

Self-supervised Learning for Hyperspectral Images of Trees

Moqsadur Rahman¹, Saurav Kumar², Santosh S. Palmate³, M. Shahriar Hossain¹

¹Department of Computer Science, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968,, USA

²School of Sustainable Engineering and Built Environment, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85281,, USA

³Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Texas A&M University, El Paso, TX 79927,, USA

mrahman20@miners.utep.edu, sk2@asu.edu, santosh.palmate@ag.tamu.edu, mhossain@utep.edu

Abstract

Aerial remote sensing using multispectral and RGB imagers has provided a critical impetus to precision agriculture. Analysis of the hyperspectral images with limited or no labels is challenging. This paper focuses on self-supervised learning to create neural network embeddings reflecting vegetation properties of trees from aerial hyperspectral images of crop fields. Experimental results demonstrate that a constructed tree representation, using a vegetation property-related embedding space, performs better in downstream machine learning tasks compared to the direct use of hyperspectral vegetation properties as tree representations.

Keywords

Vegetation index, Hyperspectral image, Neural network embedding, Self-supervised learning, Computer vision

1 Introduction

There is a growing recognition that hyperspectral imaging can have transformative effects on plant stress, and disease diagnosis [2, 3, 12, 13]. Many plant stresses are difficult to identify using RGB images but are apparent in the non-visible spectrum making hyperspectral imaging a great choice for the detection of stress. Most of the past studies with hyperspectral images have looked at designing stress indicators and correlating the spectrum of the images to detect specific types of stress or disease. While the methods have worked well for correlating stresses and diseases with the spectrum, *early detection* of these stresses and diseases is still hard to achieve [3]. Known patterns help detect stresses early. For example, drought stress [2, 3] and diseases that start in a small region on the foliage [12] can now be detected early using hyperspectral images.

Many of the stress patterns for early detection are still unknown. As a result, labeled data to classify stresses are not widely available. Moreover, there are myriads of relationships between hyperspectral bandwidths that could help detect stresses and diseases early. This paper focuses on designing a self-supervised learning method to characterize each plant of a crop field based on hidden relationships between vegetation indices. The vegetation indices are derived using hyperspectral data from around 400 to 1000 nm. We utilize a neural network embedding approach to create a mathematical space for different vegetation index bands (observed in plants of a crop field). The embedding space is contextual. That is if vegetation index band 1 and vegetation index band 2 appear in a part of tree 1, and vegetation index band 2 and vegetation index band 3 appear in a part of another tree, then all three vegetation index bands 1, 2, 3, will appear in the vicinity in the constructed embedding space. Therefore, a known correlation between one vegetation index and disease can be interpolated to another connected vegetation index.

This will increase the potential for early detection of diseases and stresses.

The contribution of this paper is limited to the construction of the embedding space for vegetation index bands and plants. The paper evaluates the potential of the embedding space using machine learning applications. Analysis of connections with diseases and stresses remains a future direction of this work.

The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We present a new self-supervised learning technique to create a distributed representation (contextual neural network embeddings) for vegetation index bands and trees using hyperspectral images. The method compresses high-dimensional hyperspectral images of trees to low-dimensional embedding vectors.
- We introduce a unique way of segmenting trees and creating vegetation index bands to build effective inputs for self-supervised learning using a neural network.
- We design new ways for experimentation on self-supervised learning with unlabeled hyperspectral imagery data in the agriculture sector.

2 Related work

The use of hyperspectral imagery data is increasing in precision agriculture. Many crops are sensitive to stresses and express visible reflection of trauma or change through leaf colors. However, by the time the stress patterns become visible, harvest loss becomes inevitable in many cases. Researchers have on detection of different kinds of stresses – such as insect and drought stresses [2, 3] – using hyperspectral images. Early detection of disease is another field of interest [12, 13] for agricultural and food scientists. Hyperspectral imagery data are used for quality and safety assessment of fruits [4] too.

Estimation of different indicators to plant phenomena has also been a research focus. Kyaw et al. [10] leveraged hyperspectral image data of leaves to estimate the photosynthetic capacity and nitrogen content. Li et al. [11] estimated leaf water content from similar datasets. Plant pathologists use different vegetation indices as indicators of plant health in many cases. Those indices could be utilized from the hyperspectral spectrum of plant or leaf-images [21]. The use of vegetation index-based indicators is common in disease [9, 17, 24] and stress detection [8, 23]. Vegetation indices are also used for remote monitoring of plants [1, 18]. In our work, we create contextual embeddings for different vegetation index bands. The embeddings are likely to help scientists discover hidden patterns between disease and stress indicators.

In the agriculture domain, the use of hyperspectral images many times revolves around classification problems. For example, Hycza,

Stereńczak, and Bałazy [7] utilized hyperspectral images to classify tree species. Fricker et al. [6], Zhang, Zhao, and Zhang [22], and Miyoshi et al. [16] also focused on plant species identification using classification algorithms. Different neural network models were applied for these classification problems. None of these classification models utilized distributed representations for better contextual classification, even though distributed representations using neural network embeddings have been proven effective in other domains, such as natural language processing [5, 14, 15, 19]. In this research, we focus on creating a self-supervised neural network model for a distributed representation of vegetation index bands. We demonstrate the potential of such a distributed representation in several classification algorithms and contextual analysis of tress.

