011; Guanter et al., 2014; Joiner et al., 2011, 2013), airborne (Damm et al., 2014; Rascher et al., 2015; Zarco-Tejada et al., 2009, 2012), and continuous ground-based techniques (Cogliati et al., 2015; Daumard et al., 2010; Drolet et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2015), have rapidly advanced the potential of SIF for monitoring terrestrial carbon uptake remotely across multiple temporal and spatial scales.

Previous studies have shown a quasi-linear GPP:SIF relationship in different ecosystems observed from diverse sources and across multiple spatial scales (Damm et al., 2015; Frankenberg, Fisher, et al., 2011;...
Guanter et al., 2014; Perez-Priego et al., 2015; Verma et al., 2017; Wood et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2015). Multiple applications have taken this empirical relationship forward, for example, using SIF to infer GPP directly, constrain the estimate of photosynthesis capacity, or derive electron transport rate proportionally (Guan et al., 2016; Guanter et al., 2014; Perez-Priego et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2014), but little justification has been made for the underlying processes associated with this relationship. The mechanistic understanding of the GPP:SIF relationship is still limited, which hampers further applications of SIF.

Photosynthesis, SIF, and heat dissipation are the three major pathways in which absorbed solar energy is utilized (Muller, 2001). Understanding the relationship between pathways relies on the partitioning of the absorbed light, that is, the fraction of absorbed photons going into each pathway. The partitioning of photosynthesis and SIF can be characterized by normalizing them with the absorbed light (Grace et al., 2007; Hilker et al., 2008), as expressed by Monteith’s (1977) light use efficiency (LUE) model (equation (1)), in which APAR is the absorbed photosynthetically active radiation, and LUE and SIFy are defined as photosynthetic LUE and SIF yield, respectively (Guanter et al., 2014). The relationship between LUE and SIFy indicates how photosynthesis and SIF covary with each other.

\[
\begin{align*}
GPP &= \frac{\text{LUE}}{\text{C}_2} \times \text{APAR} \\
\text{SIF} &= \frac{\text{SIF}_y}{\text{C}_2} \times \text{APAR}
\end{align*}
\] (1)

Equation (1) demonstrates that the GPP:SIF ratio is equal to the LUE:SIFy ratio at instantaneous scales, but at a long-term scale, the GPP:SIF relationship is jointly determined by the variations in both APAR and the LUE:SIFy relationship. However, due to the much larger variations in APAR than LUE and SIFy, it has been found that APAR is generally the dominant factor that leads to the linear relationship between GPP and SIF (Rossini et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2015). Although previous studies also suggested that LUE and SIFy contribute to the linear GPP:SIF relationship (Badgley et al., 2017), the remained variations in and the much smaller values of LUE and SIFy implicitly determine the large uncertainties in the LUE:SIFy relationship.

A prerequisite for improving our understanding of the LUE:SIFy relationship is to determine the relationships of LUE and SIFy with APAR, that is, the energy source. LUE and SIFy also vary with change in APAR, which is affected by plant physiology (e.g., chlorophyll content and photosynthetic capacity) associated with stand age/plant growth stage, environmental conditions, and time scale (Gower et al., 1999; Hilker et al., 2008; Jenkins et al., 2007). At the canopy scale or beyond, canopy structure, which is related to ratio of sun to shaded leaves, leaf inclination angles, clumping, and the reabsorption of SIF etc, can play important roles on the observed SIF and consequently the SIFy:APAR and LUE:SIFy relationships (Fournier et al., 2012; Louis et al., 2005; Rascher et al., 2009). While the LUE:APAR relationship has been broadly investigated across various ecosystems (Turner et al., 2003), the SIFy:APAR relationship is rarely reported and few types of ecosystems have been studied (Verma et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2015).

