

# Improved Classification of Nitrogen Stress Severity in Plants Under Combined Stress Conditions Using Spatio-Temporal Deep Learning Framework

Aswini Kumar Patra<sup>a,b</sup>, Lingaraj Sahoo<sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Computer Science and Engineering, North Eastern Regional Institute of Science and Technology, Nirjuli, Itanagar, Arunachal Pradesh, 791109, India

<sup>b</sup>Department of Bioscience and Bio-Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, North Guwahati, Assam, 781039, India

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Deep Learning  
Nitrogen Stress  
Combined Stress  
Spatio Temporal Framework  
Precision Agriculture

## ABSTRACT

Plants in their natural habitats endure an array of interacting stresses, both biotic and abiotic, that rarely occur in isolation. Nutrient stress—particularly nitrogen deficiency—becomes even more critical when compounded with drought and weed competition, making it increasingly difficult to distinguish and address its effects. Early detection of nitrogen stress is therefore crucial for protecting plant health and implementing effective management strategies. This study proposes a novel deep learning framework to accurately classify nitrogen stress severity in a combined stress environment. Our model uses a unique blend of four imaging modalities—RGB, multispectral, and two infrared wavelengths—to capture a wide range of physiological plant responses from canopy images. These images, provided as time-series data, document plant health across three levels of nitrogen availability (low, medium, and high) under varying water stress and weed pressures. The core of our approach is a spatio-temporal deep learning pipeline that merges a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) for extracting spatial features from images with a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) network to capture temporal dependencies. We also devised and evaluated a spatial-only CNN pipeline for comparison. Our CNN-LSTM pipeline achieved an impressive accuracy of 98%, impressively surpassing the spatial-only model's 80.45% and other previously reported machine learning methods' 76%. These results bring actionable insights based on the power of our CNN-LSTM approach in effectively capturing the subtle and complex interactions between nitrogen deficiency, water stress, and weed pressure. This robust platform offers a promising tool for the timely and proactive identification of nitrogen stress severity, enabling better crop management and improved plant health.

## 1. Introduction

Among all essential macro-nutrients, nitrogen (N) deficiency represents a major constraint on plant growth, development, and productivity [1]. As a fundamental component of amino acids, proteins, nucleic acids, and chlorophyll [2], nitrogen plays a central role in multiple physiological and metabolic processes. Its deficiency disrupts these pathways, resulting in reduced leaf area, chlorosis, lower leaf count, and stunted plant height [3]. Beyond nutrient limitations, abiotic stressors such as drought and biotic pressures like weed competition frequently co-occur, compounding the negative effects on plant health. For example, water stress restricts nutrient mobility and uptake, thereby intensifying the impacts of nitrogen deficiency [4]. In natural environments, plants rarely face single stress factors in isolation. Rather, stress events often occur simultaneously or sequentially, interacting in synergistic or antagonistic ways [5, 6]. These multi-stress combinations induce overlapping phenotypic symptoms, complicating efforts to diagnose the underlying causes [7]. Despite this, the majority of plant stress phenotyping studies have focused on single-stress scenarios, with relatively limited progress in disentangling or classifying coexisting stresses [8, 9, 10]. This gap demands the need

for advanced tools capable of modeling the intricate, multi-dimensional dynamics of plant responses under combined stress conditions.

The advent of imaging and sensor technologies has transformed plant research through the development of high-throughput phenotyping platforms [11]. These platforms, driven by computer vision and imaging-based phenomics, facilitate non-invasive and automated monitoring of key morphological and physiological traits [12]. Such techniques enable rapid, scalable, and effective assessment of plant health, significantly enhancing yield prediction and stress diagnosis capabilities [13]. Machine learning (ML) [14] and deep learning (DL) [15] have become indispensable tools in this domain, capable of capturing subtle, nonlinear patterns indicative of diverse stress conditions. Among DL models, Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) have demonstrated strong performance in extracting spatially significant features from RGB, hyperspectral, and thermal imagery [16]. When integrated with temporal modeling frameworks like Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks, these models can learn the progression of stress responses over time.

Recent research reflects a growing interest in nitrogen stress detection under both isolated and combined stress conditions. Clarke et al. [17] examines how spatial and temporal soil variability influences nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) in wheat using the Sirius crop simulation model and long-term field data. It finds that soil electrical conductivity

\*Corresponding author

✉ aswinipatra@gmail.com/akp@nerist.ac.in (A.K. Patra);

ls@iitg.ac.in (L. Sahoo)

ORCID(s):