3 Problem description

Let $T = \{t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots, t_{|T|}\}$ be a collection of $|T|$ separate trees with hyperspectral pixels. For each hyperspectral pixel, a set of $|Indices|$ vegetation indices are computed, where $Indices = \{Index_1, Index_2, Index_3, \dots, Index_{|Indices|}\}$. Each vegetation index, $Index_i$, is further divided into $|b|$ number of bands (ranges of values of the index), where the bands are $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{|b|}$. Therefore, there are $|b| \times |Indices|$ vegetation index bands. Let us represent the set of all vegetation index bands as V , where $V = \{Index_1^{b_1}, Index_1^{b_2}, \dots, Index_1^{b_{|b|}}, Index_2^{b_1}, Index_2^{b_2}, \dots, Index_2^{b_{|b|}}, \dots, Index_{|Indices|}^{b_1}, Index_{|Indices|}^{b_2}, \dots, Index_{|Indices|}^{b_{|b|}}\} = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{|b| \times |Indices|}\}$. Each tree has $|S|$ segments of circular rings, where $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_{|S|}\}$. s_1 is in the center and is a circle. The rest of the segments are rings. Each ring and the center circle of a tree is called a context. The context set in the entire dataset is $C = \{c_{t_1}^{s_1}, c_{t_1}^{s_2}, \dots, c_{t_1}^{s_{|S|}}, c_{t_2}^{s_1}, c_{t_2}^{s_2}, \dots, c_{t_2}^{s_{|S|}}, \dots, c_{t_{|T|}}^{s_1}, c_{t_{|T|}}^{s_2}, \dots, c_{t_{|T|}}^{s_{|S|}}\}$. For $|T|$ trees, the total number of contexts is $|T| \times |S|$.

This research aims to generate self-supervised models for all vegetation index bands and trees.

- Create a self-supervised embedding model to provide vectors, $U = \{u_{Index_1}^{b_1}, u_{Index_1}^{b_2}, \dots, u_{Index_1}^{b_{|b|}}, u_{Index_2}^{b_1}, u_{Index_2}^{b_2}, \dots, u_{Index_2}^{b_{|b|}}, \dots, u_{Index_{|Indices|}}^{b_1}, u_{Index_{|Indices|}}^{b_2}, \dots, u_{Index_{|Indices|}}^{b_{|b|}}\} = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, \dots, u_{|b| \times |Indices|}\}$, for all vegetation index bands.
- Generate embeddings for all trees $\tau = \tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_{|T|}$, where τ_i is composed of the embedding vectors of all $|S|$ segments of tree t_i . That is, the embeddings for tree t_i is a vector of size $|S| \times |Indices| \times |u_i|$.

4 Methodology

4.1 Data collection process

The hyperspectral datasets were collected using an unmanned aircraft system (UAS) based on DJI Matrice 600 that was integrated with Resonon® Pika L hyperspectral push-broom imaging system (imaging spectroradiometer). The flights were conducted in cloudless weather conditions around solar noon over a Pecan and tornillo orchards near El Paso, Texas. The hyperspectral imager has a spectral range of around 400-1000nm, with about 300 spectral channels and a minimum spectral bandwidth of 2.1nm. The UAS was also equipped with a separate small-sized Real-Time Kinetic (RTK) Inertial Navigation System (INS) from SBG systems® for the imager. The UAS was flown at the height of about 100m above ground level




Figure 1: (top) Before filtration, (bottom) After filtration. with a 17mm fixed focus lens, field-of-view (FOV) of 17.6 degrees. The data obtained were radiometrically corrected using the factory calibration data to compute radiance; radiance data were converted to surface reflectance (scaled to integer values between 0-10,000) via in-scene reference spectra from a calibration-tarp placed in the flight path, and finally, geo-rectified and resampled to produce a hypercube of 0.07m spatial resolution. The hypercube was used for further analysis and computation of indexes.

4.2 Extracting trees

We ran the hyperspectral images through several preprocessing steps to extract the trees from other vegetation such as grass. The following subsections describe the steps.

Our observation is that pixels associated with leaves, the surrounding of a tree (such as the grass area), and tree shades can be characterized using the brightness of pixels. Let us assume that the brightness of pixel P at wavelength x is P_x . We found that most leaf pixels have $P_{780} > 2500$, $P_{900} < 6000$, and $P_{600} < 1000$. Pixels in the surroundings and shades can be characterized the same way. However, some pixels in the surroundings with grass may have similar brightness to the leaves, while shades are easily distinguishable from the brightness property.

To ensure a better distinction between leaf pixels and surrounding pixels, we used two widely used vegetation indices for canopy or leaf area detection: (Eq. 1) Anthocyanin Reflectance Index 2 (ARI2) [20], and (Eq. 2) Structure Intensive Pigment Index (SIPI) [20].

$$ARI2(P) = P_{800} * \left(\frac{1}{P_{550}} + \frac{1}{P_{700}} \right) \quad (1)$$

$$SIPI(P) = \frac{P_{800} - P_{445}}{P_{800} + P_{680}} \quad (2)$$




Figure 2: Connecting neighboring pixels.

Given a pixel p , the following formula detects whether p is a leaf pixel (1) or not (0).

$$isLeaf(P) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } ARI2(P) > \theta_{ARI2If} \ \& \ SIPI(P) > \theta_{SIPIIf} \\ & \ \& \ P_{900} < 6000 \ \& \ P_{780} > 2500 \ \& \ P_{660} < 1000 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $\theta_{ARI2If} = 0.80$ and $\theta_{SIPIIf} = 0.88$. Both the thresholds θ_{ARI2If} and θ_{SIPIIf} are empirically selected. Fig. 1 (top) shows an image without filtration, and Fig. 1 (bottom) shows the corresponding leaf pixels (in red) after the filtration of the non-leaf pixels using Eq. 3.