It has been observed that agricultural lands have remarkably high SIF (e.g., U.S. Corn Belt, Guanter et al., 2014) and SIF signal could be used as an indicator of vegetation stress status (Ac et al., 2015; Flexas et al., 2002; Perez-Priego et al., 2015, 2005), which is particularly valuable for monitoring crop productivity and stress (Guan et al., 2016). While there have been a few SIF studies on croplands, most of them are based on spaceborne and airborne sensors covering sporadic sunny days (Alexander Damm et al., 2010; Damm et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2017; Pinto et al., 2016; Zarco-Tejada et al., 2013). Ground-based continuous techniques have the advantage of covering all light conditions and capturing both short- and long-term variations, with much less noise from atmospheric effects due to the close distance between plants and sensors (Frankenberg, Butz, et al., 2011; Malenovsky et al., 2009; Meroni et al., 2009). This could help to disentangle the confounding effects associated with environmental stresses, plant growth stages, or time scales on LUE, SIFy, and the relationship between them. We deployed an automated ground-based SIF system at a soybean field in the Midwestern USA, paired with an existing eddy-covariance (EC) flux tower, to continuously collect optical signals for SIF retrieval in 2016 growing season. The major objectives of this study were to investigate (1) the GPP:SIF relationships at diurnal and seasonal scales, (2) the SIFy:APAR and LUE:APAR relationships, and (3) the relationship between SIFy and LUE at multiple temporal scales and under different light conditions.
2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Site Description

The study site is located at the Energy Farm of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA (40.065791 N, 88.208387 W, and ~220 m elevation). The mean annual air temperature and total precipitation from climate records of an adjacent station (Champaign, Illinois State Water Survey) are 11.1 °C and 1048 mm, respectively, for the period of 1981–2010. The average air temperature of growing season (from April to September) is 19.4 °C, and precipitation is 625 mm. In 2016, the mean annual air temperature and precipitation were 12.5 °C and 1025 mm, respectively. The average growing season air temperature was 20.2 °C, and precipitation was 715 mm.

The soybean (*Glycine max* L.) plot, 200 m × 200 m, is a long-term EC flux site with a maize/maize/soybean rotation since 2008 (Joo et al., 2016; Zeri et al., 2011). The sowing date for 2016 was 26 May, and the study was conducted from 11 August to 20 September, covering the soybean reproductive stages from R3 (beginning pod) to R7 (beginning maturity) (Fehr et al., 1971). The leaf area index was 6.6 ± 0.3 at the beginning of the study and was 2.0 ± 0.1 at the end.

2.2. Field Instrumentation: FluoSpec2 System and Eddy-Covariance Flux System

We installed the FluoSpec2 system (Yang et al., 2015, Figure 1; field images in Figure S1 in the supporting information) in the field to collect signals required for SIF retrieval and several associated vegetation indices. The FluoSpec2 system included two spectrometers: one (Path 1) covered wavelength from 730 to 780 nm with an optical resolution of 0.15 nm (measured as full width half maximum, QEPRO embedded with an internal shutter, Ocean Optics, Dunedin, FL, USA), which is specifically for SIF retrievals at the O2-A band. The other (Path 2) covered wavelength of 350–1100 nm with the optical resolution of 1.10 nm (HR2000+, Ocean Optics), which served as a spectrometer that can provide canopy reflectance and standard vegetation indices. Each path contained two optical fibers, with one collecting optical signals from the sun (irradiance) and the other collecting signals from the crop canopy (radiance). One inline shutter switches between irradiance and radiance for one spectrometer. The irradiance fiber was attached with a cosine corrector to have a field of view of 180°, while the radiance fiber had a 25° field of view. The irradiance signal was directly calibrated with a standard light source (HL-CAL-2000, Ocean Optics), and the radiance signal was calibrated through a standard reflection board (Spectralon®, Labsphere, NH, USA) at noontime. Field calibration was conducted for the system before and after the field data collection to estimate the potential signal drift. The inline shutters and spectrometers were installed in a temperature-controlled enclosure for field measurement (Figure 1).

Specific configuration of each path was described in Table S1 in the supporting information.

An EC flux system including meteorological sensors was installed in parallel to measure the above-canopy gas exchange. The EC system consisted of a 3-D sonic anemometer (81000VRE, R.M. Young, Traverse City, MI, USA) and an open-path infrared gas analyzer (LI-7500, LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA). Meteorological variables measured above the canopy included air temperature and relative humidity (HMP-4SC, Campbell Scientific,
Ecosystem fluxes were calculated following procedures and configurations from previous studies conducted at the same site (Joo et al., 2016; Zeri et al., 2011). The 10 Hz raw data were first processed using EddyPro software (version 6.1.0, LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA) for coordinate alignment (double rotation method), compensation of density fluctuations (Webb et al., 1980), low- and high-frequency spectral corrections (Moncrieff et al., 1997, 2004), and calculating turbulent flux and CO2 storage flux. The turbulent flux integrated with the CO2 storage change is referred to the net ecosystem CO2 exchange. Further data quality control and net ecosystem CO2 exchange separation to GPP and ecosystem respiration followed the standard procedure from Papale et al. (2006) and Reichstein et al. (2005).

