

Table S1. Vegetation Indices calculated and used in tree species classification.

Index	Name	Equation	Reference
BR	Blue Ratio	$\frac{663.54nm}{481.37nm} * \frac{546.95nm}{481.37nm} * \frac{721.84nm}{481.37nm} * \frac{831.14nm}{481.37nm}$	[1]
CAI	Cellulose Absorption Index	$0.5 * (2019nm + 2206nm) - 2109nm$	[2]
CF1	Chlorophyll fluorescence, R761–R757	$761\text{ nm} - 757\text{ nm}$	[3]
CF2	Chlorophyll fluorescence, R690/R630	$\frac{690\text{ nm}}{630\text{ nm}}$	[3]
CF3	Chlorophyll fluorescence, R761/R757	$\frac{761\text{ nm}}{757\text{ nm}}$	[3]
CI	Conifer Index	$\frac{751nm - 534nm}{751nm + 534nm}$	[4]
Cl <sub>green</sub>	Chlorophyll Index Green	$\frac{788nm}{558nm} - 1$	[5]
Cl <sub>re</sub>	Chlorophyll Index Red Edge	$\frac{788nm}{722nm} - 1$	[5]
CRI <sub>550</sub>	Carotenoid Reflectance Index1	$\frac{1}{510nm} - \frac{1}{550nm}$	[6]
CRI <sub>700</sub>	Carotenoid Reflectance Index2	$\frac{1}{510nm} - \frac{1}{700nm}$	[6]
EVI	Enhanced Vegetation Index	$2.5 * \frac{867.57nm - 648.97nm}{(867.57nm + 6 * 648.97nm - 7.5 * 466.79nm) + 1}$	[7]
GNDVI	Green Normalized Difference Vegetation Index	$\frac{750.98nm - 546.95nm}{750.98nm + 546.95nm}$	[8]
GR	Green Ratio	$\frac{546.95nm}{663.54nm}$	[1]
MCARI	Modified chlorophyll absorption in reflectance index	$[(700nm - 670nm) - 0.2 * (700nm - 550nm)] * (700nm - 670nm)$	[9]
MCARI1	Modified chlorophyll absorption in reflectance index1	$1.2 * (2.5 * (800nm - 670nm) - 1.3 * (800nm - 550nm))$	[10]
MCARI2	Modified chlorophyll absorption in reflectance index2	$\frac{1.5 * (2.5 * (800nm - 670nm) - 1.3 * (800nm - 550nm))}{\sqrt{(2 * 800nm + 1)^2 - (6 * 800nm - 5 * \sqrt{670nm})}}$	[10]
mND <sub>705</sub>	Modified Normalized Difference Index	$\frac{750\text{ nm} - 705\text{ nm}}{750\text{ nm} + 705\text{ nm} - 2 * 445\text{ nm}}$	[11]