(ECa) can guide site-specific nitrogen management, with lower water-holding soils requiring less nitrogen but posing higher leaching risks. Sarkar et al. [18] investigates how abiotic stressors—especially drought and temperature—affect nitrogen dynamics and crop productivity in dryland forage systems. Using field data and machine learning (ML) analysis, the study compares conventional tillage and no-till practices, along with the impact of green manures such as field peas. The results show that no-till systems with green manuring significantly improve nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) and reduce the negative effects of drought on plant growth. Combining SPAD data from multiple leaf positions significantly improves the estimation of the Nitrogen Nutrition Index (NNI), as demonstrated in another study by Wang et al. [19], where machine learning models like Random Forest and XGBoost outperformed linear regression in predicting NNI. A spatio-temporal spectral framework combining RGB, infrared, hyperspectral data and derived plant traits like canopy cover, height, biomass, and vegetation indices to detect drought, nitrogen, and weed stress in sugar beet. Machine learning models, especially SVM, showed high accuracy with multi-modal features outperforming single ones [20]. A reinforcement learning (RL) environment was developed by Kallenberg et al. [21] where agents learn crop management policies through crop growth models. In a nitrogen management case study for winter wheat, the RL agent successfully detected crop nitrogen requirements by analyzing growth states and guided optimal fertilizer application. Ghazal et al. evaluates machine learning models for nitrogen stress detection in maize using RGB images under field conditions. Among tested models, EfficientNetB0 achieved the highest accuracy, outperforming vision transformers and other CNNs [22]. A study developed machine learning and deep learning models for image-based nitrogen diagnosis in muskmelon using canopy leaf images and environmental data. Among all models they devised, the hybrid DCNN–LSTM achieved the highest accuracy by combining spatial features and temporal light–temperature inputs [23]. A hybrid deep learning model is proposed by Liao et al. that integrates CNN with an attention mechanism and LSTM to diagnose nitrogen (N) and potassium (K) nutrient levels in rice at the early panicle initiation stage [24]. The study by Hui et al. estimated sugarcane nitrogen levels using digital images and regression-based machine learning models, including Random Forest (RF), Backpropagation Neural Network (BPNN), and a stacking fusion approach. Results showed that the fusion model with PCA-based color–texture features outperformed both RF and BPNN [25]. Electrophysiological signals proved to be a successful modality for detecting nitrogen deficiency stress in tomato plants grown under greenhouse conditions, with deep learning—particularly an encoder-based architecture—outperforming models such as XGBoost [26]. Charro et al. estimated foliar nitrogen content in pineapple by integrating multispectral UAV imagery, IoT-based environmental sensors, and SPAD chlorophyll values with machine

learning. Of the nine models tested, XGBoost and multi-layer perceptron (MLP) achieved the highest accuracies, while multi-sensor data fusion consistently outperformed image-only approaches [27]. Hyperspectral remote sensing is combined with stepwise multiple linear regression to detect nitrogen and water stress in maize in a study by Naik et al. Nitrogen stress was most effectively identified at 540, 780, and 860 nm, with leaf nitrogen content accounting for up to 66% of yield variation at the tasseling stage [28]. Trung-Tin Tran et al. [29] employ two distinct models, namely Inception-ResNet v2 and an Autoencoder based on convolutional neural networks, to classify and predict nutrient deficiency symptoms, specifically related to calcium, potassium, and nitrogen. Azimi et al. developed a 23-layer CNN to classify nitrogen deficiency stress in sorghum using shoot images. It outperformed classical ML methods and performing comparably to deeper models like ResNet18 and NasNet Large with far fewer parameters [30]. In summary, the literature uses single and multi-modal datasets that include imaging and spectral, physiological, biochemical, environmental, electrophysiological, and visual trait data—often processed with machine learning and deep learning techniques to improve nitrogen stress detection and management.

Despite these advances, most studies examine stresses in isolation, overlooking the complex interactions that occur when nutrient stress coincides with other environmental pressures. This gap limits the applicability of current models in real-world conditions, where stresses such as nitrogen deficiency, drought, and weed pressure often co-occur. To address this challenge, we propose a spatio-temporal deep learning framework that leverages pre-trained CNNs in combination with LSTMs to capture both spatial features and temporal growth dynamics, enabling accurate classification of nitrogen stress severity under combined drought and weed pressure. The key contributions of our work are as follows:

- We developed a hybrid MobileNetV2–LSTM model that leverages transfer learning and temporal encoding to classify nitrogen stress severity. Our model achieves a high classification accuracy of 98%, significantly outperforming traditional spatial-only and machine learning-based approaches.
- To validate our architecture, we implemented a spatial-only CNN pipeline, enhanced via data augmentation and transfer learning, achieving 80.45% accuracy. This serves as a baseline to demonstrate the advantage of temporal modeling.
- Our results demonstrate that integrating spatial information over time is significantly more effective for predicting nitrogen stress severity than relying on spatial information alone. The proposed spatio-temporal framework outperforms our spatial-only pipeline as well as other machine learning methods employed in previous studies.

**Table 1**  
Combined Stress Treatment

Nitrogen Input	Water Input	Weed Pressure	Box Numbers
Low	Sufficient	None	22,23,24
Medium	Sufficient	None	4,5,6
High	Sufficient	Medium	7,8,9
High	Sufficient	High	10,11,12
Medium	Low	None	13,14,15
High	Sufficient	High	16
High	Sufficient	High	17
High	Sufficient	High	18
Low	Sufficient	Medium	25,26,27
Medium	Low	High	19,20,21
Low	Low	None	28,29,30

## 2. Materials and Methods

In this section, we first introduce the experimental dataset used in the study. We then describe the proposed spatio-temporal framework, followed by the spatial-only network architecture. Finally, we outline the performance metrics employed for model evaluation.

### 2.1. Data Description

The dataset utilized in this study is derived from the work by Khanna et al.[20], who established a comprehensive plant phenotyping framework to investigate the physiological effects of combined abiotic (drought) and biotic (weed competition) stresses alongside nitrogen deficiency in sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.). Their experimental design closely mimicked field-realistic stress scenarios, enabling systematic evaluation of plant responses under factorial combinations of low, medium, and high nitrogen supply, with varying water availability and weed presence. This design aimed to disentangle the complex interactions between multiple, simultaneously occurring stressors, which often induce overlapping phenotypic responses such as reductions in leaf area, biomass, and visible symptoms like chlorosis. To classify nitrogen stress levels in sugar beet plants, we utilized canopy images from multiple modalities, namely RGB, infrared, and multi-spectral. The images were collected using an Intel® RealSense™ ZR300 camera—providing RGB and dual infrared (stereo IR) channels and a Ximea MQ022HG-IM-SM5X5 camera capturing multi-spectral images.