2.3. SIF Retrieval and Vegetation Indices

Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence was calculated using the spectral fitting method (Meróni et al., 2009; Yang et al., 2015). The basic assumption of the spectral fitting method (equation (2)) is that upwelling radiation (L) from a canopy is composed of a reflected signal (reflectance [r, dimensionless] x irradiance \(E, m \cdot m^{-2} \cdot nm^{-1} \cdot sr^{-1}\)) and an emitted one \(F, m \cdot W \cdot m^{-2} \cdot nm^{-1} \cdot sr^{-1}\), in which \(L\) and \(E\) could be directly measured. The emitted fluorescence and reflectance are assumed linearly related with the wavelength (\(\lambda\)) at the selected band, and the coefficients \((a, b, c,\) and \(d)\) are derived from the regression between \(L\), \(E\), and \(\lambda\) as in equation (2). SIF is then calculated as the regression response at the wavelength of 760 nm (equation (3)). The irradiance and radiance measured by Path 1 of the Fluospec2 system at 1 min interval were applied for SIF retrieval. The 1 min retrieved SIF was averaged every 30 min to match with the frequency and timestamp of EC flux data.

\[
L = \frac{rE}{\pi} + F\left(\frac{a + b\lambda}{\pi} + c + d\lambda\right).\lambda\in(759.00, 767.76 \text{ nm})
\]

\[
SIF = F_{760} = c + d \times 760
\]

Two vegetation indices were derived from the reflectance collected by Path 2 of the Fluospec2 system as proxies to track phenological and physiological changes. Specifically, the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) = \(\frac{\text{F}_{750} - \text{F}_{670}}{\text{F}_{750} + \text{F}_{670}}\) (Tucker, 1979), a proxy of canopy structure, and Rededge Index (Rededge = \(\frac{\text{F}_{705}}{\text{F}_{750}}\)) (Gitelson & Merzlyak, 1994), a proxy of canopy chlorophyll content, were paired to identify the growth stages. The Rededge NDVI (Rededge_NDVI = \(\frac{\text{F}_{705} - \text{F}_{680}}{\text{F}_{705} + \text{F}_{680}}\)) was used to approximate the fraction of APAR (fAPAR) in PAR (section 2.4).

2.4. Data Processing and Analysis for Different Temporal Scales and Light Conditions

With SIF, GPP, and PAR data, the LUE model (equation (1)) was applied to derive LUE and SIF. Since we did not directly measure APAR, we calculated it as the product of PAR and fAPARgreen, in which fAPARgreen refers to the fAPAR that has been absorbed by green leaves (i.e., photosynthetically active leaves). We used the Rededge_NDVI as the proxy of fAPARgreen (equation (4)). Rededge_NDVI was proposed by Viña and Gitelson (2005) for studying soybean and maize in Nebraska and was found to be the best index for fAPARgreen among various other vegetation indices. It is worth noting that we also used other vegetation indices, for example, green NDVI (green_NDVI = \(\frac{\text{F}_{770} - \text{F}_{670}}{\text{F}_{770} + \text{F}_{670}}\)) and MERIS Terrestrial Chlorophyll Index (MTCI = \(\frac{\text{F}_{704} - \text{F}_{744}}{\text{F}_{704} + \text{F}_{744}}\)) (Viña et al., 2011) to approximate fAPARgreen (Figures S3 and S4) and found that different formulated fAPARgreen had little impacts on the general pattern of our results shown in section 3.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{APAR} &= \text{PAR} \times \text{fAPAR}_{\text{green}} \\
f\text{APAR}_{\text{green}} &= 1.37 \times \text{Rededge\_NDVI} - 0.17
\end{align*}
\]
In addition to the analysis of apparent plant response reflected by GPP:SIF, SIF:APAR, and GPP:APAR relationships, we further explored the SIFy:APAR and LUE:APAR relationships through the intrinsic response of individual pathways to light conditions. Last, the LUE:SIFy relationship was discussed for a direct comparison between the two pathways.