4.2.1 Analyzing neighboring pixels to separate trees: The leaf pixels (Fig. 1 (bottom)) are scattered points without any information on how they are connected within trees. To generate connectivity relationships between neighboring pixels, we divide an entire image to fit as many $k \times k$ non-overlapping grids as possible. We varied k from 2 to 10, and $k=4$ resulted in the best outcome for most images. Let us say that the grids in an image are flattened as $G = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{|G|}\}$. Assume that $countlp(g_i)$ is the number of leaf pixels in grid g_i of an image.

$$isconnected(g_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } countlp(g_i) \geq \theta_g \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Here, θ_g the minimum number of pixels required to establish all the pixels inside the grid-connected. $\theta_g = 10$ gave us reasonable connectivity between pixels of the same tree for $k = 4$. That is, if a grid has 10 leaf pixels out of 16, then the grid is considered a container of connected pixels.

Consider that $g(p)$ is the grid where pixel p exists. Non-leaf pixels within a grid that contains at least θ_g leaf pixels are marked for the detection of tree areas.

$$isInConnectedGrid(p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } isconnected(g(p)) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Fig. 2 shows the pixels that are detected as within connected grids (using Eq. 5) for our running example.

4.2.2 Indexing the trees: For pixel p , for which $isInConnectedGrid(p) = 1$, we apply depth first search (DFS) to include all the leaf pixels of a tree. When DFS is exhausted for one pixel, then the algorithm moves to an unexplored pixel with $isInConnectedGrid(p) = 1$. The algorithm continues till there is no more pixel to traverse. A constructed tree with less than 40 pixels is not actually a tree, based on our observation, and hence removed. Also, we only keep leaf pixels




Figure 3: Indexing the trees.

within a tree area. We index the trees, $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{|T|}\}$, based on the sequence DFS created them. Fig. 3 shows the pixels of the trees.

4.3 Computing pixel-wise vegetation indices

Vegetation indices play a vital role in analyzing the health of trees. For instance, anthocyanins are responsible for colors in fruits and vegetables. The level of anthocyanins can be computed from a pixel using Anthocyanin Reflectance Index 1 ($ARI1$) and Anthocyanin Reflectance Index 2 ($ARI2$). The formulas are provided in Table 1. We calculated 21 hyperspectral vegetation indices, which are listed in Table 1. For some of the vegetation indices, not all wavelengths were available in the hyperspectral images. In such cases, we used the closest available wavelength to calculate the vegetation index. For example, according to the Eq. 2 (Structure Insensitive Pigment Index - SIPI), we need $P_{445}, P_{680}, P_{800}$. The exact wavelengths of 680 and 800 were not available in the data. We used 680.47 nm instead of 680 because 680.47 nm was the closest to 680. Similarly, we used 799.94 nm instead of 800.

4.4 Analyzing the relationship between segments of a tree and vegetation indices

Our observation is that, in a drone-view of a tree, most vegetation indices vary between the central part of a tree and the outer part. We divide each tree area into $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_{|S|}\}$ circular segments. We consider the center of the line drawn between the two furthest pixels of a tree as the center of the tree. The radius of the tree is considered to be half of the length of the line between the two furthest points of the tree. The tree area is divided into $|S|$ parts. The first segment, s_1 is the circle from the center with a radius of $\frac{radius}{|S|}$. Segment s_2 is the ring between the radius $\frac{radius}{|S|}$ to $\frac{2*radius}{|S|}$, so and so forth. Then, we compute the average of each vegetation index of all the pixels in each segment. Figure 4 shows a sample of the segments of a tree area, where the color red represents the tree area. The green circles separate the segments.




Figure 4: Segments of a tree.

For every vegetation index, we checked if the vegetation index keeps increasing or decreasing in at least l segments from the center to the outer part, where $l \leq |S|$.

Table 1: Hyperspectral vegetation indices

SL.	Hyperspectral Vegetation Index	Equation
01	Anthocyanin Reflectance Index 1	$ARI1 = \frac{1}{p_{550}} - \frac{1}{p_{700}}$
02	Anthocyanin Reflectance Index 2	$ARI2 = p_{800} \left(\frac{1}{p_{550}} - \frac{1}{p_{700}} \right)$
03	Atmospherically Resistant Vegetation Index	$ARVI = \frac{NIR - (Red - \gamma(Blue - Red))}{NIR + (Red - \gamma(Blue - Red))}$
04	Carotenoid Reflectance Index 1	$CRI1 = \frac{1}{p_{510}} - \frac{1}{p_{550}}$
05	Carotenoid Reflectance Index 2	$CRI2 = \frac{1}{p_{510}} - \frac{1}{p_{700}}$
06	Enhanced Vegetation Index	$EVI = \frac{NIR - Red}{NIR + 6.0 \cdot Red - 7.5 \cdot Blue + 1}$
07	Modified Chlorophyll Absorption Reflectance Index	$MCARI = p_{700} - p_{670} - 0.2(p_{700} - p_{550}) \left(\frac{p_{700}}{p_{670}} \right)$
08	Modified Chlorophyll Absorption Reflectance Index Improved	$MCARI2 = \frac{1.5 \cdot (2.5 \cdot (NIR - Red) - 1.3 \cdot (NIR - Green))}{\sqrt{(2 \cdot NIR + 1)^2 - (6 \cdot NIR - 5 \cdot \sqrt{Red} - 0.5)}} \cdot \frac{p_{700} - p_{705}}{p_{700} - p_{705}}$
09	Modified Red Edge Normalized Vegetation Index	$MRENNVI = \frac{p_{750} - p_{705}}{p_{750} + p_{705} - 2 \cdot p_{445}}$
10	Modified Red Edge Simple Ratio Index	$MRESRI = \frac{p_{705} - p_{445}}{p_{705} + p_{445}}$
11	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index	$NDVI = \frac{NIR - RED}{NIR + RED}$
12	Photochemical Reflectance Index	$PRI = \frac{p_{531} - p_{570}}{p_{531} + p_{570}}$
13	Plant Senescence Reflectance Index	$PSRI = \frac{p_{680} - p_{500}}{p_{680} + p_{500}}$
14	Red Edge Normalized Difference Vegetation Index	$RENDVI = \frac{p_{750} - p_{705}}{p_{750} + p_{705}}$
15	Simple Ratio Index	$SRI = \frac{NIR}{Red}$
16	Structure Insensitive Pigment Index	$SIPi = \frac{p_{800} - p_{445}}{p_{800} + p_{680}}$
17	Transformed Chlorophyll Absorption Reflectance Index	$TCARI = 3 \left p_{700} - p_{670} - 0.2(p_{700} - p_{550}) \left(\frac{p_{700}}{p_{670}} \right) \right $
18	Vogelmann Red Edge Index 1	$VREI1 = \frac{p_{740}}{p_{720}}$
19	Vogelmann Red Edge Index 2	$VREI2 = \frac{p_{734} - p_{747}}{p_{715} - p_{726}}$
20	Vogelmann Red Edge Index 3	$VREI3 = \frac{p_{734} - p_{747}}{p_{715} + p_{720}}$
21	Water Band Index	$WBI = \frac{p_{970}}{p_{900}}$

