

SpykProps: An Imaging Pipeline to Quantify Architecture in Unilateral Grass Inflorescences

Joan Barreto Ortiz

University of Minnesota

Candice N. Hirsch

University of Minnesota

Nancy Jo Ehke

University of Minnesota

Eric Watkins (✉ ewatkins@umn.edu)

University of Minnesota

Method Article

Keywords: inflorescence architecture, latent phenotypes, image analysis, high-throughput phenotyping, machine learning

Posted Date: August 23rd, 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3273400/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Plant Methods on November 13th, 2023.

See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13007-023-01104-z>.

Abstract

Background

Inflorescence properties such length, spikelet number, and their spatial distribution across the rachis, are fundamental indicators of fitness and seed productivity in grasses, and have been a target of selection throughout domestication and crop improvement. However, quantifying such complex morphology is laborious, time-consuming, and commonly limited to human-perceived traits. These limitations can be exacerbated by unfavorable trait correlations between inflorescence architecture and seed yield that can be unconsciously selected for. Computer vision offers an alternative to conventional phenotyping, enabling higher throughput and reducing subjectivity. These approaches provide valuable insights into the determinants of seed yield, and thus, aid breeding decisions.

Results

Here, we described SpykProps, an inexpensive Python-based imaging system to quantify morphological properties in unilateral inflorescences, that was developed and tested on images of perennial grass (*Lolium perenne* L.) spikes. SpykProps is able to rapidly and accurately identify spikes ($RMSE < 1$), estimate their length ($R^2 = 0.96$), and number of spikelets ($R^2 = 0.61$). It also quantifies color and shape from hundreds of interacting descriptors that are accurate predictors of architectural and agronomic traits such as seed yield potential ($R^2 = 0.94$), rachis weight ($R^2 = 0.83$), and seed shattering ($R^2 = 0.85$).

Conclusions

SpykProps is an open-source platform to characterize inflorescence architecture in a wide range of grasses. This imaging tool generates conventional and latent traits that can be used to better characterize developmental and agronomic traits associated with inflorescence architecture, and has applications in fields that include breeding, physiology, evolution, and development biology.

Background

Inflorescences are flower-bearing structures composed of multidimensional traits that humans and many other organisms have selected over millennia to guarantee mutual survival. These selective pressures and developmental changes over variable climates resulted in plants with highly complex inflorescence architectures (Prusinkiewicz et al., 2007). Hidden in this complexity are the relationships between micro and macroscopic inflorescence traits that attract biotic and abiotic dispersers and allow gene flow across spacetime (Bello & Barreto, 2021; Robledo-Arnuncio et al., 2014). For example, short-distance dispersal relies on shattering, a programmed disarticulation of inflorescence structures due to a microscopic abscission formation, as well as insects. In contrast, long-distance dispersal is associated with wind, water, and vertebrates (Thomson et al., 2010), and thus depends on macroscopic or visible traits. For

humans, selecting on inflorescence properties that reduced dispersal without affecting fitness was paramount to plant domestication and to continued efforts to increase grain yield and food supply.

Inflorescences, seed heads, ears, and spikes, all refer to the same modified panicle, the morphology of which determines seed yield potential in grasses (Abel et al., 2017). In grasses that are not fully domesticated, poor seed yield is commonly attributed to spike properties that facilitate dispersion such as shattering and asynchronous flowering and ripening. The rate at which such traits can be improved through breeding depends on their genetic architecture as well as our ability to properly quantify and select the traits that associate with them. This is a major challenge for yield increase because the myriad of traits comprising inflorescence architecture are often pleiotropic (Sun et al., 2016) and have complex genetic correlations (Perreta et al., 2009) that may result in indirect selection for unfavorable traits (Farris & Lechowicz, 1990; Kimball et al., 2013; Schulthess et al., 2017; Thorwarth et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2017), decreasing breeding efficiency. Furthermore, selection on spike properties is time consuming, low-throughput, costly, and restricted to traits that can be perceived or measured.