To disentangle the effects of different plant growth stages on the plant response to environmental conditions, we categorized the whole 30 min data set following the workflow shown in Figure S2. Plants did not experience significant water/heat stress across the study period; therefore, the environmental changes only referred to the variation in light conditions in this current study. At every category, GPP:SIF and the relationships of the other associated variables (mainly referring to the relationships of SIF:APAR, GPP:APAR, SIFy:APAR, LUE:APAR, and LUE:SIFy hereafter) were analyzed accordingly.

Growth phases were first identified from the time series of NDVI (the proxy of phenology) and Rededge (the proxy of chlorophyll content) indices. The rationale of using the paired indices to divide the growth phases is that we define periods during which the effects of individual factors impacting GPP, SIF, and APAR can be possibly distinguished from each other. For example, if both NDVI and Rededge are constant at one phase, then the relationship of SIF, SIFy, or GPP and LUE with APAR implies the true response of plants to absorbed energy at this specific phase.

Second, we defined a sunlight threshold by comparing the actual PAR with theoretical PAR to distinguish sunny and cloudy conditions. Theoretical PAR was derived from dates and solar zenith angle of every 30 min (Weiss & Norman, 1985). We calculated the ratio of actual PAR to theoretical PAR and set the ratio threshold of 0.6. It was defined as sunny when a ratio was greater than 0.6 and as cloudy otherwise. This threshold was applied for all the time scales discussed in this study.

Diurnal variation of the GPP:SIF relationship and the relationships of other paired variables was then investigated for individual growth phases, by which the effect of growth phases can be excluded largely. Furthermore, sunny days and cloudy days were separated at every phase, and diurnal pattern of all the relationships was analyzed under each light condition.

Seasonal changes of GPP:SIF and other variables’ relationships were investigated across multiple phases with the diurnal variations removed by averaging daily data. Meanwhile, due to the rapid change of light conditions at diurnal scale (especially during cloudy days) and that GPP, SIF, and associated variables may respond to light differently, impetuous averaging a whole day data would conceal the actual differences between days and between phases. To minimize this averaging uncertainty while also reducing the influence from short-term fluctuation, we examined the data and found that, during this study period, the weather appeared mostly cloudy in the morning and sunny in the afternoon. Therefore, we averaged the data by morning (9–12), midday (12–14), and afternoon (14–17) every day instead of the daily mean of 9–17.

Overall, during the 41 day study period, there were 30 (73%) days of data involved in this study, of which 17 (57%) were sunny days and 13 (43%) cloudy or partly cloudy days. Days when precipitation events occurred during the daytime were excluded.

3. Results

3.1. Growth Phases Identified by Vegetation Indices

Daily mean SIF and GPP decreased continuously during the study period (11 August to 20 September) at the soybean site (Figure 2a), with a seasonal variation of 1.7 ± 0.5 (mean ± SD) mW m⁻² nm⁻¹ sr⁻¹ in SIF and 28.7 ± 6.8 μmol C m⁻² s⁻¹ in GPP. Based on seasonal trajectories of NDVI and Rededge, we distinguished three phenological/physiological phases (Figure 2b): Phase 1, 11–31 August 2016 (21 days), during which both NDVI and Rededge were in their peak period and a relatively stable status; Phase 2, 1–7 September 2016 (7 days), during which NDVI was stable while Rededge was decreasing; and Phase 3, 8–20 September 2016 (13 days), during which both NDVI and Rededge decreased rapidly. The absolute cut-off day for each stage was uncertain, but 1–2 day shift did not affect the results. The following relationship analysis mainly focused on the first two phases when photosynthesis was still active.
3.2. Overall GPP:SIF and LUE:SIF\textsubscript{y} Relationships

The whole 30 min data exhibited strong positive GPP:SIF relationship ($R^2 = 0.46$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 3a). SIF was highly correlated with APAR positively ($R^2 = 0.83$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 3b), while GPP was also positively correlated with APAR but with a lower $R^2$ ($R^2 = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 3c).

After SIF and GPP were normalized by APAR, SIF\textsubscript{y} and LUE were weakly correlated with APAR. SIF\textsubscript{y} and APAR were positively correlated ($R^2 = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 3d), and LUE and APAR were negatively correlated ($R^2 = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 3e) with a concave shape as has been reported previously (Damm et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2017). SIF\textsubscript{y} and LUE had a weak negative correlation ($R^2 = 0.067$, Figure 3f and Table S3), though it was statistically significant ($p < 0.01$).

