



Supplement of

Uncertainty Assessment in Deep Learning-based Plant Trait Retrievals from Hyperspectral data

Eya Cherif et al.

Correspondence to: Eya Cherif (eya.cherif@uni-leipzig.de)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

1 *Table S1. Chemical and mineral composition of the basalt amendment.*

| Oxide | Percentage of total mass | Element | Concentration (ppm) | Mineral | Percentage of total mass |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| SiO ₂ | 42 | Ba | 1320 | Plagioclas | 38 |
| CaO | 16 | Sr | 1037 | Pyroxene | 26 |
| Al ₂ O ₃ | 12 | Cr | 408 | K-feldspar | 10 |
| Fe ₂ O ₃ | 11 | V | 396 | 2:1 Al clay | 9 |
| MgO | 11 | Zr | 240 | Olivine | 7 |
| K ₂ O | 3 | Ce | 156 | Kaolinite | 5 |
| Na ₂ O | 3 | Ni | 147 | Ulvospinel | 3 |
| TiO ₂ | 2 | Cu | 121 | Quartz | 1 |
| P ₂ O ₅ | 1 | Nb | 119 | Mica/illite | 1 |
| Mn ₂ O ₃ | 0,2 | Cu | 110 | | |
| ZrO ₂ | 0,1 | Rb | 101 | | |
| BaO | 0,1 | Ni | 95 | | |
| SrO | 0,1 | Cr | 93 | | |
| SO ₃ | 0,04 | La | 91 | | |
| Cr ₂ O ₃ | 0,02 | Zn | 68 | | |
| Moisture 105 °C | 1,59 | Nd | 64 | | |
| | | Zn | 59 | | |
| | | Sc | 29 | | |
| | | Y | 24 | | |
| | | Th | 12 | | |
| | | Pb | 7 | | |
| | | Pb | 5 | | |
| | | U | 3 | | |
| | | As | 2 | | |
| | | Cl- | | | |
| | | Cd | <0.1 | | |
| | | Loss on ignition | 0,2 | | |

2


3

4 *Table S2. Maximal mass changes during the CO₂ adsorption and desorption steps*

| Sample | Δm_{ads}, wt% | Δm_{des}, wt% |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Soil without basalt | 0.009 | 0.008 |
| Soil with basalt | 0.015 | 0.014 |
| Basalt | 0.019 | 0.023 |


5

6




11 *Figure S1. Climate conditions simulated in the ecotron. They correspond to local climate projections or the RCP*
 12 *8.5 model for the year 2072 in a 15km pixel around Maastricht (Netherlands). For more details see (Rineau et al.*
 13 *2019a; Vanderkelen et al. 2019). The two bottom panels show average topsoil temperature (left) and volumetric*
 14 *water content (right), as average values for control (black) and basalt-amended (red) units.*

15




16

17 *Figure S2. Effect of basalt treatment on the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ signature of soil organic carbon (TOC). The CO_2 injected in*
 18 *every unit has a low isotopic C signature. The effect of basalt treatment has been tested by a mixed model with*
 19 *treatment as a fixed effect and unit as a random effect ($F=0.36$, $df=4$, $p=0.58$).*




21

22 *Figure S3. Effect of basalt treatment on oat (left), weed biomass (center) and total biomass (right) (gC/m²). Weed*
 23 *biomass was mostly consisting of *Rumex acetosella* and was harvested manually at the end of June. The biomass*
 24 *of oats was calculated by multiplying the average plant density by the average of the sum of the dry weight of*
 25 *individual plant per unit, multiplied by the average C content of oat plants (40%). The biomass of *R. acetosella**
 26 *(harvested at the end of the growing season and weighed fresh as a total value per unit) was calculated by*
 27 *correcting for the lysimeter surface (3.14m²), for the average water content of these plants (10%), and for the*
 28 *average C content of *R. acetosella* plants (40%). The effect of basalt treatment on oat, *R. acetosella* and total plant*
 29 *biomass has been tested by a mixed model with treatment as a fixed effect and unit as a random effect, and was*
 30 *significant only for total biomass ($F=10.04$, $df=1$, $p=0.03$). Values for oat biomass: $F=0.42$, $df=1$, $p=0.55$. Values*
 31 *for *R. acetosella* biomass: $F=0.34$, $df=1$, $p=0.59$.*



32


33 *Figure S4. Effect of basalt amendment on the biomass of the organs of individual plants (n=20). Red: basalt*
 34 *treatment, black: control. The effect of treatment on every organ has been tested using a mixed model with*
 35 *treatment as a fixed variable (2 levels: basalt or control) and unit as a random variable, and was never significant.*