MTCI	MERIS terrestrial chlorophyll index	$\frac{753.75\text{nm} - 708.75\text{nm}}{708.75\text{nm} + 681.25\text{nm}}$	[12]
NDLI	Normalized Difference Lignin Index	$\frac{\log(\frac{1}{1754\text{nm}}) - \log(\frac{1}{1680\text{nm}})}{\log(\frac{1}{1754\text{nm}}) + \log(\frac{1}{1680\text{nm}})}$	[13]
NDNI	Normalized Difference Nitrogen Index	$\frac{\log(\frac{1}{1510\text{nm}}) - \log(\frac{1}{1680\text{nm}})}{\log(\frac{1}{1510\text{nm}}) + \log(\frac{1}{1680\text{nm}})}$	[13]
NDRE	Normalized Difference Red Edge Index	$\frac{790\text{nm} - 720\text{nm}}{790\text{nm} + 720\text{nm}}$	[14]
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index	$\frac{800\text{nm} - 670\text{nm}}{800\text{nm} + 670\text{nm}}$	[15]
NDWI	Normalized Difference Water Index	$\frac{860\text{nm} - 1240\text{nm}}{860\text{nm} + 1240\text{nm}}$	[16]
PRI	Photochemical Reflectance Index	$\frac{531\text{nm} - 570\text{nm}}{531\text{nm} + 570\text{nm}}$	[17]
PSI1	Plant stress index R695/R420	$\frac{695\text{ nm}}{420\text{ nm}}$	[18]
PSI2	Plant stress index R605/R760	$\frac{605\text{ nm}}{760\text{ nm}}$	[18]
PSI3	Plant stress index R695/R760	$\frac{695\text{ nm}}{760\text{ nm}}$	[18]
PSI4	Plant stress index R710/R760	$\frac{710\text{ nm}}{760\text{ nm}}$	[18]
PSND	Pigment Sensitive Normalized Difference	$\frac{800\text{nm} - 680\text{nm}}{800\text{nm} + 680\text{nm}}$	[19]
PSND2	Pigment Sensitive Normalized Difference 2	$\frac{800\text{nm} - 635\text{nm}}{800\text{nm} + 635\text{nm}}$	[19]
PSRI	Plant Senescence Reflectance Index	$\frac{678\text{nm} - 500\text{nm}}{750\text{nm}}$	[20]
PSSR	Pigment Specific Simple Ratio	$\frac{800\text{nm}}{680\text{nm}}$	[19]
PSSR2	Pigment Specific Simple Ratio 2	$\frac{800\text{nm}}{635\text{nm}}$	[19]
REIP	Red Edge Inflation Point	$700 + 40(\frac{(\frac{670\text{ nm}+780\text{ nm}}{2}) - 700\text{ nm}}{740\text{ nm}-700\text{ nm}})$	[21]
RENDVI	Red Edge Normalized Difference Vegetation Index	$\frac{750\text{nm} - 705\text{nm}}{750\text{nm} + 705\text{nm}}$	[8]
RR	Red Ratio	$\frac{831.14\text{nm}}{663.54\text{nm}} * \frac{546.95\text{nm}}{663.54\text{nm}} * \frac{831.14\text{nm}}{721.84\text{nm}}$	[1]

RVSI	Red-Edge Vegetation Stress Index	$\frac{714\text{nm} + 752\text{nm}}{2 - 733\text{nm}}$	[22]
RWP	Red Well Position	$670 + 30 \left( \frac{\frac{670\text{nm} + 780\text{nm}}{2} - 700\text{nm}}{740\text{nm} - 700\text{nm}} \right)$	[21]
SI	Spruce Index	$\frac{751\text{nm} - 715\text{nm}}{751\text{nm} + 715\text{nm}}$	[4]
SICI	Structure-Insensitive Pigment Index	$\frac{800\text{nm} - 445\text{nm}}{800\text{nm} + 680\text{nm}}$	[23]
SIWSI	Shortwave infrared water stress index	$\frac{859\text{nm} - 1640\text{nm}}{859\text{nm} + 1640\text{nm}}$	[24]
SRWI	Simple Ratio Water Index	$\frac{858\text{nm}}{1240\text{nm}}$	[25]
TCARI/ OSAVI	Transformed Chlorophyll Ratio Index/Optimization of Soil-adjusted Vegetation Index	$\frac{3 * (750.66\text{nm} - 704.6\text{nm}) - 0.2 * (750.66\text{nm} - 550.67\text{nm}) * \frac{750.66\text{nm}}{704.6\text{nm}}}{(1 + 0.16) * (750.66 - 704.6)} \\ (750.66 + 704.6 + 0.16)$	[9,26]
VOG1	Vogelmann Index 1	$\frac{740.480\text{nm}}{721.520\text{nm}}$	[27]
WBI	Water Band Index	$\frac{970\text{nm}}{900\text{nm}}$	[28]

Table S2. Spectral variance of each principal component used in the analysis.