3.3. GPP:SIF and LUE:SIF\textsubscript{y} Relationships at the Diurnal Scale

Local light condition during the study period changed rapidly at the diurnal scale, especially from noontime to late afternoon. Even for the cloudy days defined by the sunlight threshold, most of the days had occasional sunny moments (e.g., the black line in Figure 4b). GPP and SIF responded simultaneously to these light condition changes. The diurnal SIF and GPP variations were comparable to and even larger than the seasonal variations. The SIF variation was 2.3 ± 1.0 (mean ± SD) mW m\textsuperscript{-2} nm\textsuperscript{-1} sr\textsuperscript{-1} on a typical sunny day and 1.7 ± 0.8 mW m\textsuperscript{-2} nm\textsuperscript{-1} sr\textsuperscript{-1} on a cloudy day. Likewise, GPP was 34.0 ± 9.6 μmol C m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1} on a sunny day and 31.1 ± 9.8 μmol C m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1} on a cloudy day (Figure 4).

Generally, all the diurnal scale relationships between the six paired variables (i.e., GPP:SIF, SIF:APAR, GPP:APAR, SIF\textsubscript{y}:APAR, LUE:APAR, and LUE:SIF\textsubscript{y}) were consistent between sunny and cloudy days (Figures 5 and 6). Since Phases 1 and 2 did not exhibit significant differences in these relationships (results not shown here), here we only presented the results from Phase 1. The diurnal scale relationships were consistent with those from the whole 30 min data (Figure 3). Despite the consistency, at the diurnal scale, GPP and SIF had a stronger linear relationship on sunny days ($R^2 = 0.65$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 5a) than on cloudy days ($R^2 = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 6a). SIF\textsubscript{y}:APAR (Figures 5b and 6b) and GPP:APAR (Figures 5c and 6c) relationships both had a good linear pattern at the diurnal scale.

The LUE- and SIF\textsubscript{y}-related relationships showed large differences between the two light conditions. The SIF\textsubscript{y}:APAR relationship had larger $R^2$ on sunny days ($R^2 = 0.43$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 5d) than on cloudy days ($R^2 = 0.12$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 6d), though both were significant. In contrast, the LUE:APAR relationship had larger $R^2$ on cloudy days ($R^2 = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 5e) and a steeper regression slope (Table S3) than on sunny days ($R^2 = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 6e). These significant differences were primarily caused not only by the data in the cloudy mornings but also by the more unstable light condition during cloudy days (Figure 5d versus Figure 6d). Both SIF\textsubscript{y} and LUE at the diurnal scale were high under the low APAR, although the trend in SIF\textsubscript{y} (Figure 6d) was not as clear as in LUE.
Figure 3. Relationships based on all 30 min data: (a) gross primary productivity (GPP):Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF), (b) SIF:absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (APAR), (c) Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence yield (SIFY):APAR, (d) GPP:APAR, (e) light use efficiency (LUE):APAR, and (f) LUE:SIFY over the study period at the soybean site. The color scheme represents point density. A linear regression between the paired variables is applied when such a relationship is statistically significant (p < 0.01).

(Figure 6e). LUE and SIFY were negatively correlated on both sunny ($R^2 = 0.069$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 5f) and cloudy days ($R^2 = 0.017$, $p = 0.23$, Figure 6f), though this correlation was weak.

3.4. GPP:SIF and LUE:SIFY Relationships at Seasonal Scale

The GPP:SIF, SIF:APAR, and GPP:APAR relationships were weaker at the seasonal scale than at the diurnal scale (Figures 7a–7c), partly due to the greater variation in light condition between days. The SIFY:APAR and LUE:SIFY relationships between sunny and cloudy conditions exhibited clearer differences at the seasonal scale (Figures 7d and 7f) than at the diurnal scale. SIFY was negatively correlated with APAR under cloudy conditions despite the lack of statistical significance ($R^2 = 0.36$, $p = 0.21$, Figure 7d and Table S3), but they were positively correlated under sunny conditions and statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.33$, $p = 0.02$). If we fit the cloudy and sunny data together with a quadratic equation, a turning point of APAR that reaches the lowest SIFY existed at approximately 840 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ ($p = 0.03$). In contrast, LUE:APAR was consistently negative under both sunny and cloudy conditions ($R^2 = 0.76$, $p < 0.01$, Figure 7e). Accordingly, LUE and SIFY were positively correlated under cloudy conditions.