Each stress factor was applied at different severity levels. Nitrogen availability was assessed using three levels—low, medium, and high—representing deficient, sufficient, and surplus nitrogen supply, equivalent to 20, 40, and 80 kg/ha, respectively. Weed pressure was categorized as no weeds, medium pressure (chickweeds), or high pressure (chickweeds and grasses). Water supply was manually regulated at two levels—sufficient and low. As a result, plants experienced varying combinations of these three stressors at any given time. The experiment was intentionally structured to emulate real-world conditions by applying nitrogen deficiency, drought, and weed competition both individually and in combination. Nitrogen deficiency levels with varying

water and weed pressure captured by RGB, stereo infrared, and hyperspectral sensors on a specific day are illustrated in Fig. 1. The detailed stress treatments are summarized in Table 1, which lists the combinations of nitrogen input, water input, and weed pressure, along with the corresponding cultivation box numbers. The treatment matrix (i.e., Table 1) assigns 27 cultivation boxes to these combinations. The dataset includes images from 16 measurement dates throughout the growth period, featuring 27 boxes (9 per nitrogen level). Images from 14 dates were retained for analysis, excluding the first two dates due to early-stage germination where stress symptoms were minimal. For each nitrogen level category, nine boxes were imaged across four modalities, yielding 504 images per category (14 dates  $\times$  9 boxes  $\times$  4 modalities). Across all three nitrogen levels, a total of 1,512 images were used in this study. All images were cropped to remove irrelevant background content.

### 2.2. Proposed Framework

#### 2.2.1. Spatio-Temporal Framework

In this study, we present a deep learning framework that integrates spatial and temporal features to classify images into three nitrogen severity levels: low, medium, and high. The model integrates a CNN for feature extraction and a LSTM network for temporal sequence modeling. The overall architecture of the proposed framework is depicted in Fig. 2. The architecture of the proposed CNN-LSTM hybrid consists of the following components:

- Feature Extractor:** A pre-trained MobileNetV2 (with imagenet weights) served as the base CNN, where the classification head was removed. The network’s output was passed through a Global Average Pooling layer to obtain a fixed-size feature vector per image. This CNN was wrapped within a TimeDistributed layer to process each frame of the sequence independently while sharing weights.
- Temporal Encoder:** The sequence of image features was then fed into an LSTM layer with 128 hidden units to learn temporal patterns across the sequence. LSTM networks are an extension of recurrent neural networks (RNNs) designed to address the vanishing



(a) Low nitrogen (sufficient water, medium weed), RGB



(b) Medium nitrogen (low water, high weed), Infra Red 1



(c) Medium nitrogen (low water, high weed), Infra Red 2



(d) High nitrogen (sufficient water, high Weed), Multi-Spectral

**Figure 1:** Nitrogen deficiency levels (with varying levels of water and weed) on a specific day captured by RGB, Infra Red and Multi-spectral sensor.

gradient problem and effectively capture long-term dependencies in sequential data [31]. In LSTM models, a memory cell with gating mechanisms enables the network to retain and utilize information over extended sequences, allowing for the reading, writing, and deletion of information from its memory. These gating mechanisms, comprised of forget, input, and output gates, play crucial roles in managing the flow of information within the LSTM unit [32]. An LSTM unit consists of three main components:

- (a) **Forget Gate ( $f_t$ ):** Evaluates the relevance of existing information stored in the memory cell. It decides which information to retain and which to discard based on the input at the current time step ( $x_t$ ) and the previous hidden state ( $h_{t-1}$ ). Mathematically, the output of the forget gate ( $f_t$ ) is computed using a sigmoid activation function:

$$f_t = \sigma \left( W_{f_h} h_{t-1} + W_{f_x} x_t + b_f \right)$$

where  $W_{f_h}$  and  $W_{f_x}$  are weight matrices, and  $b_f$  is the bias.

- (b) **Input Gate ( $i_t$ ) and Candidate Cell State ( $\tilde{c}_t$ ):** Determines how much new information should

be added to the memory cell. It consists of a sigmoid layer that controls the update and a "tanh" layer that generates a vector of new candidate values. The input gate output ( $i_t$ ) and the candidate cell state ( $\tilde{c}_t$ ) are computed as follows:

$$i_t = \sigma(W_{ih} h_{t-1} + W_{ix} x_t + b_i)$$

$$\tilde{c}_t = \tanh(W_{ch} h_{t-1} + W_{cx} x_t + b_c)$$

The candidate cell state represents the new information to be added to the memory cell.

- (c) **Memory Update and Output Gate:** Updates the memory cell content based on the forget gate output ( $f_t$ ), input gate output ( $i_t$ ), and candidate cell state ( $\tilde{c}_t$ ). The updated cell state ( $c_t$ ) is calculated as:

$$c_t = f_t \odot c_{t-1} + i_t \odot \tilde{c}_t$$

where  $\odot$  denotes element-wise multiplication. Finally, the output gate controls which parts of the cell state contribute to the output. The output




Figure 2: Spatio-Temporal Deep Learning Framework for Nitrogen Stress Severity Classification

gate output ( $o_t$ ) and the final hidden state ( $h_t$ ) are computed as:

$$o_t = \sigma \left( W_{oh} h_{t-1} + W_{ox} x_t + b_o \right)$$

$$h_t = o_t \odot \tanh (c_t)$$

The output gate output ( $o_t$ ) determines the relevance of the current cell state, and the final hidden state ( $h_t$ ) represents the LSTM’s output at the current time step.