Principal Component		Spectral variance (%)				
1	0.733424541	47	6.17E-05	97	7.90E-06	
2	0.101193229	48	6.03E-05	98	7.69E-06	
3	0.079277231	49	5.52E-05	99	7.52E-06	
4	0.028275502	50	5.41E-05	100	7.26E-06	
5	0.017410613	51	5.09E-05	101	6.76E-06	
6	0.008052092	52	4.84E-05	102	6.48E-06	
7	0.00557642	53	4.79E-05	103	6.35E-06	
8	0.003834948	54	4.75E-05	104	6.24E-06	
9	0.003657565	55	4.58E-05	105	5.76E-06	
10	0.003140772	56	4.18E-05	106	5.70E-06	
11	0.002409257	57	3.98E-05	107	5.52E-06	
12	0.001775957	58	3.64E-05	108	5.07E-06	
13	0.001771961	59	3.51E-05	109	5.02E-06	
14	0.001162961	60	3.45E-05	110	4.81E-06	
15	0.00114785	61	3.21E-05			
16	0.00085279	62	3.00E-05			
17	0.000802317	63	2.86E-05			
18	0.000523554	64	2.70E-05			
19	0.000481042	65	2.67E-05			
20	0.000317236	66	2.46E-05			
21	0.000268142	67	2.39E-05			
22	0.000260903	68	2.34E-05			
23	0.000248778	69	2.10E-05			
24	0.00022868	70	2.02E-05			
25	0.000179743	71	1.92E-05			
26	0.000166136	72	1.83E-05			
27	0.000162626	73	1.80E-05			
28	0.000152263	74	1.71E-05			
29	0.000133389	75	1.70E-05			
30	0.00013281	76	1.61E-05			
31	0.000127287	77	1.51E-05			
32	0.000122028	78	1.47E-05			
33	0.000113652	79	1.44E-05			
34	0.000109681	80	1.37E-05			
35	0.000103511	81	1.31E-05			
36	9.97E-05	82	1.27E-05			
37	9.29E-05	83	1.22E-05			
38	8.94E-05	84	1.21E-05			
39	8.62E-05	85	1.15E-05			
40	7.93E-05	86	1.11E-05			
41	7.75E-05	87	1.05E-05			
42	7.44E-05	88	9.93E-06			
43	7.23E-05	89	9.71E-06			
44	6.93E-05	90	9.56E-06			
45	6.77E-05	91	9.20E-06			
46	6.28E-05	92	8.93E-06			

Table S3. Kappa and overall accuracy (OA) results for the classification with different principal component sets using support vector machine.

Principal Component	Kappa (VNIR+SWIR)	OA (VNIR+SWIR)	Principal Component	Kappa (VNIR+SWIR)	OA (VNIR+SWIR)
<b>1</b>	0.24	0.43	<b>44</b>	0.75	0.81
<b>2</b>	0.41	0.56	<b>45</b>	0.76	0.82
<b>3</b>	0.42	0.56	<b>46</b>	0.75	0.81
<b>4</b>	0.44	0.58	<b>50</b>	0.74	0.80
<b>5</b>	0.43	0.57	<b>55</b>	0.74	0.80
<b>6</b>	0.45	0.59	<b>60</b>	0.76	0.82
<b>7</b>	0.47	0.60	<b>65</b>	0.76	0.82
<b>8</b>	0.46	0.59	<b>70</b>	0.75	0.81
<b>9</b>	0.48	0.61	<b>75</b>	0.73	0.80
<b>10</b>	0.50	0.62	<b>80</b>	0.73	0.80
<b>11</b>	0.51	0.63	<b>85</b>	0.73	0.80
<b>12</b>	0.52	0.64	<b>90</b>	0.73	0.79
<b>13</b>	0.55	0.66	<b>95</b>	0.73	0.80
<b>14</b>	0.60	0.70	<b>100</b>	0.70	0.78
<b>15</b>	0.60	0.71	<b>105</b>	0.70	0.78
<b>16</b>	0.60	0.70	<b>110</b>	0.73	0.80
<b>17</b>	0.67	0.75			
<b>18</b>	0.68	0.76			
<b>19</b>	0.70	0.77			
<b>20</b>	0.70	0.78			
<b>21</b>	0.71	0.78			
<b>22</b>	0.71	0.79			
<b>23</b>	0.71	0.78			
<b>24</b>	0.71	0.78			
<b>25</b>	0.70	0.77			
<b>26</b>	0.72	0.79			
<b>27</b>	0.72	0.79			
<b>28</b>	0.72	0.79			
<b>29</b>	0.72	0.79			
<b>30</b>	0.71	0.78			
<b>31</b>	0.72	0.79			
<b>32</b>	0.72	0.79			
<b>33</b>	0.71	0.79			
<b>34</b>	0.72	0.79			
<b>35</b>	0.73	0.79			
<b>36</b>	0.74	0.81			
<b>37</b>	0.75	0.81			
<b>38</b>	0.76	0.82			
<b>39</b>	0.76	0.82			
<b>40</b>	0.76	0.82			
<b>41</b>	0.76	0.82			
<b>42</b>	0.76	0.82			
<b>43</b>	0.76	0.82			