Consider $v_{avg}(s_i)$ the average of a vegetation index of the pixels in segment s_i . To check if there are l segments with increasing or decreasing values of a vegetation index in the segments, we use the following formula.

$$pc(l) = \begin{cases} l & \text{if } \max\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{|S|} v_{avg}(s_i) > v_{avg}(s_{i-1}), \right. \\ & \left. \sum_{i=1}^{|S|} v_{avg}(s_i) < v_{avg}(s_{i-1}) \right\} = l \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The formula returns l if there are l such segments with increasing or decreasing average values of the vegetation index. Otherwise, it returns 0.

The following formula gives the largest number of segments in increasing or decreasing values for a given vegetation index.

$$pl_{max} = \max_{l=2}^{|S|} pc(l) \quad (7)$$

Fig. 5 shows the relationship between the number of segments and the number of trees that have increasing or decreasing vegetation index within the segments. The experiment was done with 15 trees collected from the same hyperspectral image. The figure shows the number of trees having a vegetation index in l segments where l varies from 1 to 5. Each line represents a vegetation index. While most vegetation indices follow an increasing or decreasing pattern in most trees, some do not have any increasing or decreasing patterns. For example, RENDVI (Red Edge Normalized Difference Vegetation Index) does not have increasing or decreasing patterns within the segments of the trees, as observed in Fig. 5. Note that there are only four trees (out of 15) with increasing or decreasing

patterns with the number of segments=4 for RENDVI. The corresponding line represents that RENDVI does not have the center of the tree different from the outer parts.

Not all the vegetation indices are plotted in Fig.5 to ensure picture clarity. Our observation is that most vegetation indices have increasing or decreasing values from the center toward the outer region, making the choice of creating segments within a tree for feature generation a logical one. With more than five segments, we observed that the number of pixels is not workable. With a lesser number of segments, the increasing or decreasing patterns are not captured well. Therefore, in our experiments, we divided each tree into five segments.




Figure 5: Relationship between the number of segments with increasing or decreasing vegetation index. Plots are given for five vegetation indices in five lines.




Figure 6: How the tree data are prepared for an input of embedding models. I_i refers to vegetation index $Index_i$.

4.5 Input for the embedding model

As illustrated in Fig. 6, how tree segments go through a series of changes to create input data for an embedding model. Each segment of a tree has an average of 21 vegetation indices. The first step is to normalize each vegetation index based on all segments of all trees using min-max normalization. That brings all indices within the range of 0 to 1.

After the normalization, we detect outlier values for each vegetation index. For each vegetation index, outliers are detected for all values in all segments of all trees. We use a box-plot method to detect outliers. $Q1_{Index_j}$ is the first quartile, $Q2_{Index_j}$ is the median, and $Q3_{Index_j}$ is the third quartile of the vegetation index $Index_j$. Then, the interquartile range is given by the following formula.

$$IQR_{Index_j} = Q3_{Index_j} - Q1_{Index_j} \quad (8)$$

whereas, the lower-bound is

$$lb_{Index_j} = Q1_{Index_j} - 1.5 * IQR_{Index_j} \quad (9)$$

and the upper-bound is

$$ub_{Index_j} = Q3_{Index_j} + 1.5 * IQR_{Index_j} \quad (10)$$

A value of $Index_j$ in segment s_i of a tree t_k smaller than the lower-bound or greater than the upper-bound is marked as an outlier, with a negative value.

$$t_k^{s_i, Index_j} = \begin{cases} t_k^{s_i, Index_j} & \text{if } lb_{Index_j} \leq t_k^{s_i, Index_j} \leq ub_{Index_j} \\ -1000000 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

In Fig. 6, the outlier cells after detection are marked with a light shade of red. After the removal of outliers, we create vegetation index bands. Each vegetation index range is divided into four bands in such a way that each band has an equal number of observations in all segments of all trees. We achieve such equidistribution by creating three thresholds at quartile 1, quartile 2, and quartile 3 of the outlier-discarded data. The thresholds to create the bands are shown in the quartile matrix of Fig. 6.

Now, each vegetation index in every segment of a tree is converted to an integer representing which band the index falls into, as

shown in the right-most matrix of Fig. 6. The number of vegetation index bands $|V|$ becomes $4 \times 21 = 84$.