Figure 4. Examples of the diurnal cycles of sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF), gross primary productivity (GPP), and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) at (a) a mostly sunny day and (b) a mostly cloudy day. The dashed line marks the separation of the whole day data to morning (9–12), noontime (12–14), and afternoon (14–17).
conditions \((R^2 = 0.70, p = 0.039, \text{Figure 7f})\). There was no clear pattern in the LUE:SIFy relationship under sunny conditions at the seasonal scale \((p = 0.41)\).

Both GPP and LUE had lower values in Phases 2 than 1, which did not occur in SIF and SIFy (Figures 7a–7c). Due to the very short period of Phase 2, it was difficult to separate cloudy and sunny conditions for a meaningful comparison in this current study. Further investigation is required to determine whether GPP, SIF, and especially the corresponding LUE and SIFy would exhibit different patterns under cloudy conditions at this transition phase from active growth to senescence stage.

Both GPP and LUE had lower values in Phases 2 than 1, which did not occur in SIF and SIFy (Figures 7a–7c). Due to the very short period of Phase 2, it was difficult to separate cloudy and sunny conditions for a meaningful comparison in this current study. Further investigation is required to determine whether GPP, SIF, and especially the corresponding LUE and SIFy would exhibit different patterns under cloudy conditions at this transition phase from active growth to senescence stage.

Figure 5. Relationships based on the 30 min data at the soybean field under sunny conditions at Phase 1 (both canopy structure and physiological status were relatively stable): (a) gross primary productivity (GPP):Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF), (b) SIF:absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (APAR), (c) GPP:APAR, (d) Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence yield (SIFy):APAR, (e) light use efficiency (LUE):APAR, and (f) LUE:SIFy. The color scheme represents the time stamps at 30 min interval from 9 to 17. A linear regression between the paired variables is applied when such a relationship is statistically significant \((p < 0.01)\).

Figure 6. Relationships based on the 30 min data at the soybean field under cloudy conditions at Phase 1 (11–31 August, both canopy structure and physiological status were relatively stable): (a) gross primary productivity (GPP):Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF), (b) SIF:absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (APAR), (c) GPP:APAR, (d) Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence yield (SIFy):APAR with the cloudy morning measurements highlighted, (e) light use efficiency (LUE):APAR, and (f) LUE:SIFy. The color scheme represents the time stamps at 30 min interval from 9 to 17. A linear regression between the paired variables is applied when such a relationship is statistically significant \((p < 0.01)\).
4. Discussion

Mechanistic understanding on the spatiotemporal variability of SIF and the SIF:GPP relationship is still in its early stage. By deploying a ground-based spectral system to collect SIF signals continuously, we were able to capture the SIF and SIFy variations under different light conditions and over multiple growth phases at a soybean field in the Midwestern USA. Through the framework of categorizing the continuous measurements by growth phases, light conditions, and time scales (Figure S2), we disentangled the confounding effects from growth stages, light conditions, and time scales on GPP:SIF and other associated relationships. To our best knowledge, our study represents the first agricultural based continuous SIF measurements over multiple growth stages and paired with the EC flux measures. These data also provide the valuable validation resources for modeling studies (Van Der Tol et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2016).

4.1. Comparison Between Soybean and Other Terrestrial Ecosystems

Overall, the general GPP:SIF, SIF:APAR, and GPP:APAR relationships observed at both diurnal and seasonal scales at the soybean field were consistent with previous observations measured at other ecosystems (Alexander Damm et al., 2010; Damm et al., 2015; Yang et al., 2015; Zarco-Tejada et al., 2013). GPP was more linearly correlated with SIF during sunny days when light condition was stable, while the GPP:SIF relationship showed an asymptotic trend during cloudy days with light condition changing rapidly. The highly correlated and positive relationship between SIF and APAR confirmed that the majority of the GPP:SIF relationship could be attributed to the fact that SIF carries much APAR information (Rossini et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2015). When GPP and SIF were normalized by APAR, however, SIFy and LUE showed different relationships with APAR. Specifically, LUE was negatively correlated with APAR, while SIFy was positively correlated with APAR at our site.