Table S4. Statistical significance of the difference in overall accuracy between the 15 models compared using McNemar's test (significant differences >3.84 indicated with \*). McNemar's test statistic values are on the left side of the diagonal, p-values on the right side. The models were trained with Random Forest (RF) and Support Vector Machines (SVM), using all features with and without Recursive Feature Elimination (RFE) and fitted with different feature sets (Refl. = VNIR + SWIR reflectance, VI = Vegetation Indices, PCA = Principal Component Analysis).

	Refl. (RF)	VI (RF)	Refl. + VI (RF)	PCA (RF)	PCA + VI (RF)	Refl. (SVM)	VI (SVM)	Refl. + VI (SVM)	PCA (SVM)	PCA + VI (SVM)	Refl. (RF + RFE)	VI (RF + RFE)	Refl. + VI (RF + RFE)	VI (RF + RFE)	Refl. (SVM + RFE)	VI (SVM + RFE)	Refl. (SVM + RFE)	VI (SVM + RFE)	Refl. + VI (SVM + RFE)
Refl. (RF)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
VI (RF)	27.57 *		0.83	0.02	0.02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.61	0.66	0.02	0.02	0.01			
Refl. + VI (RF)	30.81 *	0.04		0.02	0.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.57	0.61	0.02	0.02	0.01			
PCA (RF)	47.64 *	5.44 *	5.13 *		0.69	0	0.23	0.07	0.35	0.31	0	0.06	0.07	0.35	0.34	0.22			
PCA + VI (RF)	43.76 *	5.23 *	4.45 *	0.16		0	0.12	0.03	0.19	0.15	0	0.1	0.11	0.25	0.24	0.15			
Refl. (SVM)	70.51 *	23.68 *	22.22 *	8.00 *	9.62 *		0.08	0.22	0.02	0.02	0	0	0	0.68	0.67	0.89			
VI (SVM)	55.31 *	14.52 *	12.19 *	1.42	2.48	3.10		0.38	0.75	0.87	0	0.02	0.02	0.73	0.73	0.53			
Refl. + VI (SVM)	58.84 *	15.91 *	14.10 *	3.38 *	4.90 *	1.50	0.76		0.25	0.26	0	0	0.01	1	1	0.78			
PCA (SVM)	52.08 *	10.05 *	9.23 *	0.86	1.72	5.12 *	0.10	1.32		0.85	0	0.02	0.02	0.63	0.63	0.44			
PCA + VI (SVM)	49.47 *	10.38 *	9.33 *	1.03	2.05	5.54 *	0.03	1.29	0.04		0	0.02	0.02	0.68	0.67	0.48			
Refl. (RF + RFE)	0.27	8.73 *	9.12 *	18.28 *	16.44 *	31.4 *	23.37 *	27.35 *	22.37 *	23.40 *		0	0	0	0	0			
VI (RF + RFE)	8.80 *	0.25	0.32	3.46	2.73	10.22 *	5.87 *	8.00 *	5.36 *	5.73 *	17.33 *		0.83	0	0	0			
Refl. + VI (RF + RFE)	9.13 *	0.19	0.25	3.27	2.55	9.93 *	5.68 *	7.60 *	5.17 *	5.54 *	20.05 *	0.05		0	0	0			
Refl. (SVM + RFE)	31.68 *	5.44 *	5.07 *	0.89	1.32	0.17	0.12	0.00	0.23	0.17	60.83 *	21.75 *	21.00 *		1	0.37			
VI (SVM + RFE)	32.39 *	5.49 *	5.16 *	0.91	1.37	0.18	0.12	0.00	0.24	0.18	61.89 *	25.33 *	23.84 *	0.00		0.5			

