

Supplementary Material

Dynamic response of plant chlorophyll fluorescence to light, water and nutrient availability

M. Pilar Cendrero-Mateo^{A,B,F,H}, *A. Elizabete Carmo-Silva*^{C,G}, *Albert Porcar-Castell*^D, *Erik P. Hamerlynck*^B, *Shirley A. Papuga*^{A,E} and *M. Susan Moran*^B

^ASoil Water and Environmental Science, The University of Arizona, 1177 East Fourth Street, Tucson 85721, USA.

^BUSDA Southwest Watershed Research Centre, 2000 East Allen Road, Tucson, AZ 85719, USA.

^CUSDA Arid-Land Agricultural Research Center, 21881 North Cardon Lane, Maricopa, AZ 85138, USA.

^DDepartment of Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki, PO Box 27, 00014 Helsinki, Finland.

^ESchool of Natural Resources, The University of Arizona, 325 Biosciences East, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA.

^FPresent address: Institute of Bio- and Geosciences, Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Leo-Brandt-Str., 52425 Jülich, Germany.

^GPresent address: Rothamsted Research, Plant Biology and Crop Science, Harpenden, Herts., AL5 2JQ, UK.

^HCorresponding author. Email: p.cendrero@fz-juelich.de




Fig. S1. Canopy and leaf scale relationship between active (leaf-level, F_{SLeaf}) and passive (canopy-level, SIF_{Canopy}) measurements in wheat plants under low (square), medium (triangle), and high fertilization treatment (circle). For leaf level measurements each point represents the replicated leaves fluorescence mean (n=9). Black line represents regression line between active and passive techniques. Canopy measurements were taken with a field portable spectroradiometer (GER-1500, Geophysical and Environmental Research Corp., Milbrook, NY, USA) operating at a spectral range between 350 and 1050 nm with a FWHM of 3.2 nm.