In summary, LSTM models utilize gated memory cells to effectively capture and retain long-term dependencies in sequential data, addressing the limitations of traditional RNNs. The forget, input, and output gates enable the LSTM to selectively process and utilize information, making it a powerful tool for tasks involving sequential data analysis and prediction.

3. **Fully Connected Layers:** The output of the LSTM layer (128 units) was followed by Batch Normalization and Dropout (0.25), then passed through a Dense layer with 64 units and ReLU activation with L2 regularization, followed by another Batch Normalization and Dropout (0.25), and finally an output layer with softmax activation for multiclass classification.

Algorithm 1 outlines the steps involved in training and evaluating the proposed framework. The dataset comprises images grouped into three class-based folders, with each image filename containing a date stamp in the format YYYYMMDD. These dates were extracted and parsed to create a chronological order within each class. To capture the temporal dynamics, we generated overlapping image sequences of fixed length (5 images per sequence), preserving their temporal order. Each sequence was labeled according to its class, resulting in a structured dataset for temporal learning. All images were resized to  $224 \times 224$  pixels and normalized to a  $[0, 1]$  range. Each sequence was stacked into a 4D tensor with dimensions (sequence\_length, height, width, channels), i.e., (5, 224, 224, 3), forming the input to the model. After sorting the images by date, sequences were created using a sliding window approach within each class. Each sequence of five consecutive images was treated as one sample, and the

corresponding class label was assigned. Label encoding was performed using `LabelEncoder`, and categorical labels were one-hot encoded to be used with softmax-based classification.

To ensure reliable evaluation and generalization, we adopted a 5-fold Stratified Cross-Validation scheme. Stratification maintained class distribution across folds, allowing balanced training and validation splits. This also enabled assessment of the model’s stability across multiple runs.

Freezing the layers of the CNN model refers to preventing the weights of the pre-trained convolutional layers from being updated during the training process. This approach ensures that only the newly added layers, such as the LSTM and Dense layers, are trained. Freezing the CNN layers is particularly beneficial when working with small datasets, as it enables the model to retain the learned feature representations from the pre-trained model. This allows the model to focus on learning the temporal patterns from the sequential data using the LSTM layers without altering the feature extraction process that has already been established by the CNN.

The model is trained using experiments on different subsets of parameters, namely learning rate, sequence length, batch size, and number of epochs. A fixed random state is used to ensure reproducibility of the results. The model was compiled using the *Adam* optimizer, with categorical cross-entropy as the loss function and accuracy as the evaluation metric. To prevent overfitting, the CNN base was frozen during training, and `ModelCheckpoint` was used to save the best-performing model based on validation loss. For each fold, the model was evaluated on the validation dataset using accuracy score, classification report (including precision, recall, and F1-score), and confusion matrix.

To monitor the model’s learning behavior, we plotted training and validation loss curves, training and validation accuracy curves, and confusion matrices annotated with prediction counts and color maps. These visualizations supported qualitative assessment and helped identify potential overfitting or underfitting trends.

### 2.2.2. Spatial Framework

A spatial-only baseline architecture is proposed as a reference to compare the results achieved through temporal modeling in the CNN–LSTM framework. For the spatial-only setup, we employed pretrained MobileNetV2

---

**Algorithm 1:** Training and Evaluating the CNN-LSTM model with K-Fold Cross Validation

---

**Data:** Dataset from directory `DATA_DIR`, sequence length `SEQUENCE_LEN`, number of folds `N_SPLITS`, epochs `EPOCHS`, batch size `BATCH_SIZE`, random state `RANDOM_STATE`

**Result:** Learning curves, validation reports, and trained model for each fold

```
1 for each class_name in DATA_DIR do
2   Read images from each class directory;
3   for each filename in class directory do
4     Extract date from filename and store image paths, class, and date in records list;
5 Create DataFrame df from records with columns filename, class, and date;
6 Convert date column to datetime format;
7 for each (class_name, group) in df.groupby("class") do
8   Sort the group by date and generate sequences of length SEQUENCE_LEN with corresponding labels;
9 Encode labels using LabelEncoder;
10 One-hot encode the labels;
11 Define function load_seq_batch(seq_file_list) to load and preprocess image sequences;
12 for fold = 1 to N_SPLITS do
13   Split the data into training and validation sets using StratifiedKFold;
14   Load the training and validation image sequences using load_seq_batch;
15   Define CNN base model using MobileNetV2 with pre-trained weights;
16   Freeze CNN layers;
17   Define feature extractor with GlobalAveragePooling2D;
18   Define LSTM model with TimeDistributed wrapper, LSTM, BatchNormalization, Dropout, Dense, and final
      softmax layer;
19   Compile with Adam optimizer and categorical crossentropy loss;
20   Set up model checkpoint based on validation loss;
21   Train model with training and validation data;
22   Store training history for each fold;
23   Plot and save learning curves (loss and accuracy);
24   Evaluate model on validation set and store accuracy;
25   Generate confusion matrix and classification report;
```

---

with weights initialized from the *ImageNet* dataset. The original top layer, configured for 1,000 ImageNet classes, was removed so the backbone could function as a feature extractor. Custom classification layers were appended to adapt the model for our three-class classification task. By leveraging pretrained weights, we utilized the rich feature representations learned from large-scale data while fine-tuning the model to our target domain.