Our results of the SIFy:APAR and LUE:SIFy relationships at the soybean field showed some convergence but also inconsistent patterns with previous SIF studies (Table 1). At the diurnal scale, Damm et al. (2010) also observed negative LUE:SIFy relationship at corn fields, which is consistent with our finding at the diurnal scale. At the seasonal scale, we compared our results with previous results reported for temperate forests (Yang et al., 2015) and a C4 grassland (Verma et al., 2017). Under cloudy conditions, our soybean field showed a weak positive LUE:SIFy relationship (derived from the relationship that both LUE and SIFy were negatively correlated with APAR, Figure 8). This weak positive LUE:SIFy relationship was also found in the long-term SIF measurements conducted at the Harvard Forest site (Yang et al., 2015). In contrast, though Verma et al. (2017) also reported a positive LUE:SIFy relationship in an Australian C4 grassland, they found that both LUE and SIFy were positively correlated with APAR. Under sunny conditions, our study observed negative
LUE: APAR and positive SIF_y:APAR relationships (Figure 8), resulting in a negative LUE:SIF_y relationship, contrary to both prior studies (Verma et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2015). These patterns derived from observations at the canopy scale or larger also differed from previous modeled results. Specifically, modeling results from the widely used Soil-Canopy Observation Photosynthesis and Energy (SCOPE) fluxes model suggested the general pattern for different types of ecosystems (e.g., C3 crops and deciduous broadleaf forests); that is, under low light conditions, the simulated LUE is negatively correlated with SIF_y, while under high light conditions, LUE and SIF_y are positively correlated (Flexas et al., 2002; Porcar-Castell et al., 2014; Van Der Tol et al., 2009), but the dominant pattern simulated was the positive LUE:SIF_y relationship (Zhang et al., 2016).

### 4.2. Physiological and Structural Controls on the Canopy-Level LUE:SIF_y Relationship

Both positive and negative LUE:SIF_y and SIF_y:APAR relationships can be possible as a result of energy partitioning due to various light and plant stress conditions. Schlau-Cohen and Berry (2015) discussed the theory of plant photosynthetic regulatory systems at the leaf level and the consequent light partitioning based on previous leaf light-response experiments (Demmig & Björkman, 1987), and they suggested that plants under varying conditions (e.g., limited, saturated light conditions, or drought) could show different coupling patterns between LUE and SIF_y. Generally, LUE decreases with the APAR increase, although the decreasing rate varies with the light intensity. SIF_y, however, could exhibit opposite patterns—when light is limiting, SIF_y increases with the APAR increase; when light becomes rate saturating or plants experience stress, SIF_y starts

\[
\text{LUE:APAR and positive SIF_y:APAR relationships (Figure 8), resulting in a negative LUE:SIF_y relationship,}
\]

contrary to both prior studies (Verma et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2015). These patterns derived from observations at the canopy scale or larger also differed from previous modeled results. Specifically, modeling results from the widely used Soil-Canopy Observation Photosynthesis and Energy (SCOPE) fluxes model suggested the general pattern for different types of ecosystems (e.g., C3 crops and deciduous broadleaf forests); that is, under low light conditions, the simulated LUE is negatively correlated with SIF_y, while under high light conditions, LUE and SIF_y are positively correlated (Flexas et al., 2002; Porcar-Castell et al., 2014; Van Der Tol et al., 2009), but the dominant pattern simulated was the positive LUE:SIF_y relationship (Zhang et al., 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diurnal scale</th>
<th>LUE:APAR</th>
<th>SIF_y:APAR</th>
<th>LUE:SIF_y</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soybean (sunny)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean (cloudy)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Weak positive</td>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean (sunny)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate forest</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Yang et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Grassland</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Satellite</td>
<td>Verma et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diurnal and extrapolated seasonal scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCOPE model</td>
<td>Zhang et al. (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean and deciduous broadleaf forest (low light)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>SCOPE model</td>
<td>Zhang et al. (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LUE, light use efficiency; SIF_y, Sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence yield; APAR, absorbed photosynthetically active radiation; SCOPE, Soil-Canopy Observation Photosynthesis and Energy fluxes.

The high light condition defined in the modeling study is similar to the sunny conditions in our study.
decreasing as well. As a result, LUE:SIFy relationship could be positive under light-saturating conditions while negative under light-limiting condition (Van Der Tol et al., 2014). This trend is potentially applicable to various ecosystems, but the threshold of light-limiting/light-saturating may depend on species, ecosystem, or specific site. When we consider the canopy level, the variation of light or stress conditions may differ for individual leaves, which could be also site or ecosystem specific (Pearcy, 1990). The integrated responses of individual leaves over the whole canopy result in the canopy-level LUE:SIFy relationship.