36

37 *Figure S5. Effect of the basalt treatment on soil net C flux. The soil net C flux was calculated as the sum of the*
 38 *CO₂ net flux, the CH₄ net flux, the rainfall C flux, minus the leachate C flux, the sampling C flux, and the plant*
 39 *C flux (n=3 for each treatment). To account for the error propagation in the calculation process while*
 40 *comparing the soil net C flux between treatments, we used bootstrapping (n = 10 000) to generate a distribution*
 41 *of soil C net flux for each treatment (left panel; positive values indicate increase in soil C). We then compared*
 42 *these distributions using a bootstrap hypothesis test, assessing the observed difference between treatments (right*
 43 *panel) (red dashed line) against a null distribution representing no treatment effect (blue bars) (p=0).*

44




45

46 *Figure S6. Correlation between cumulated NEE difference between treatments and average topsoil temperature.*


47 *Every point represents the computed daily average in soil temperature recorded at 10cm depth by three different*
 48 *sensors per unit, for three units per treatment level in function of the daily average difference in CO₂-C net flux.*

49 *Effect of soil temperature and soil moisture on difference in C balance between the treatments was tested using a*
 50 *linear model with daily average difference in CO₂-C flux between treatments response variable and average soil*


51 *temperature on the top 10cm and average soil moisture on the top 20cm as fixed variables; p-value = 0.06 for soil*
 52 *moisture; p-value = 3.8×10^{-9} for soil temperature).*



53



54




55

56 *Figure S7. Effect of the basalt amendment on Ca and Mg in soil pore water at different depths (top) and its*
 57 *dynamics (bottom; red=basalt treatment, black=control; each point is a sample at a given date, unit and depth;*
 58 *the shaded zones represent the confidence interval). The effect of treatment on Ca and Mg concentration in the*
 59 *solution has been assessed at each depth using a mixed model with treatment as a fixed variable (2 levels: basalt*
 60 *or control) and unit and date as a random variables. The effect was not significant for any depth.*

61

62

63




64


65 *Figure S8. Effect of basalt on inorganic carbon concentration of soil water samples taken by suction cups in*
 66 *function of depth. The suction cups were installed at 5 different depths, with 3 replicates per depth, and set at a*
 67 *tension of -150 HPa until 35cm deep and -50 HPa below. Soil water was sampled every 3 weeks and analysed for*
 68 *TOC and inorganic C. Values are pooled for all dates after basalt amendment until just before harvest*
 69 *(30/08/2022). The effect of basalt treatment has been tested by a mixed model with treatment as a fixed effect*
 70 *and unit as a random effect, and was not significant at any depth.*

71

72



73



74

75 *Figure S9. Effect of the basalt amendment (control: blue, basalt: red) on topsoil inorganic Carbon (SIC: left, in %*
 76 *dry mass of soil) and soil organic Carbon (SOC: right, in g/m²), displayed as horizontal boxplots (top) and violin*
 77 *plots (bottom). The PIC represents the fraction of carbonates and bicarbonate ions that did not dissolve in the*
 78 *soil solution. The effect of treatment has been assessed using a t test. The POC represents the concentration of C*
 79 *in soil samples measured as non-purgeable organic C in a TOC/TN analyser.*

80

81 **Macrocosm details**

82 -location of the plot from which the macrocosms were extracted: 50° 59' 02.1" N, 5° 37' 40.0" E

83 -agricultural treatments:

84 27/10/2021: mustard was sown as a cover crop.

85 18/03/2022 (DOY 77): mineral NPK fertilisation was applied (100-80-140) (NH₄NO₃, K₂HPO₄, KNO₃).

86 25/03/2022 (DOY 85): basalt application in 3 units (incorporation on the top 20cm of soil)

87 Basalt composition: ((0.8 P₂O₅, 16 CaO, 11 MgO, 42 SiO₂, 3 K₂O, 11 Fe₂O₃, 1 Al₂O₃))


88 05/04/2022 (DOY 95): oat seeding (*Avena sativa*, cv SYMPHONY, 400 seeds/m², 3-5 cm deep)

89 02/09/2022 (DOY 245): harvest (150 days of growth)

90

91 Note that the incorporation involved topsoil manipulation similar to tillage, and was not applied to the control
92 units, but that tillage was anyway applied in all treatments (control and basalt) at the time of seeding, about 10
93 days later.

94 We did not add herbicides but weeded manually three times during growing season as *Rumex acetosella* L.
95 colonized some macrocosms.



97