Refl. + VI (SVM + RFE)	34.98 *	6.88 *	6.45 *	1.50	2.05	0.02	0.40	0.08	0.59	0.50	61.46 *	25.99 *	25.19 *	0.80	0.44	
------------------------	---------	--------	--------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	---------	---------	---------	------	------	--

## References

1. Waser, L.T.; Küchler, M.; Jütte, K.; Stampfer, T. (2014). Evaluating the Potential of WorldView-2 Data to Classify Tree Species and Different Levels of Ash Mortality. *Remote Sensing* 2014, 6, 4515–4545. <http://doi.org/10.3390/rs6054515>.
2. Daughtry, G. S. T. (2001). Discriminating crop residues from soil by shortwave infrared reflectance. *Agronomy* 93, 125–131. <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2001.931125x>.
3. Zarco-Tejada, P. J., Berni, J. A. J., Suárez, L., Sepulcre-Cantó, G., Morales, F., Miller, J. R. (2009). Imaging chlorophyll fluorescence with an airborne narrow-band multispectral camera for vegetation stress detection. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 113, 6, 1262 – 1275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2009.02.016>.
4. Trier, Ø. D., Salberg, A-B., Kermit, M., Rudjord, Ø., Gobakken, T., Næsset, E. & Aarsten, D. (2018). Tree species classification in Norway from airborne hyperspectral and airborne laser scanning data. *European Journal of Remote Sensing*, 51, 1, 336–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22797254.2018.1434424>.
5. Gitelson, A. A., Gritz, Y. & Merzlyak, M. N. (2003). Relationships between leaf chlorophyll content and spectral reflectance and algorithms for non-destructive chlorophyll assessment in higher plant leaves. *Journal of Plant Physiology* 160, 3, 271–282. <https://doi.org/10.1078/0176-1617-00887>.
6. Gitelson, A. A., Merzlyak, M. N., Zur, U., Stark, R. & Gritz, Y. (2001). Non-destructive and remote sensing techniques for estimation of vegetation status. Proceedings of the 3rd European Conference on Precision Agriculture, Montpellier, France, 2001.
7. Liu, H. Q. Huete, A. R. (1995). A feedback based modification of the NDVI to minimize canopy background and atmospheric noise. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 33, 2, 457–465. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.1995.8746027>.
8. Gitelson, A. & Merzlyak, M. N. (1994). Spectral reflectance changes associated with autumn senescence of *Aesculus hippocastanum* L. and *Acer platanoides* L. leaves. Spectral features and relation to chlorophyll estimation. *Journal of Plant Physiology* 143, 3, 286–292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0176-1617\(11\)81633-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0176-1617(11)81633-0).
9. Daughtry, C. S. T., Walthall, C. L., Kim, M. S., Brown de Colstoun, E. & McMurtrey, J. E. (2000). Estimating corn leaf chlorophyll concentration from leaf and canopy reflectance. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 74, 2, 229–239. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257\(00\)00113-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(00)00113-9).
10. Haboudane, D.; Miller, J.R.; Pattey, E.; Zarco-Tejada, P.J.; Strachan, I.B. Hyperspectral vegetation indices and novel algorithms for predicting green LAI of crop canopies: Modeling and validation in the context of precision agriculture. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 2004, 90, 3, 337–352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2003.12.013>.
11. Sims, D. A., Gamon, J. A. (2002). Relationships between leaf pigment content and spectral reflectance across a wide range of species, leaf structures and developmental stages. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 81, 2–3, 337–354. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257\(02\)00010-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(02)00010-X).
12. Dash, J., & Curran, P. J. (2004). The MERIS terrestrial chlorophyll index. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 25, 5403–5413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0143116042000274015>.
13. Serrano, L., Peñuelas, J. & Ustin, S. L. (2002). Remote sensing of nitrogen and lignin in Mediterranean vegetation from AVIRIS data: Decomposing biochemical from structural signals. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 81, 2–3, 355–364. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257\(02\)00011-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(02)00011-1).
14. Barnes, E. M., Clarke, T. R., Richards, S. E., Colaizzi, P. D., Haberland, J., Kostrzewski, M., Waller, P., Choi, C., Riley, E., Thompson, T., Lascano, R. J., Li, H., Moran, M. S. (2000). Coincident detection of crop water stress, nitrogen status and canopy density using ground based multispectral data. In Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Precision Agriculture, Bloomington, MN, USA 1619.