Soybean, a C3 species with high photosynthetic capacity, if there is no severe stress, usually exhibits slightly light-saturated or nonsaturated photosynthesis at the canopy level (Gitelson et al., 2015; Slattery et al., 2017; Suyker et al., 2016). Additionally and importantly, the reabsorption of emitted SIF was not taken into account in this current study (Gitelson, Buschmann, & Lichtenthaler, 1998; Porcar-Castell et al., 2014), implying a potential bidirectional refootprint difference. The SIF observation might be also impacted by the directionality (characterized by the bidirectional reflectance distribution function), although observing from the nadir partially reduces the effect.

4.3. Uncertainties and Implications of the Agricultural Based Continuous SIF Measurements

Ground-based continuous SIF measurements enable us to disentangle the confounding effects of factors such as plant growth stages and light conditions on the GPP:SIF and LUE:SIFy relationships. This is even more important to the LUE:SIFy relationship as its smaller variation could be concealed by the confounding effects. In the current study, we observed the consistent positive SIFy:APAR and negative LUE:SIFy relationships under sunny conditions at both diurnal and seasonal scales. These patterns were strong under stable sunny conditions at early reproductive stage (Figures 5d and 5e and 7d and 7e)—the peak growing status with closed canopy and relatively stable chlorophyll content. Therefore, we believe that these patterns are robust and indicate the light responses of photosynthesis and SIF at the soybean field. These patterns also implicitly suggest the negative LUE:SIFy relationship, providing an additional support to the weak directly derived LUE:SIFy pattern (Figures 5f and 7f).

However, uncertainties related to the current field instrumentation require further attention and improvements in future studies. The different footprint sizes of GPP and SIF could impact the GPP:SIF relationship under instable light conditions. For example, during partly cloudy days, GPP might only change slightly due to the large footprint (hundreds of meters), while SIF measurements could fluctuate remarkably with clouds moving over its much smaller footprint area (1 m diameter in our system). These different responses to the changing light conditions might have caused the asymptotic GPP:SIF relationship we observed during cloudy days. In contrast, on stable sunny days, the changes in GPP and SIF were much less affected by the footprint difference. The SIF observation might be also impacted by the directionality (characterized by the bidirectional reflectance distribution function), although observing from the nadir partially reduces the effect. Multitude observations of SIF could be helpful to characterize the uncertainties of directional effects (Liu et al., 2016). Additionally and importantly, the reabsorption of emitted SIF was not taken into account in this current study (Gitelson, Buschmann, & Lichtenthaler, 1998; Porcar-Castell et al., 2014), implying a potential gap between the observed SIF and the true SIFy (SIFy = APAR × SIFy × fesc, in which fesc accounts for the fraction of SIF photons escaping from the canopy to be detected). It is challenging to measure the reabsorption in the...
field, but modeling could help fill the gap (Dahn et al., 1992; Du et al., 2017), and this is an ongoing study area in the SIF community.

Our agricultural-based continuous measurements added a different scenario into the variety of the SIF$_{y}$–APAR and LUE:SIF$_{y}$ relationships and provided new insights on the theoretical light partitioning framework of plant regulatory system (Schlau-Cohen & Berry, 2015). The variety of these relationships also suggests that despite the small contributions, LUE:SIF$_{y}$ relationship may contain the information associated with some fundamental differences between ecosystems, in addition to the similar GPP:APAR and SIF: APAR relationships across various ecosystems. These fundamental differences in both physiology and plant structure, such as the high photosynthetic capacity of soybean and the structural dynamics of sunlit and shaded leaves, could play important roles in interpreting the canopy-level GPP:SIF relationship but need to be tested by further comparisons in more ecosystems. It is also necessary to conduct measurements on more variables, such as LUE, SIF$_{y}$, and photosynthetic capacity of sunlit and shaded leaves under different light conditions, for a better understanding of physiological and structural effects on GPP: SIF relationship. Furthermore, the difference between observations and modeling results highlights the necessity of incorporating these observed patterns into fluorescence-related models (e.g., SCOPE model) for further tests to improve the model applicability in various ecosystems or under different conditions and provide the foundation to scale the SIF up at broader spatiotemporal scales for estimating GPP.
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