To retain essential feature extraction capabilities, the first 18 layers of MobileNetV2 were frozen, while the subsequent layers were fine-tuned. On top of the backbone, a GlobalAveragePooling2D layer reduced spatial dimensions, followed by two dense layers (128 and 64 neurons) with ReLU activation and L2 regularization. Dropout layers with a rate of 0.5 were added after each dense layer to improve generalization. The final classification layer used softmax activation to predict probabilities across the three categories. The architecture is illustrated in Fig. 3.

To improve model performance and address limited training data, extensive data augmentation is performed using random rotations, shear transformations, horizontal and vertical flips, and spatial translations. The model is trained using the *Adam* optimizer with an exponentially

decaying learning rate and evaluated under a 5-fold stratified cross-validation protocol.

### 3. Results and Discussion

The spatio-temporal and spatial-only frameworks were implemented in Python (version 3.10.14) using machine learning libraries, including *Keras*, *TensorFlow*, *Scikit-learn*, *Pandas*, *NumPy*, and *Matplotlib*.

#### 3.1. Performance Evaluation of Spatial Temporal Framework

The proposed MobileNetV2–LSTM framework, illustrated in the Fig. 2 and detailed in the Algorithm 1, was tested with different subsets of parameters for 20 epochs. The best performance was obtained using the parameter settings summarized in Table 2. A 5-fold cross-validation was performed, with the data split controlled using a fixed random state of 42 to ensure reproducibility. This pure k-fold cross-validation approach maximizes the use of available data by combining the validation and test roles within each fold, making it particularly suitable for relatively small datasets where retaining an entirely separate test set would significantly reduce the amount of training data.




Figure 3: Spatial Deep Learning Framework for Nitrogen Stress Severity Classification

Table 2

Best Parameter Settings for the MobileNetV2–LSTM Framework

Parameter	Value
Batch Size	16
Sequence Length	5
Learning Rate	0.001
Epochs	20

The model achieved consistently high performance across all folds of cross-validation. As shown in Table 3, training, validation, and test accuracies exceeded 98% in every fold, with a mean accuracy of  $98.47 \pm 0.0045\%$ . This demonstrates the stability and generalization power of the spatio-temporal pipeline.

Fig. 4 presents the accuracy curves across folds, confirming rapid convergence and minimal variance between training and validation accuracy. Similarly, the loss curves (Fig. 5) show stable optimization without overfitting, further supported by confusion matrices in Fig. 6, which illustrate near-perfect classification across nitrogen stress levels.

Table 4 highlights class-specific performance. Precision, recall, and F1-scores consistently exceeded 0.97 for all nitrogen categories (low, medium, high), confirming that the model effectively captured subtle spectral and morphological features. The macro-averaged F1-score of 0.99 ensures the overall reliability of the spatio-temporal model.

While Khanna et al.[20] utilized the same dataset, leveraging vegetation indices, hyperspectral signatures, and 3D

point cloud features over a two-month crop cycle, their modeling approach lacked dynamic learning components such as LSTMs that are capable of capturing temporal dependencies inherent in stress progression. In contrast, our results demonstrate that the temporal evolution of nitrogen stress is more accurately modeled using the sequential learning capacity of LSTMs, particularly when integrated with lightweight CNN backbones like MobileNetV2. Furthermore, the spatial feature representations extracted via MobileNetV2 enabled superior early stress detection by capturing fine-grained morphological variations, which were not effectively addressed by the handcrafted features employed in Khanna et al.’s pipeline. This advantage is practically relevant during early phenological stages, where visible symptoms may be subtle, and precise morphological cues become essential for timely and accurate stress diagnosis.


### 3.2. Performance Evaluation of Spatial Framework

To establish a baseline for comparison with the CNN–LSTM temporal framework, a spatial-only CNN model based on MobileNetV2 was designed. The model was trained for 250 epochs with a batch size of 64, ensuring stable gradient updates while balancing computational efficiency. To address limited training data and simulate real-world variability, extensive data augmentation was applied through the ImageDataGenerator class with the following parameters: rescale =  $1/255$ , shear range = 0.2, rotation range =  $30^\circ$ , width and height shift range = 0.2, horizontal and vertical

**Table 3**

Fold-wise best performance metrics of MobileNetV2-LSTM spatio-temporal framework during 5-fold cross-validation.

Fold	Train Accuracy	Train Loss	Val Accuracy	Val Loss	Test Accuracy	Epoch
1	0.9733	0.1424	0.9867	0.0920	0.9867	20
2	0.9775	0.1547	0.9900	0.1123	0.9800	19
3	0.9892	0.0989	0.9867	0.0925	0.9867	20
4	0.9758	0.1581	0.9800	0.1373	0.9800	20
5	0.9800	0.1275	0.9900	0.1000	0.9900	20
<b>Mean</b>	0.9792	0.1363	0.9867	0.1068	0.9847	
<b>Std</b>	0.0061	0.0241	0.0041	0.0189	0.0045	



**Figure 4:** Accuracy curves of MobileNetV2-LSTM for 5-fold cross-validation (a–e correspond to Fold 1–5).

flips = True, and fill mode = nearest, thereby enhancing generalization and reducing overfitting.

For optimization, the Adam optimizer was used with an exponentially decaying learning rate schedule. The initial learning rate was set to 0.001. The decay schedule

followed an ExponentialDecay policy with decay\_steps = steps\_per\_epoch × 10, decay\_rate = 0.9, and a staircase update, ensuring the learning rate decreased gradually as training progressed. This strategy stabilized convergence and avoided premature overfitting.