The development of high-throughput phenotyping (HTP) systems has contributed to overcoming challenges from intensive phenotyping and has facilitated the genetic characterization of many plant traits (Yang et al., 2020). High-throughput phenotyping systems to characterize inflorescence architecture are less common; image-based tools such as P-TRAP (A L-Tam et al., 2013) and PANorama (Crowell et al., 2014) have been developed to estimate properties such as length, spikelet number, and branching patterns in rice. Similar methods exist for *Zea mays* (Gage et al., 2017), *Sorghum bicolor* (Zhou et al., 2019), *Triticum* (Hasan et al., 2019; Misra et al., 2020), and *Avena sativa* (Berro et al., 2023). While these tools have been useful in the breeding (Hamsa Poorna Prakash et al., 2022) and studying the genetic control of inflorescence morphology (Crowell et al., 2016); (Rebolledo et al., 2016), they focus on conventional traits such as spike length and spikelet number. While their interpretability are a key advantage for plant breeding, the exclusive focus on these conventional traits impedes exploring the effect of subtle traits, i.e., latent traits, as the interacting components of multidimensional inflorescence architecture (Chitwood & Topp, 2015; Feldmann et al., 2021).

Here we describe SpykProps, a tool that segments inflorescences from images, and estimates both conventional and latent architectural traits. The former include spike length, area, and spikelet number. The latter are derived from a myriad of interacting descriptors of color and shape that focus on the inflorescence as a multidimensional phenotype. This tool was developed and tested in perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.), a multifunctional crop that due to its recent domestication for seed production suffers from yield reductions from wild spike architectural traits. Nonetheless, SpykProps can be used to study other species with two-ranked unilateral, i.e., flat inflorescences (Kellogg et al., 2013) in fields including breeding, physiology, evolutionary biology, and developmental biology.

Results

Our goal was to develop an inexpensive high-throughput system capable of quantifying spike architecture in species with a two-ranked unilateral inflorescence, such as perennial ryegrass. Accordingly, we developed SpykProps, an imaging pipeline written in Python to characterize color and shape-based properties of the spike and spikelets. This system is aimed to be implemented in breeding and research programs seeking to unveil subtle relationships between architectural and dispersal traits affecting yield, using RGB images (Fig. 1). The pipeline was built using 8-bit color images obtained with flatbed scanners at 600 dpi that have a black non-reflective background. However, the functions in the program have flexibility to process images of variable size, resolution, and background color. SpykProps is an open-source program that can be accessed from <https://github.com/joanmanbar/SpykProps> along with detailed instructions to analyze single spikes using a Python integrated development environment, or to automate it on a set of images using Bash and the *SpykBatch.py* function. In either run mode, images are imported in and parameters can be set to export datasheets with hundreds of color and shape descriptors per spike and spikelet, along with images of the segmented structures for visual validation.

Spike Segmentation

The first step in the automated pipeline is to identify spikes in the image and separate them from background and other debris. This requires a threshold that can be set on a channel from the red-green-blue (RGB) value representation, or can be estimated automatically using the Otsu algorithm (Otsu, 1979). This algorithm uses the pixel intensity histogram in gray scale to maximize separability between classes, resulting in a stringent threshold when using dark backgrounds and therefore requires a scaling factor. In Spykprops, spikes are detected using the *spike_segm* function calling on either the *channel_thresh* option for manual RGB thresholding or the *OtsuScaling* option for automated segmentation. At this step, users can also opt to rescale the original images by a factor (*rescale_rgb*), resulting in fewer pixels and detail to process, reducing computational time. The *spike_segm* function produces segmented spikes in individual output images with different representations including, RGB, CIELAB ($L^*a^*b^*$), and hue-saturation-value (HSV). Using multiple spaces provides a broader range of colors which increases the ability to discriminate across spikes with similar color profiles. Selecting a proper method and threshold that accurately segments the spike is essential since the binary mask that results from this step directly affects the quality of the color and shape descriptors.

To determine optimal thresholds for accurately segmenting spikes in our images, we evaluated different thresholds on the red channel as well as scaling factors for the Otsu algorithm (Fig. 2). Specifically, 116 images containing 2743 spikes were run through SpkyPros rescaled at 50% on each axis, and were also manually segmented. Pixel values between 20–35 on the red channel and scaling the Otsu threshold by 28–30% had a RMSE < 1, i.e., an average lower than one misdetected spike (0.03%). The optimal threshold value on the red channel was 20 (RMSE = 0.89 ± 0.49) and the best scaling factor for the Otsu threshold was 29% (RMSE = 0.91 ± 0.48). The time to detect the 2743 spikes and generate binary masks for all tested thresholds across both methods was 184 minutes, with an average of 0.14 seconds per spike and threshold. It is important to note that optimal thresholds may vary according to image resolution, size, light conditions, and the color and texture of the image background. These features of the

image may also impact processing time and accuracy. As such, we included a Python script (*SpikeSeg_Batch.py*) within SpykProps to assist users in determining the method and threshold that is most optimized to their image properties.