4.6 Building a self-supervised model to generate embeddings for vegetation index bands

As stated in Section 3, one of the objectives is to create a self-supervised embedding model U for each vegetation index band: $U = \{u_{Index_1}^{b_1}, u_{Index_1}^{b_2}, \dots, u_{Index_1}^{b_{|b|}}, u_{Index_2}^{b_1}, u_{Index_2}^{b_2}, \dots, u_{Index_2}^{b_{|b|}}, \dots, u_{Index_{|Indices|}}^{b_{|b|}}\} = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, \dots, u_{|b| * |Indices|}\}$. The current state of the art embedding models are Word2vec [14, 15], Glove [19], BERT [5], which are suitable for text data. These models leverage semantic relationships of words within a context window. Such semantic relationships do not exist in our problem with vegetation indices using hyperspectral imagery. However, as described in Section 4.4, trees have increasing or decreasing order of vegetation indices from the center to outer segments, making each segment a potential context for vegetation index bands. In such a unique scenario of vegetation index for trees, we have $|V| = 84$ bands which is analogous to the vocabulary in natural language terminology.

4.6.1 A Word2vec-inspired model: We constructed two Word2vec models, one using the Continuous Bag of Words (CBOW) approach and the other using the Skip-graph model, that is commonly used in generating embedding vectors in natural language processing. With our data, each band was a word (with a vocabulary size of 84), each tree is a document, and each segment of a tree is considered a sentence/context. Neither of the models was able to produce contextual embeddings for the vegetation index-based data generated from high-spectral images. One of the reasons is that Word2vec captures the semantic relationships from a large number of samples (documents). Even though our data are high-spectral (high-dimensional), the number of sentences or segments in the trees is limited to generate a solid neural network embedding-based mathematical space.

The results gained from the word2vec inspired us to construct a neural network model that performs well with a limited number of input samples, as described in the following subsection.




Figure 7: Neural network architecture to generate embeddings using hyperspectral tree imagery and vegetation index data.

4.6.2 Embedding model to generate embeddings for vegetation index bands: The objective of creating embeddings is to bring two contextually similar vegetation index bands close by in a mathematical space. If two vegetation index bands are found in the same tree segments, then these two vegetation index bands must be contextually similar. Assume that two vegetation index bands v_i and v_j are contextually similar. Another pair of vegetation index bands, v_j and v_k , are also contextually similar. Even though v_i and v_k bands never appeared together in any tree segment, they should be contextually connected via v_j . Regular vector space, such as direct use of vegetation index bands or hyperspectral ranges, will not provide such contextual similarity. With an embeddings space that correctly puts the vegetation index bands in the mathematical space, v_i , v_j , and v_k will be in the same neighborhood indicating contextual proximity.

To encode the appearance of a pair of bands, v_i and v_j , we use the Jaccard similarity between the segments where they appear. Let $s(v_i)$ be the set of segments where the vegetation index band v_i was observed. Then the Jaccard similarity between the existence of v_i and v_j is:

$$J(v_i, v_j) = \frac{|s(v_i) \cap s(v_j)|}{|s(v_i) \cup s(v_j)|} \quad (12)$$

Fig. 7 shows the neural network model to generate the embeddings using the Jaccard similarity between all v_i and v_j pairs of embedding bands in all trees as training information. The input to the neural network is two band IDs, where IDs range between 1 and the number of vegetation index $|V|$. The forward propagation moves via an embedding layer. The embedding matrix has $|V|$ columns and 64 rows, generating an embedding vector of length 64 for each vegetation index. For the v_i and v_j inputs, the i th and j th columns of the embedding matrix are flattened to construct a column vector u_{ij} of length 128. Forwarding from that, via a hidden layer, the loss for one pair of vegetation indices can be computed as:

$$Loss(i, j) = ((w_h)^T u_{ij})^T w_o - J(v_i, v_j) \quad (13)$$

w_h is the weight matrix used between the flattened embedding vector u_{ij} and the hidden layer. w_o is the weight vector between the hidden layer and the output. That is, w_o has a length equal to the number of hidden nodes.

The adam optimizer minimizes the following loss function.

$$FinalLoss = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{|V|} \sum_{j=i+1}^{|V|} (Loss(i, j))^2 \quad (14)$$

where $n = \sum_{i=1}^{|V|} \sum_{j=i+1}^{|V|} 1$. We used leaky relu as the activation function. The hidden layer had 600 nodes, with a 20% drop-out rate.

4.7 Constructing tree vectors using vegetation index band embeddings

As explained in Section 4.6.2, each vegetation index band v_i is represented as an embedding vector u_i of length 64. Each tree has $|S|$ segments, which is 5 in our case, as explained in Section 4.4. Each segment has $|Indices| = 21$ vegetation indices. To construct a tree from the vegetation index bands, we combine the embeddings of the vegetation index bands of each tree segment in a sequence. The segments appear from the center to the outer part of the tree. Hence, a tree t_i is represented by a vector τ_i of length $|S| \times |Indices| \times |u_i| = 5 \times 21 \times 64 = 6720$.

As shown in Figure 6, the tree representation might have some vegetation index bands detected as outliers. An embedding vector of a vegetation index v_i for an outlier in a segment s_p is copied from the vegetation index band embedding u_i of a non-outlier vegetation index band of another nearest segment s_q . If an outlier vegetation index band in a segment s_p has two nearest segments s_{p-k} and s_{p+k} , where k is either 1 or 2, the average of two u_i 's of those two segments, s_{p-k} and s_{p+k} , will become the vegetation index band u_i of the outlier segment s_p .

5 Experimental results

To evaluate the potential of the embeddings generated for vegetation index bands and constructed for trees, we use two hyperspectral image datasets of trees. The first dataset has 81 pecan trees. The second dataset contains 198 tornillo trees. For each dataset, we extracted the trees from large aerial hyperspectral images of the crop fields using the method described in Section 4.2.