**Table 4**

Precision, Recall, and F1-score across 5 folds in MobileNetV2-LSTM

Class	Metric	Fold 1	Fold 2	Fold 3	Fold 4	Fold 5
High	Precision	0.98	1.00	0.99	0.97	0.99
	Recall	0.99	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00
	F1-score	0.99	0.97	1.00	0.99	1.00
Low	Precision	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99
	Recall	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.98	0.98
	F1-score	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.98	0.98
Medium	Precision	0.99	0.95	0.98	0.99	0.99
	Recall	0.97	0.99	0.99	0.96	0.99
	F1-score	0.98	0.97	0.99	0.97	0.99




Figure 5: Loss curves of MobileNetV2-LSTM for 5-fold cross-validation (a–e correspond to Fold 1–5).




Figure 6: Confusion Matrices of MobileNetV2-LSTM for 5-fold cross-validation (a–e correspond to Fold 1–5).




Figure 7: Accuracy curves of Spatial Framework for 5-fold cross-validation (a–e correspond to Fold 1–5).

Table 5

Training, validation, and test performance across 5 folds in Spatial Framework

Fold	Train Loss	Train Acc.	Val. Loss	Val. Acc.	Test Acc.	Epochs
1	0.2855	0.8412	0.2949	0.8119	0.8119	238
2	0.2943	0.8337	0.3470	0.8053	0.8053	240
3	0.3022	0.8165	0.3636	0.8344	0.8344	245
4	0.2830	0.8322	0.3968	0.7881	0.7881	200
5	0.2747	0.8331	0.3605	0.7848	0.7848	224
<b>Mean</b>	0.2879	0.8313	0.3226	0.8049	0.8049	
<b>Std</b>	0.0098	0.0081	0.0370	0.0186	0.0186	

The network employed L2 regularization (0.01) on the dense layers and dropout (rate = 0.5) after each fully connected layer to further prevent overfitting. The training incorporated a ModelCheckpoint callback, saving the best-performing model weights per fold based on the lowest validation loss.

The model is trained and evaluated under a 5-fold stratified cross-validation strategy. Fig. 3, 7, and 8 illustrate the architecture, accuracy, and loss curves respectively. Table 5 summarizes fold-wise training, validation, and test results, while Table 6 reports the precision, recall, and F1-scores across classes.

As illustrated in Fig. 7, across all folds, the training accuracy rapidly converged to approximately 0.83, while validation accuracy improved gradually and stabilized in the range of 0.78–0.83. Fold 3 demonstrated the strongest alignment between training and validation curves, whereas Folds 4 and 5 displayed a slightly larger gap, suggesting mild overfitting. The corresponding loss curves (Fig. 8) revealed

sharp decreases in training loss, with validation loss exhibiting high variance in the early epochs but stabilizing after 150 epochs. These observations confirm that data augmentation, dropout, and L2 regularization were effective in mitigating overfitting, while the exponentially decaying learning rate ensured stable convergence.

Table 5 shows that the model achieved an average training accuracy of 83.13% and a validation accuracy of 80.49% across folds, with low standard deviation (1.86%). The test accuracy mirrored the validation accuracy (80.49%), highlighting the model’s ability to generalize well across unseen data. The highest validation accuracy was observed in Fold 3 (83.44%), while the lowest occurred in Fold 5 (78.48%). Training and validation losses were consistent across folds, with only minor fluctuations.

As shown in Table 6, class-wise evaluation revealed balanced predictive capacity, with F1-scores ranging from 0.76 to 0.85 across all classes and folds. For the *High* class, precision was strong in most folds ( $\geq 0.97$ ) but recall was comparatively lower (0.69–0.75), except in Fold 1 where




Figure 8: Loss curves of Spatial Framework for 5-fold cross-validation (a–e correspond to Fold 1–5).

Table 6

Precision, Recall, and F1-score across 5 folds in Spatial Framework

Class	Metric	Fold 1	Fold 2	Fold 3	Fold 4	Fold 5
High	Precision	0.64	0.99	0.97	0.99	0.99
	Recall	1.00	0.72	0.75	0.73	0.69
	F1-score	0.78	0.83	0.85	0.84	0.81
Low	Precision	1.00	0.64	0.96	0.97	0.61
	Recall	0.72	0.96	0.76	0.65	0.99
	F1-score	0.84	0.77	0.85	0.78	0.76
Medium	Precision	1.00	0.96	0.69	0.62	0.99
	Recall	0.71	0.73	0.99	0.98	0.67
	F1-score	0.83	0.83	0.81	0.76	0.80

recall reached 1.00. Conversely, the *Low* class showed complementary trends, with high recall in Folds 2 and 5 ( $\geq 0.95$ ) but reduced precision (0.61–0.64). The *Medium* class was the most variable, with precision fluctuating between 0.62 and 1.00, though recall generally remained high (0.71–0.99). These results suggest that inter-class boundaries are occasionally ambiguous, leading to trade-offs in precision and recall.

Overall, the spatial framework achieved an average test accuracy of 80.49%, with stable performance across folds and balanced per-class F1-scores. While this indicates strong baseline capability, the variability in class-specific precision and recall reveals the limitations of a purely spatial approach. The nearly 18% performance gap compared to the CNN–LSTM framework (98.47%) clearly demonstrates the critical role of temporal dynamics in nitrogen stress identification. Spatial features primarily capture structural

and color-based traits, whereas temporal sequences encode progression patterns essential for distinguishing overlapping symptoms caused by drought, weeds, and nitrogen deficiency.

### 3.3. Comparison with Machine Learning Methods

Notably, this performance surpasses that of traditional models, as reported by Khanna et al.[20]. The comparative analysis of performances is presented in Table 7.