Spike Length

Spike length is a major determinant of spike architecture in the grasses (Abel et al., 2017; Norris, 1992), and a key component of seed yield in perennial ryegrass (Acar et al., 2010). However, measuring this trait in field or lab conditions can be tedious, time intensive, and low-throughput, making it an important trait for image based acquisition. Imaging strategies often approximate length from the major axis' distance of a geometric object such as an ellipse, fitted on the object of interest (Fig. 3A) or its convex hull (Fig. 3B). This strategy works well on straight spikes, but has reduced accuracy with curved spike architectures. To account for this curved architecture that is commonly observed in perennial ryegrass, and many other species for which SpykProps could be applied, we implemented two additional methods that reduce the spike's binary mask to a single-pixel (thinning) after applying a low-pass filter (blurring). These methods include *skeleton*, which relies on Zhang and Suen's (1984) skeletonization algorithm (Fig. 3C), and *medial_axis*, which computes the medial axis transform of the spike (Van der Walt et al., n.d.) (Fig. 3D). Any or all of these four methods can be specified on the *spk_length* function which returns the estimated length, computing time, and in the case of the thinning methods an image of the spike's binary mask with the overlay of the length (Fig. 3C-D).

To determine the accuracy of each of the length detection methods that are built into SpykProps, we compared predicted lengths to manual measurements of spike length obtained using imageJ (Ferreira & Rasband, 2012) for 810 segmented spikes. As predicted, thinning algorithms, i.e., medial axis ($R^2 = 0.96$) and skeleton ($R^2 = 0.95$) that are able to account for the curved nature of some spikes were more accurate in approximating spike length than using the major axis of a fitted ellipse on the binary spike ($R^2 = 0.92$) or on its convex hull ($R^2 = 0.81$) (Fig. 3). Nevertheless, there was a tradeoff between accuracy and execution time for the thinning algorithms (Fig. 3E). Using a fitted ellipse on the spike was on average 15 times faster than the medial axis method. The fastest method, fitted ellipse, was also less variable (0.007 ± 0.006 seconds) than medial axis (0.103 ± 0.023 seconds), convex hull (0.063 ± 0.027 seconds), and skeleton (0.086 ± 0.030 seconds). However, this variability in execution time is highly dependent on the proportion of irregular spikes in the set of images. Taken together, this analysis demonstrates that if curved spikes are common in a dataset, the medial axis is the ideal approach despite the computational cost. Otherwise, the length of a fitted ellipse on the spike will suffice to provide an accurate approximation of spike length.

Spikelet Segmentation

In addition to spike length, the number of spikelets and distribution across the rachis are key components of seed productivity (Kellogg et al., 2013). In order to segment individual spikelets, we compiled a series of algorithms in a single function (*spikelet_segm*) that returns spikelet count and generates a mask to quantify their morphology. The first steps involve adding a pad around the spike to facilitate

morphological operations such as erosion and opening, which are performed using a cross-shaped kernel of 3x3 pixels. These convolutions are executed on a 10% rescaled version of the spike's mask to increase performance, before it is rescaled back to its original size to generate a mask of the Euclidean distances from each pixel to the nearest background pixel. The local peaks in the mask are calculated according to the expected minimum distance (in pixels) between spikelets and are used as markers for the watershed algorithm, which approximates the spikelets boundaries by treating the transformed distance as a topographic map flooded with water (Fig. 4A). Next, an ellipse is fitted on each spikelet contour and its major axis length is used to estimate the spikelet's angle (Fig. 4A) with respect to the top-left image corner. Spikelet detection accuracy primarily depends on the minimum distance expected between spikelets which must be defined a priori. Users can determine the best minimum distance for their inflorescences from a range of values in the *SpikeletSeg_batch.py* program, which also generates images of the detected spikelets as in Fig. 4A and a dataset with the number of detected spikelets, as well their ellipse's area, length, and relative angle (Fig. 4B).