In this section, we seek to answer the following questions.

- (1) Does the embedding space constructed for the vegetation index bands have structures capturing relationships between them? (Section 5.1)
- (2) How are embedding-based clusters of trees different from direct vegetation index-based clusters? (Section 5.2)
- (3) How well does the embedding-based tree representation perform in creating discriminative features compared to a direct vegetation index-based representation of trees? (Section 5.3)
- (4) How can we characterize groups of trees constructed from an embedding-based representation? (Section 5.4)
- (5) How can we retrieve the context of vegetation index bands using an embedding-based representation? (Section 5.5)

5.1 Does the embedding space of vegetation index bands capture relationships between vegetation indices?

Using a t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) plot of two dimensions in Fig. 8 (constructed from the 64-dimensional embedding space), we observe that embedding vectors of the vegetation index bands form some structures. Each point in the figure represents the embedding of a vegetation index band. Some groups are manually drawn in Fig.8. The plot only illustrates that there are




Figure 8: A two-dimensional t-SNE Plot for the embedding vectors of the vegetation index bands. There are $21 \times 4 = 84$ points in the plot for 21 vegetation indices.

structures in the embedding space, but it does not demonstrate the potential of using the embeddings for analyzing trees.

The following subsections provide experiments demonstrating the potential of the use of embeddings of vegetation index bands in analyzing hyperspectral imagery of plants.

5.2 Difference between embedding-based and vegetation index-based clusters

Even before we study the potential of embeddings, a crucial question is – if trees represented by embeddings provide a different insight than the same trees represented by direct vegetation indices in segments of the trees. Each tree vector in our embedding-based representation has a length of 6720. For the direct vegetation index-based representation, each tree is represented as a vector of length $|S| \times |\text{Indices}| = 5 \times 21 = 105$.

For each representation, we apply k-means with $k=4$. Then we constructed a confusion matrix illustrating the size of intersections of trees between cluster i of embedding-based clustering and cluster j of direct vegetation index-based clustering. i and j vary between 1 to 4 because the number of clusters is 4. As observed in the confusion matrix of Table 2, none of the embedding-based clusters solely intersect with a direct vegetation index-based cluster. If each embedding-based cluster had a sole mapping with one direct vegetation index-based cluster, then exactly four cells of the confusion matrix would have non-zero values.

The pecan dataset was used for Table 2. We use purity to compute a scalar value representing overlaps between the clusters of two **Table 2: Confusion matrix using embedding-based clusters and vegetation index-based clusters of trees for the Pecan dataset.**

→ Direct ↓ Embedding	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4
Cluster 1	0	2	15	1
Cluster 2	19	1	0	0
Cluster 3	3	19	2	0
Cluster 4	0	3	1	15

clusterings.

$$\text{purity} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \max_{j=1}^k (g_i \cap h_j)}{|T|} \quad (15)$$

where k is the number of clusters in each clustering and g_i refers to the i th cluster of the embedding-based clustering, and h_j refers to the j th cluster of the direct vegetation index-based clustering.

For Table 2, the computed purity is 0.84, which indicates that around 84% of the trees agree on the clustering results using embedding and direct vegetation index-based approach. The summary of this experiment is that the embedding-based approach does not result in the same clustering result as the direct vegetation-based approach. We ran a similar test with the tornillo dataset, which also resulted in the same conclusion that the embedding-based approach gives a different clustering result.

While this subsection focuses on the uniqueness of the embedding-based approach compared to the direct use of vegetation indices, the following subsections provide experiments on the quality of the embedding vectors.

5.3 A comparison between embedding-based and direct vegetation index-based representations

Section 4.7 explains how we constructed tree vectors using embeddings of the vegetation index bands. To evaluate the potential of the constructed embeddings of the trees, we compare the performance of a classification application between our embedding-based tree representation and a tree representation that directly uses vegetation indices of each segment of a tree.

An issue in framing a classification problem is that we need labeled data. Since the dataset is newly created, there are no available classification labels. To mitigate the issue of labeling the data, we created four clusters of the available trees using the k-means clustering algorithm. Then we used the outcome of the k-means clustering as class labels for the trees. For a dataset, we created two clusterings of trees, one with embedding-based features and the other using direct vegetation index-based representation. For a fair comparison, we used embedding-based clusters of trees as labels when we used classification algorithms for embedding-based trees. We used direct vegetation index-based clusters when we used classification algorithms for direct vegetation index-based trees. We used both the pecan and tornillo datasets in this study.

We applied five different classification algorithms, for each of the two representations (embedding-based and direct vegetation index-based), for each of the two datasets (pecan and tornillo). The five classification algorithms are neural network, support vector machine, naive Bayes, random forest, and decision tree. Fig. 9 demonstrates the results. For each dataset and each algorithm, we performed the experiments with an increasing test data percentage of 4%, 8%, 12%, 16%, ..., 48% (that is, decreasing training portion). A repetition of 100 different random splits was taken at each percentage. The reported accuracy is the average of 100 computed accuracies of predicting the cluster labels of the test data. The five plots on the left are for tornillo, and the five plots on the right are for pecan plants.

As observed in the left-side plots of Fig. 9, our embedding-based representation results in better accuracies compared to the direct




Figure 9: Classification accuracy comparison between our embedding-based approach and direct veg. index-based approach. (left) Tornillo dataset and (right) Pecan dataset.

vegetation index-based representation, using all the five algorithms. On the right side, we observe that our embedding-based approach performs better for all splits using neural network, support vector machine, and naive Bayes classification. However, the direct vegetation index-based classification performs better for random forest and decision tree-based classification. The explanation is that the mechanics of the decision tree and random forest work in such a way that the best discriminating feature from the feature vector is selected to make a decision. The number of direct vegetation index features (105) is lesser than the number of embedding features 6720, making a single vegetation index feature more powerful than a single embedding-based feature. Moreover, embedding features are powerful and contextual when all of the features are used, not just one or a subset of the features.