To contextualize our findings, we compared the performance of proposed framework against that of conventional machine learning models and the spatial-only CNN. Traditional classifiers such as Decision Trees, KNN, and Bagged Trees achieved test accuracies below 70%, while SVM achieved a higher accuracy of 80.95%, comparable to the spatial-only CNN.

Method	Mean Nitrogen Train Accuracy (%)	Nitrogen Test Accuracy (%)	Reference
Decision Trees	63.66	47.62	
LDA	68.47	78.57	
SVM	75.68	80.95	
KNN	62.16	55.95	
Bagged Trees	67.57	63.10	[20]
Subspace Discriminant	70.57	75.00	
Subspace KNN	60.66	66.67	
RUSBoosted Trees	69.37	63.10	
Proposed Spatial Framework	83.13	80.49	
Proposed Spatio-Temporal Framework	97.92	98.47	[Proposed]

**Table 7**

Training and test set classification accuracy for Nitrogen stress using different machine learning methods.

In contrast, the spatio-temporal CNN-LSTM framework markedly outperformed all baselines, achieving 98.47% test accuracy. This performance gain demonstrates that sequential modeling provides a substantial advantage in resolving confounding stress symptoms and effectively predicting nitrogen severity classes.

## 4. Conclusion

This study demonstrates the effectiveness of a spatio-temporal deep learning framework for classifying nitrogen stress severity in sugar beet under combined drought and weed pressure. By integrating MobileNetV2 for spatial feature extraction with LSTM for temporal sequence modeling, the proposed CNN-LSTM approach achieved 98.47% accuracy, substantially outperforming both the spatial-only CNN (80%) and conventional machine learning models (<76%).

The inclusion of temporal dynamics is particularly valuable because it enables early detection of nitrogen deficiency before visible symptoms become severe. Detecting stress at earlier growth stages allows for timely corrective interventions, preventing yield loss and reducing excessive fertilizer use. This advantage underscores the importance of modeling stress progression rather than relying solely on static imaging.

From an application standpoint, the proposed framework offers a lightweight and transferable solution for precision agriculture. Its high accuracy, coupled with the capacity for early detection, makes it suitable for guiding variable-rate fertilizer management, optimizing resource efficiency, and minimizing environmental impacts.

Future work should focus on scaling the dataset with field-level images, developing advanced data augmentation strategies, and exploring multi-sensor fusion to further enhance generalizability. These improvements would accelerate the deployment of spatio-temporal deep learning in real-world crop monitoring systems, ensuring sustainable and proactive agricultural practices.

## References

- [1] Bertrand Hirel, Thierry Tetu, Peter J. Lea, and Frederic Dubois. Improving nitrogen use efficiency in crops for sustainable agriculture. *Sustainability*, 3(9):1452–1485, 2011.
- [2] Prabha Singh, Krishan Kumar, Abhishek Kumar Jha, Pranjali Yadava, Madan Pal, Sujay Rakshit, and Ishwar Singh. Global gene expression profiling under nitrogen stress identifies key genes involved in nitrogen stress adaptation in maize (*zea mays* l.). *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):4211, 2022-03-10.
- [3] Samrat Das, Dalveer Singh, Hari S Meena, Shailendra K Jha, Jyoti Kumari, Viswanathan Chinnusamy, and Lekshmy Sathee. Long term nitrogen deficiency alters expression of mirnas and alters nitrogen metabolism and root architecture in indian dwarf wheat (*triticum sphaerococcum* perc.) genotypes. *Scientific reports*, 13(1):5002, 2023.
- [4] Shah Saud, Shah Fahad, Chen Yajun, Muhammad Z. Ihsan, Hafiz M. Hammad, Wajid Nasim, Amanullah, Muhammad Arif, and Hesham Alharby. Effects of nitrogen supply on water stress and recovery mechanisms in kentucky bluegrass plants. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 8, 2017.
- [5] Abraham Blum. Stress, strain, signaling, and adaptation - not just a matter of definition. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 67(3):562–565, 2016.
- [6] Prachi Pandey, Vadivelmurugan Irulappan, Muthukumar V Bagavathiannan, and Muthappa Senthil-Kumar. Impact of combined abiotic and biotic stresses on plant growth and avenues for crop improvement by exploiting physio-morphological traits. *Frontiers in plant science*, 8:537, 2017.
- [7] Heidi Webber, Ehsan Eyshi Rezaei, Masahiro Ryo, and Frank Ewert. Framework to guide modeling single and multiple abiotic stresses in arable crops. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 340:108179, 2022.
- [8] Ramamurthy Mahalingam. Consideration of combined stress: a crucial paradigm for improving multiple stress tolerance in plants. In *Combined stresses in plants: Physiological, molecular, and biochemical aspects*, pages 1–25. Springer, 2014.
- [9] Jiating Li, Peng Fu, and Carl J Bernacchi. Enhancing plant resilience under combined stress: the role of reflectance spectroscopy. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, page eRAF368, 2025.
- [10] Maja Zagorščak, Lamis Abdelhakim, Natalia Yaneth Rodriguez-Granados, Jitka Široká, Arindam Ghatak, Carissa Bleker, Andrej Blejec, Jan Zrimec, Ondřej Novák, Aleš Pěnčík, et al. Integration of multi-omics data and deep phenotyping provides insights into responses to single and combined abiotic stress in potato. *Plant physiology*, 197(4):kIAF126, 2025.
- [11] Nadia Al-Tamimi, Patrick Langan, Villo Bernad, Jason Walsh, Eleni Mangina, and Sonia Negrao. Capturing crop adaptation to abiotic stress using image-based technologies. *OPEN BIOLOGY*, 12(6), 2022.
- [12] Wanneng Yang, Hui Feng, Xuehai Zhang, Jian Zhang, John H. Doonan, William David Batchelor, Lizhong Xiong, and Jianbing Yan. Crop Phenomics and High-Throughput Phenotyping: Past Decades, Current Challenges, and Future Perspectives. *Molecular Plant*, 13(2):187–214, 2020.