To assess the accuracy of our spikelet segmentation method, we visually counted the number of spikelets across 793 spikes and compared them with automated detection. The spikes were segmented using a minimum threshold of 25 in the red channel and a range of minimum distances from 25 to 75 pixels between spikelets. Our results indicated that values between 25–40 pixels missed or overestimated less than two spikelets per spike on average (Fig. 4C). We then selected a minimum distance of 25 pixels (1.98 ± 1.64 misdetections) to validate the spikelet count and found a strong Pearson correlation ($r = 0.78$) between the automated and manual spikelet count on 793 spikes (Fig. 4D). This indicates relatively high accuracy ($R^2 = 0.61$) with potential for improvement using conditional or variable minimum expected distances between spikelets.

Quantifying Spike Shape

The ubiquity of irregular shapes in plant morphology poses a challenge in accurately quantifying phenotypic variation. As a result, conventional phenotyping methods tend to prioritize interpretability and ease of measurement, leading to potential biases and a limited scope of the multidimensional phenotype (Feldmann et al., 2021; Li et al., 2014). SpykProps addresses these challenges in two ways: using both geometric descriptors that are easy to interpret, and elliptical Fourier descriptors, which approach the overall spike shape from a multidimensional perspective.

Geometric descriptors are generated from the binary mask resulting in segmenting spikelets, also referred to as regions of interest (ROI). This step relies on the *regionprops* function from scikit-image (Van der Walt et al., n.d.), which generates over 20 possible properties; however, we only focused on those that are more relevant to spike architecture (Table 1). Nevertheless, additional variables can be retrieved with minor changes in the *SpikeDF* and *SpikeletDF* functions within SpykProps, based on specific researcher needs. These descriptors can be combined with spike length, number of spikelets, and other univariate traits, to derive more robust and uncorrelated phenotypes using dimensional reduction techniques.

Table 1
Geometric descriptors of spike and spikelet shape.

Property	Description	Purpose
<i>Area</i> ^a	Number of pixels within the ROI ^b	Quantifies the ROI's area
<i>Eccentricity</i>	Measure of elongation	Helps to identify curved spikes
<i>Equivalent diameter</i>	Diameter of a circle with same the area	Provides a latent measure of ROI's size and shape with reference to a circle
<i>Extents</i>	Ratio of the ROI's bounding box area to the <i>Area</i>	Provides a latent measure of the ROI's spread or aperture
<i>Ferets</i>	Estimates the longest and shortest distance within the ROI's outline	Useful to estimate width on non-curved ROI's. Unlike <i>Minor Axis</i> , it considers the overall shape rather than a fitted ellipse.
<i>Major axis</i>	Length of the longest axes of an ellipse fitted on the ROI	Provides a fast estimate of length on non-curved ROI's.
<i>Minor axis</i>	Length of the shortest axes of an ellipse fitted on the ROI	Provides a fast estimate of width on non-curved ROI's.
<i>Perimeter</i>	Length of the ROI's outline	Provides a latent measure of the ROI's size
<i>Solidity</i>	Ratio of the <i>Area</i> to the ROI's convex hull's area.	Provides a latent measure of shape

^aItalic features refer to those described in the column Property.

^bRegion of interest (ROI), specifically refers to a segmented spike or spikelet.

The spike shape can also be quantified by deriving latent features from its contour. This is done by decomposing the outline into waves with a specified number of harmonic series using the Fourier Transform (Chitwood & Otoni, 2017; Li et al., 2018). The resulting Elliptical Fourier descriptors (EFDs) are the coefficients a_n , b_n , c_n and d_n , derived from the elliptic loci $x_i = a_i \cos \theta + b_i \sin \theta$ and $y_i = c_i \cos \theta + d_i \sin \theta$, for a point (x_i, y_i) with n number of harmonics (Kuhl & Giardina, 1982). The coefficients are obtained using the *CalculateEFD* function from the *spatial-efd* package (W D Grieve, 2017) which is built on the *pyefd* module. To do so, we first provide a binary mask of the spike and fill any holes using the *binary_fill_holes* function from *SciPy* (Virtanen et al., 2020), and then execute the *findContours* function using the *RETR_CCOMP* mode and the *CHAIN_APPROX_SIMPLE* method (Bradski, 2000) to extract the outline of the spike as paired x and y coordinates. Once obtained, the a_n , b_n , c_n , and d_n , are normalized to be insensitive to the spike's rotation and size. The outline representation of the spike depends on the number of harmonics chosen: the more harmonics included, the more accurate the shape representation (Fig. 5). It is worth mentioning that the EFD can also be used to describe more features

including symmetric (b_n and c_n harmonics) and asymmetric (a_n and d_n harmonics) sources of variance (Chitwood & Otoni, 2017).