Even though with a larger dataset (e.g., tornillo), our embedding-based approach demonstrates better classification results with all the five classification algorithms, we advocate the use of embedding-based approaches in classification techniques where all features are used in all aspects of an algorithm, such as neural network, support

Table 3: Embedding cluster characterization by vegetation index bands.

Clusters	1	2	3	4	5
Cluster1	Low SRI	Low ARVI	Low SIPI	Low NDVI	Low CRI1
Cluster2	Mid TCARI	Mid MCARI	Mid ARI2	Mid ARI1	High ARI1
Cluster3	Mid WBI	Low SRI	Mid ARI2	Low ARI2	Mid ARI1
Cluster4	Low CRI1	Low CRI2	Low VREI1	Low SRI	Low SIPI

vector machine, and naive Bayes. The mechanics of decision trees and random forests do not support the actual use of embedding-based features.

5.4 Characterizing clusters of trees retrieved from the embedding-based clustering

As demonstrated in Section 5.3, the embedding-based tree representations have more contextual ability for classification. This indicates that the contextual features can be used for studying trees further. A complexity is that the features of embedding-based tree representations are not understandable for human interpretation. However, it is possible to characterize each embedding-based cluster based on the original vegetation index-based features of the trees.

To characterize each cluster, we take the vegetation index representation of all the trees of an embedding-based cluster and compute a vegetation index-based centroid:

$$\text{centroid}_{\text{veg.Ind}}(g_i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{|g_i|} (v(t_j))}{|g_i|} \quad (16)$$

where g_i is the i th embedding-based cluster and $v(t)$ gives the direct vegetation index-based vector of tree t .

Given an embedding-based cluster, g_i , we can now characterize the cluster by some top vegetation indices using the ascending order of the following computed values for the vegetation indices:

$$d_{g_i} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{|g_i|} (v(t_j) - \text{centroid}_{\text{veg.Ind}}(g_i))^2}{|g_i|} \quad (17)$$

d_{g_i} is a vector of length 105 and represents the difference of each of the 105 vegetation index bands with the center of the i th embedding-based cluster. That is, each embedding-based cluster can now be characterized using these vegetation index bands. For example, Table 3 shows the top five vegetation index bands for four embedding-based clusters. Cluster 1 has low values of Simple Ratio Index (SRI), low Atmospherically Resistant Vegetation Index (ARVI), and so forth. Cluster 2 exhibits mid-level bands of Transformed Chlorophyll Absorption Reflectance Index (TCARI) and mid-level values of Modified Chlorophyll Absorption Reflectance Index (MCARI). Similarly, Clusters 3 and 4 have characterizations using the vegetation index bands. Such characterizations of clusters help scientists in plant pathology study indications of stressors and diseases in a group of plants.

5.5 Contextual analysis of veg. index bands

A powerful aspect of creating embeddings for vegetation index bands is that scientists can study contextual vegetation indices for each crop field. In Table 4, we provide three nearest neighbors of several vegetation index bands both using the embedding space and directly using the vegetation index bands. For the embeddings,

Table 4: Nearest vegetation index of a given one. V. High indicates Very High.

(a) Nearest vegetation index bands using embedding space.

Veg. Ind. band	1	2	3
Low EVI	V. High PSRI	Low VREI1	Low MCARI2
V. High MRENV1	V. High MRESRI	V. High RENDVI	Low VREI2
V. High PSRI	Low EVI	Low MCARI2	High WBI
Mid SRI	Mid SIPI	Mid NDVI	Mid ARVI
Low TCARI	Low MCARI	Very High ARI1	V. High ARI2

(b) Nearest vegetation index bands using veg.index bands directly.

Veg. Ind. band	1	2	3
Low EVI	V. High PSRI	Low NDVI	Low ARVI
V. High MRENV1	V. High RENDVI	V. High MRESRI	Low VREI2
V. High PSRI	Low EVI	Low MCARI2	Low NDVI
Mid SRI	Mid ARVI	Mid NDVI	Mid SIPI
Low TCARI	Low MCARI	V. High MRENV1	V. High CRI2

nearest neighbors were computed based on the distance between each pair of embedding vectors. For the direct vegetation index bands, nearest neighbors were computed based on the Jaccard similarity of two binary vectors representing the appearance of two vegetation index bands in tree segments.

Table 4(a) shows that the contextual (embedding-based) second nearest neighbor of low EVI (Enhanced Vegetation Index) is low VREI1 (Vogelmann Red Edge Index 1). In contrast, Table 4(b) demonstrates that the second nearest neighbor of low EVI is low NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index). Other rows of Table 4(a) and (b) also reflect differences. Embedding-based approaches retrieve hidden connections in the feature space, whereas direct approaches look for the direct similarity of the vectors.

Mid SRI's contextual nearest neighbor being mid SIPI does not necessarily mean that plants exhibit mid SRI and mid SIPI together. Rather, it means that they are contextually connected. A contextual connection may be established because mid SRI and mid ARVI appear in Tree 1, and mid ARVI and mid SIPI appear in Tree 2. Therefore, mid SRI \rightarrow mid ARVI \rightarrow mid SIPI could be the reason why mid SRI and mid SIPI are closer in the embedding space. No such contextual relationships are observed in a direct vegetation index-based space.