15. Rouse, J. W., Haas, R. H., Schell, J. A., Deering, D. W. (1974). Monitoring vegetation systems in the Great Plains with ERTS. Third Earth Resources Technology Satellite-1 Symposium - Volume I: Technical Presentations, 301-317. NASA, Washington, D.C.
16. Gao, B. (1996). NDWI—A normalized difference water index for remote sensing of vegetation liquid water from space. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 58, 3, 257-266. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0034-4257\(96\)00067-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0034-4257(96)00067-3).
17. Gamon, J., Serrano, L. & Surfus, J. (1997). The photochemical reflectance index: An optical indicator of photosynthetic radiation use efficiency across species, functional types, and nutrient levels. *Oecologia* 112, 492–501. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420050337>.
18. Carter, G. A. (1994). Ratios of leaf reflectances in narrow wavebands as indicators of plant stress. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 15, 3, 697-703. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01431169408954109>.
19. Blackburn, G.A. (1998). Quantifying Chlorophylls and Carotenoids at Leaf and Canopy Scales: An Evaluation of Some Hyperspectral Approaches. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 66, 3, 273-285. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257\(98\)00059-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(98)00059-5).
20. Merzlyak, M. N., Gitelson, A. A., Chivkunova, O. B., & Rakitin, V. Y. (1999). Non-destructive optical detection of pigment changes during leaf senescence and fruit ripening. *Physiologia plantarum*, 106, 1, 135-141. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-3054.1999.106119.x>.
21. Pu, R., Gong, P., Biging, G. S., Larrieu, M. R. (2003). Extraction of red edge optical parameters from Hyperion data for estimation of forest leaf area index. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 41, 4, 916-921. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2003.813555>.
22. Merton, R. N., Huntington, J. (1999). Early simulation results of the ARIES-1 satellite sensor for multi-temporal vegetation research derived from AVIRIS. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual JPL Airborne Earth Science Workshop. NASA, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, USA.
23. Peñuelas, J., Baret, F., Filella, I. (1995). Semi-empirical indices to assess carotenoids/chlorophyll-a ratio from leaf spectral reflectance. *Photosynthetica* 31, 2, 221-230.
24. Fensholt, R., & Sandholt, I. (2003). Derivation of a shortwave infrared water stress index from MODIS near-and shortwave infrared data in a semiarid environment. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 87, 1, 111-121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2003.07.002>.
25. Zarco-Tejada, P. J., Ustin, S. L. (2001). Modeling canopy water content for carbon estimates from MODIS data at land EOS validation sites. In: Proceedings of IGARSS 2001, Scanning the Present and Resolving the Future. IEEE 2001 International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, Sydney, Australia. <http://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2001.976152>.
26. Wu, C., Niu, Z., Tang, Q., Huang, W. (2008). Estimating chlorophyll content from hyperspectral vegetation indices: Modeling and validation. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 148, 8-9, 1230-1241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2008.03.005>.
27. Vogelmann, J. E., Rock, B. N., Moss, D. M. (1993). Red edge spectral measurements from sugar maple leaves. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 14, 1563-1575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01431169308953986>.
28. Peñuelas, J., Gamon, J. A., Fredeen, A. L., Merino, J., Field, C. B. (1994). Reflectance indices associated with physiological changes in nitrogen- and water-limited sunflower leaves. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 48, 2, 135-146. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257\(94\)90136-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257(94)90136-8).