When computing the EFD, the pipeline uses the *FourierPower* function to estimate the number of harmonics needed to exceed a 0.9999 threshold Fourier power (W D Grieve, 2017) as a univariate representation of the outline. This value can be used as an "optimal" number of harmonics (Fig. 5D), along with the number of spikelets per spike, and geometric descriptors such as area, perimeter, circularity, length, etc., as additional sets of shape properties from which latent variables could be derived. Unlike the original geometric variables, latent variables are orthogonal and account for maximized variation across multiple dimensions of shape (Chitwood & Topp, 2015).

Quantifying Spike Color

Color is an important feature in plant inflorescence, the variation of which often provides information on maturity levels at the time of harvest. Color is a quantitative trait commonly described as qualitative because small variations in hue do not necessarily add relevant information to a biological phenomenon. However, maturity and ripening can be highly variable and arguably impossible to properly quantify at the spikelet or even plant level without high-throughput technology and data. The use of mean intensity values in a region of interest for a given color-space can be problematic when the pixel distribution is not normal. Instead of mean values per channel, SpykProps provides different percentiles across several color spaces as well as descriptors of their variation. There are currently 77 color descriptors that are output using the function *channel_percentiles* which considers all non-zero pixel values in each spike and returns the minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation, coefficient of variation, percentiles 5, 25, 50, 75, 95, and quantile-based coefficient of variation across nine channels (R, G, B, H, S, V, L*, a*, b*). In addition, *channel_percentiles* estimates the same parameters for negative and positive values in a* and b*. The resulting dataset can be dimensionally reduced with methods such as principal component analysis, where the resulting eigenvectors could be used as latent variables to separate samples with similar color profiles.

An example of how latent color phenotypes could help distinguish spikes with near identical color profiles is shown in Fig. 6 and Supplemental Figure S2. Upon projecting a subset of spikes into the first two linear combinations from variable color descriptors, we used their Euclidean distance (ED) to quantify the ability to separate spikes. In general, more descriptors tend to increase the separation between all spikes but could also introduce more noise when trying to separate a subsample of spikes. For example, using only the mean values of the RGB channels (Fig. 6B) resulted in the lowest average ED (1.92 ± 1.49) for all spikes (8892) and an average of 0.07 ± 0.04 for the spikes in Fig. 6A. Adding more descriptors to these channels (Fig. 6C) substantially increased the separation across all spikes (ED = 5.59 ± 3.82), and even more so when adding more color spaces as in Fig. 6D (ED = 7.84 ± 5.24), and more descriptors of spread as in Fig. 6E (ED = 8.2 ± 5.85). The greatest ED between spikes in Fig. 6A (0.08 ± 0.05) was achieved when using the output from SpykProps (Fig. 6D). It should be noted that this evaluation does not necessarily indicate the "best" method to use for quantifying color or a spike, but rather illustrates how using a few

highly correlated variables, (i.e., mean RGB values), limits the ability to characterize and distinguish color among different spikes. Ultimately, users will need to determine the combination of color descriptors that best capture variation in color profile across their germplasm from the array of color descriptors that are output in SpykProps.

Example application of SpykProps in perennial ryegrass breeding

As a proof of concept to validate the applicability of our system in agronomic and breeding settings, we estimate the predictability (R^2) of shape and color descriptors on yield-related traits measured in a perennial ryegrass nursery. Multiple machine learning algorithms showed that some spike properties are more important than others depending on the trait. Gradient boosting machine (gbm) models, in particular, consistently showed that shape and color features were good predictors of theoretical yield potential ($R^2 = 0.94$), while elliptical Fourier were better for rachis weight ($R^2 = 0.83$). Other traits, such as visual shattering, were best modeled using all descriptors from SpykProps ($R^2 = 0.85$; Fig. 7). This suggests that the additional trait features exported from SpykProps can be used to train models to maximize accuracy and efficiency when phenotyping complex spike architectural traits associated with seed yield.

Our results suggest that latent descriptors of shape and color are relevant to the relationships affecting spike architecture and yield-related traits. While spike area was the most important feature to predict seed yield potential and shattering, latent properties of color had at least double the importance compared to the average feature (Supplementary Table 1). For these traits, and particularly for yield potential, descriptors of the distribution of greenness had significant importance, and so did measurements of variability such as CV and QCV. Elliptical Fourier descriptors were also relevant, especially, to predict rachis weight. Altogether, this proof of concept highlights the importance of comprehensively characterizing shape and color in understanding the relationship between spike architecture and yield related traits.

