

# Evaluating a Three-Dimensional Model of Incident Radiation in Maize Canopy

Xiping Wang<sup>1</sup>, Yan Guo<sup>2</sup>, Xiyong Wang<sup>3</sup>, Baoguo Li<sup>2\*</sup>

1. College of Resources and Environmental Sciences, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang, 050016, China. 2. Key Laboratory of Plant-Soil Interaction, Ministry of Education, College of Resources and Environment, China Agricultural University, Beijing, 100094, China. 3. Department of Computer and Information Science and Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA.  
(\* Corresponding author: [libg@cau.edu.cn](mailto:libg@cau.edu.cn))

**Keywords:** Three-dimensional model, maize canopy, photosynthetically active radiation

## Introduction

The knowledge of three-dimensional (3D) radiation distribution in crop canopy is pivotal for understanding and modeling of plant eco-physiological processes (Chelle & Andrieu 1999; Sinoquet *et al.* 2000; Dauzat *et al.* 2006). A 3D model for simulating the distribution of incident radiation (3DIRM) in crop canopy is evaluated in this paper.

## The modelling scheme

The static virtual canopy was reconstructed by representing organ surfaces as little triangular facets positioned according to the 3D digitized data by Fastrak digitizer (Polhemus, USA). Parallel projection and Z-buffer algorithms (Chelle & Andrieu 1999; Espana *et al.* 1999; Maddonni *et al.* 2000) were utilized to simulate the sunfleck area ratio and the intensity of solar beam radiation to every facet in canopy. A sub-model, named as DSHP (Dividing Sky Hemisphere with Projecting), was set up for computing the incident diffuse radiation in crop canopy (Wang *et al.*, 2006). The total incident radiation in canopy could be calculated by just summing up the solar beam and incident diffuse radiation to each canopy facet.

## Evaluating the model with field experiment

A mast was built for supporting an AccuPAR ceptometer (Decagon Devices Inc. USA) to measure the 3D PAR distribution in maize canopy and an additional point PAR sensor, LI-190SA, to simultaneously measure the incoming PAR above canopy. The field measurements were carried out in maize canopies in the early filling stage near Beijing in 2002 (Wang *et al.*, 2006).

Based on the assumption that the intensity of beam PPF<sub>D</sub> (Photosynthetically photon flux density) was much higher than sky diffuse PPF<sub>D</sub> under sunshine conditions, when an AccuPAR sensor registered PPF<sub>D</sub> in canopy more than beam PPF<sub>D</sub> that had been estimated from the global PPF<sub>D</sub> measured by the LI-190SA above canopy, then this sensor point was considered to be sunfleck. Sunfleck area ratio was set to be the ratio of the number of sunfleck sensors and the total sensor number for each height. The sensors with PPF<sub>D</sub> lower than beam PPF<sub>D</sub> was set to be umbrage. The

average total and diffuse PPFD was calculated by averaging the PPFD values among all the AccuPAR sensors and only the umbrage sensors at each height.

In model evaluation, the simulated incident diffuse PPFD was slightly lower than the measured diffuse PPFD that included incident diffuse PPFD and secondary scattering PPFD by canopy elements, with a mean error of ME (Mean Error) = 20.78  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$  (Refer to Wang *et al.* 2006) for detailed information). The simulated total incident PPFD ( $PPFD_{sim}$ ) and sunfleck area ratio ( $FR_{sim}$ ) were consistently close to the measured results ( $PPFD_{obs}$  and  $FR_{obs}$  respectively) with correlation equations of  $PPFD_{sim} = 1.026PPFD_{obs}$  ( $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) with  $R^2 = 0.95$  ( $n = 74$ ), and  $FR_{sim} = 0.810FR_{obs} + 4.10$  ( $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) with  $R^2 = 0.96$  ( $n = 74$ ).

## Discussion

The 3DIRMS model achieved incident PAR (Photosynthetically active radiation) and sunfleck area estimation very close to the measurement. DSHP sub-model generated obvious errors with neglecting secondary scattering in canopy in diffuse PAR estimation. Nevertheless diffuse PAR only occupied a small proportion of total PAR in crop canopy during sunny daytime, thus DSHP sub-model can be an useful tool for incident diffuse radiation simulation in crop canopy.

It is difficult to carry out a 3D radiation measurement *in situ* in a real crop canopy. We hope the methodology of 3D measurement of PAR in maize canopy for evaluating a 3D radiation model introduced in this paper is referential to related studies.

## Acknowledgements

This study was sponsored by "863" Hi-Tech Research & Development Program of China (2006AA10Z229), the Program for Changjiang Scholars and Innovative Research Team in University (IRT0412) and Research Foundation of Hebei Normal University (L2004B13). Dr. Yuntao Ma, Mr. Zhicai Zhang and Meiping Wen gave a lot help in field measurements and data treatments.

## References:

- Chelle, M., Andrieu, B., 1999. Radiative models for architectural modeling. *Agronomie*. 19, pp. 225-240.
- Dauzat, J., Franck, N., Rapidel, B., Luquet, D., Vaast, P. 2006. Simulation of ecophysiological processes on 3D virtual stands with the Archimed simulation platform. PMA06: The Second International Symposium on Plant Growth Modeling, Simulation, Visualization and Applications. November 13-17, 2006, Beijing, P.R. China.
- Espana, M., Baret, F., Aries, F., Andrieu, B., Chelle, M. 1999. Radiative transfer. sensitivity to the accuracy of canopy structure description. The case of a maize canopy. *Agronomie* 19, pp. 241-254.
- Maddoni, G. A., Chelle, M., Drouet, J. L., Andrieu, B. Light interception of contrasting azimuth canopies under square and rectangular plant spatial distribution: simulations and crop measurements. *Field Crop Res.* 2001, 70: 1-13.
- Sinoquet, H., Rakocevic, M., Varlet-Grancher, C. 2000. Comparison of models for daily light partitioning in multispecies canopies. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 101, pp. 251-263.
- Wang, X. P., Guo, Y., Li, B. G., Wang, X. Y., Ma, Y. T., 2006. Evaluating a three dimensional model of diffuse photosynthetically active radiation in maize canopies. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* 50, 349-357.