- [13] Jan F. Humplik, Dusan Lazar, Alexandra Husickova, and Lukas Spichal. Automated phenotyping of plant shoots using imaging methods for analysis of plant stress responses: a review. *Plant Methods*, 11(1):29, 2015.
- [14] Taqdeer Gill, Simranveer K. Gill, Dinesh K. Saini, Yuvraj Chopra, Jason P. de Koff, and Karansher S. Sandhu. A Comprehensive Review of High Throughput Phenotyping and Machine Learning for Plant Stress Phenotyping. *Phenomics*, 2(3):156–183, 2022.
- [15] Asheesh Kumar Singh, Baskar Ganapathysubramanian, Soumik Sarkar, and Arti Singh. Deep Learning for Plant Stress Phenotyping: Trends and Future Perspectives. *Trends in Plant Science*, 23(10):883–898, 2018.
- [16] Yu Jiang and Changying Li. Convolutional Neural Networks for Image-Based High-Throughput Plant Phenotyping: A Review. *Plant Phenomics*, 2020, 2020.
- [17] David E. Clarke, Elizabeth A. Stockdale, Jacqueline A. Hannam, Benjamin P. Marchant, and Stephen H. Hallett. Spatial-temporal variability in nitrogen use efficiency: Insights from a long-term experiment and crop simulation modeling to support site specific nitrogen management. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 158:127224, 2024.
- [18] Reshmi Sarkar, Brian K. Northup, Charles R. Long, and Vijay P. Singh. Machine learning the abiotic stressor impacts on nitrogen availability and photo energy use in dryland forage systems under different tillage and green manuring practices. 2(1):5, 2025.
- [19] Yuan Wang, Peihua Shi, Yinfei Qian, Gui Chen, Jiang Xie, Xianjiao Guan, Weiming Shi, and Haitao Xiang. Enhancing nitrogen nutrition index estimation in rice using multi-leaf SPAD values and machine learning approaches. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 15, 2024.
- [20] Raghav Khanna, Lukas Schmid, Achim Walter, Juan Nieto, Roland Siegwart, and Frank Liebisch. A spatio temporal spectral framework for plant stress phenotyping. *Plant Methods*, 15(1):13, 2019.
- [21] Michiel G. J. Kallenberg, Hiske Overweg, Ron van Bree, and Ioannis N. Athanasiadis. Nitrogen management with reinforcement learning and crop growth models. *Environmental Data Science*, 2:e34, 2023.
- [22] Sumaira Ghazal, Namratha Kommineni, and Arslan Munir. Comparative analysis of machine learning techniques using RGB imaging for nitrogen stress detection in maize. *AI*, 5(3):1286–1300, 2024.
- [23] Catherine Chan, Peter R. Nelson, Daniel J. Hayes, Yong-Jiang Zhang, and Bruce Hall. Predicting Water Stress in Wild Blueberry Fields Using Airborne Visible and Near Infrared Imaging Spectroscopy. *Remote Sensing*, 13(8):1425, January 2021.
- [24] Fubing Liao, Xiangqian Feng, Ziqiu Li, Danying Wang, Chunmei Xu, Guang Chu, Hengyu Ma, Qing Yao, and Song Chen. A hybrid CNN-LSTM model for diagnosing rice nutrient levels at the rice panicle initiation stage. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, 23(2):711–723, 2024.
- [25] Hui You, Muchen Zhou, Junxiang Zhang, Wei Peng, and Cuimin Sun. Sugarcane nitrogen nutrition estimation with digital images and machine learning methods. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):14939, 2023.
- [26] Daniel González I Juclà, Elena Najdenovska, Fabien Dutoit, and Laura Elena Raileanu. Detecting stress caused by nitrogen deficit using deep learning techniques applied on plant electrophysiological data. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):9633, 2023.
- [27] Jorge Enrique Chaparro, José Edinson Aedo, and Felipe Lumbreras Ruiz. Machine learning for the estimation of foliar nitrogen content in pineapple crops using multispectral images and internet of things (IoT) platforms. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*, 18:101208.
- [28] B. Balaji Naik, H. R. Naveen, G. Sreenivas, K. Karun Choudary, D. Devkumar, and J. Adinarayana. Identification of water and nitrogen stress indicative spectral bands using hyperspectral remote sensing in maize during post-monsoon season. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing*, 48(12):1787–1795, 2020.
- [29] Trung-Tin Tran, Jae-Won Choi, Thien-Tu Huynh Le, and Jong-Wook Kim. A Comparative Study of Deep CNN in Forecasting and Classifying the Macronutrient Deficiencies on Development of Tomato Plant. *Applied Sciences*, 9(8):1601, 2019.
- [30] Shiva Azimi, Taranjit Kaur, and Tapan K. Gandhi. A deep learning approach to measure stress level in plants due to nitrogen deficiency. *Measurement*, 173:108650.
- [31] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- [32] Felix A Gers, Jürgen Schmidhuber, and Fred Cummins. Learning to forget: Continual prediction with lstm. *Neural computation*, 12(10):2451–2471, 2000.