6 Conclusion

The paper analyzes how hyperspectral imagery data can be examined using a neural network-driven embedding space. Our experiments demonstrate that such a self-supervised approach has the potential to retrieve unique features different from any non-contextual vector space. In the future, we plan to study ways to model harvest amounts using hyperspectral images of multiple seasons of the same crop field. We aim to design models to predict diseases for early intervention with plant-stress-related data.

Acknowledgments

This work is partly supported by NSF (Award Number: 1643944) and the USDA Hatch program (Accession Number. 1022633).

References

- [1] A. A. Aldubai, A. A. Alsadon, K. A. Al-Gaadi, E. Tola, and A. A. Ibrahim. 2022. Utilizing spectral vegetation indices for yield assessment of tomato genotypes grown in arid conditions. *Saudi Journal of Bio. Sciences* 29, 4 (2022), 2506–2513.
- [2] M. S. M. Asaari, S. Mertens, S. D., D. Inzé, N. Wuyts, and P. Scheunders. 2019. Analysis of hyperspectral images for detection of drought stress and recovery in maize plants in a high-throughput phenotyping platform. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 162 (2019), 749–758.
- [3] J. Behmann, J. Steinrücken, and L. Plümer. 2014. Detection of early plant stress responses in hyperspectral images. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 93 (2014), 98–111.
- [4] I. Chandrasekaran, S. S. Panigrahi, L. Ravikanth, and C. B. Singh. 2019. Potential of near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy and hyperspectral imaging for quality and safety assessment of fruits: An overview. *Food Analytical Methods* 12, 11 (2019), 2438–2458.
- [5] J. Devlin, M. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [6] G. A. Fricker, J. D. Ventura, J. A. Wolf, M. P. North, F. W. Davis, and J. Franklin. 2019. A convolutional neural network classifier identifies tree species in mixed-conifer forest from hyperspectral imagery. *Remote Sensing* 11, 19 (2019), 2326.
- [7] T. Hycza, K. Stereńczak, and R. Bałazy. 2018. Potential use of hyperspectral data to classify forest tree species. *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science* 48, 1 (2018), 1–13.
- [8] S. O. Ihuoma and C. A. Madramootoo. 2019. Sensitivity of spectral vegetation indices for monitoring water stress in tomato plants. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 163 (2019), 104860.
- [9] M. Kerkech, A. Hafiane, and R. Canals. 2018. Deep leaning approach with colorimetric spaces and vegetation indices for vine diseases detection in UAV images. *Computers and electronics in agriculture* 155 (2018), 237–243.
- [10] T. Y. Kyaw, C. M. Siegert, P. Dash, K. P. Poudel, J. J. Pitts, and H. J. Renninger. 2022. Using hyperspectral leaf reflectance to estimate photosynthetic capacity and nitrogen content across eastern cottonwood and hybrid poplar taxa. *PLoS one* 17, 3 (2022), e0264780.
- [11] H. Li, W. Yang, J. Lei, J. She, and X. Zhou. 2021. Estimation of leaf water content from hyperspectral data of different plant species by using three new spectral absorption indices. *PLoS one* 16, 3 (2021), e0249351.
- [12] A. Lowe, N. Harrison, and A. P. French. 2017. Hyperspectral image analysis techniques for the detection and classification of the early onset of plant disease and stress. *Plant methods* 13, 1 (2017), 1–12.
- [13] A. Mahlein, M. Kuska, S. Thomas, D. Bohnenkamp, E. Alisaac, J. Behmann, M. Wahabzada, and K. Kersting. 2017. Plant disease detection by hyperspectral imaging: from the lab to the field. *Advances in Animal Biosciences* 8, 2 (2017), 238–243.
- [14] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781* (2013).
- [15] T. Mikolov, I. Sutskever, K. Chen, G. S. Corrado, and J. Dean. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [16] G. T. Miyoshi, M. S. Arruda, L. P. Osco, J. Marcato Junior, D. N. Gonçalves, N. N. Imai, A. M. G. Tommaselli, E. Honkavaara, and W. N. Gonçalves. 2020. A novel deep learning method to identify single tree species in UAV-based hyperspectral images. *Remote Sensing* 12, 8 (2020), 1294.
- [17] P. Moghadam, D. Ward, E. Goan, S. Jayawardena, P. Sikka, and E. Hernandez. 2017. Plant disease detection using hyperspectral imaging. In *2017 International Conference on Digital Image Computing: Techniques and Applications (DICTA)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [18] R. Nogueira Martins, F. A. de Carvalho Pinto, D. Marçal de Queiroz, D. S. Magalhães Valente, and J. T. Fim Rosas. 2021. A novel vegetation index for coffee ripeness monitoring using aerial imagery. *Remote Sensing* 13, 2 (2021), 263.
- [19] J. Pennington, R. Socher, and C. D. Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*. 1532–1543.
- [20] S. Valero, P. Salembier, and J. Chanussot. 2012. Hyperspectral image representation and processing with binary partition trees. *IEEE Transactions on image processing* 22, 4 (2012), 1430–1443.
- [21] J. Xue and B. Su. 2017. Significant remote sensing vegetation indices: A review of developments and applications. *Journal of sensors* 2017 (2017).
- [22] B. Zhang, L. Zhao, and X. Zhang. 2020. Three-dimensional convolutional neural network model for tree species classification using airborne hyperspectral images. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 247 (2020), 111938.
- [23] Z. Zhang, M. Liu, X. Liu, and G. Zhou. 2018. A new vegetation index based on multitemporal Sentinel-2 images for discriminating heavy metal stress levels in rice. *Sensors* 18, 7 (2018), 2172.
- [24] H. Zhao, C. Yang, W. Guo, L. Zhang, and D. Zhang. 2020. Automatic estimation of crop disease severity levels based on vegetation index normalization. *Remote Sensing* 12, 12 (2020), 1930.