Discussion

Our open-source imaging platform offers advantages to enhance both data quantity and quality. SpykProps is high throughput and fast, enabling the extraction of more than 100 traits per spike in less than three seconds. This attribute is particularly crucial in scenarios where limited sample size and number of traits pose challenges to data quality. Our system minimizes human subjectivity, allowing for a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of color and shape. Unlike conventional approaches relying solely on central tendencies, our system focuses on different measures of spread and variability, providing a more comprehensive representation of color. Additionally, elliptical Fourier descriptors provide a purely quantitative definition of inflorescence shape, enhancing the ability to discern even the subtlest latent differences between samples. Importantly, researchers do not need expensive hardware for image acquisition, and can access our continuously-improving platform freely from its Github repository.

SpykProps has potential applications across research areas including agronomy, genetics, and developmental biology. For instance, comprehensive assessments of inflorescence morphology throughout the growing season could provide valuable insights into the dynamics affecting developmental rate and seed productivity. Similarly, our tool could be useful in comprehending disease progression, assessing its severity, and unraveling plant responses to other biotic and abiotic stresses. When coupled with environmental data, such assessments could facilitate identifying optimal timing for various agronomic management practices. Moreover, the integration of genomic resources could expand our understanding of source-sink relationships, and thus aid the development of varieties with improved resource allocation, response to biotic and abiotic stresses, and overall performance.

Given that our system is meant as a foundation for the study of inflorescence architecture through latent phenotypes, it currently has some challenges. First, SpykProps is limited to unbranched inflorescences that can be flattened out without compromising their 3D shape. For example, the system would work on perennial ryegrass, which it was developed on, and other species with similar architectures such as two-row barley, but would not work on 6-row barley or wheat that do not have a flat inflorescence architecture. However, researchers can overcome these challenges reconstructing their 3D-shaped samples by imaging and stitching multiple sides (Topp et al. 2013), or using proper 3D imaging hardware (Tubbs and Chastain 2023). Second, best results require sample preparation to avoid overlapping spikes, which can increase phenotyping time. Nevertheless, SpykProps can identify overlapping spikes as outliers from the spike's outline Fourier transform, or length, which alleviates the problem with large enough sample size. Similarly, the output data facilitates detecting outliers with anomalous colors that might influence spike segmentation; and users can also evaluate different parameters to determine adequate segmentation parameters. Lastly, unlike conventional traits, latent phenotypes are not intuitive or easy to interpret. For example, classifying a spike as "green" or with a maturity percentage, is more straightforward than calculating a score on a principal component -or a different dimensional reduction approach- from over a hundred color variables. However, the latter would account for a larger proportion of phenotypic variation, and to a greater extent, for the interaction between subtle traits that comprise the complex conventional traits.

Conclusion

We developed SpykProps, a freely available Python-based imaging platform to measure conventional and latent phenotypes in unilateral grass inflorescences. Using perennial ryegrass spikes as a model, we showed that our high throughput phenotyping system is able to quantify spike architecture and accurately associate such morphology with yield-related traits. SpykProps has potential applications in agronomy, plant breeding, and developmental biology as demonstrated in the case example with perennial ryegrass.

Methods

Plant material

The spikes to develop SpykProps were obtained from perennial ryegrass plants of the variety Galactic Green that were harvested from experiments in field and greenhouse conditions (Barreto Ortiz, 2022). The experiments sought to evaluate the effect of ethylene and gibberellin inhibitors at different rates on shattering and seed yield in perennial ryegrass. The greenhouse experiment took place in 2021 at the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station Plant Growth Facility in St. Paul, Minnesota, United States. The field experiment was located in Roseau, Minnesota, and comprised two locations separated by 6.5 km that were planted in 2020 as a double crop with spring wheat, and harvested in 2021. Upon maturity, spikes were harvested at 0.5 mm below the last spikelet, bagged in paper bags, and stored for further processing. Variation across environments and inhibitor rates provided a wide range of size and color within and among spikes.

Data collection

A total of 166 images were obtained by carefully placing the dry spikes on a CanoScan Lide 300 flatbed scanner at 600 dpi and 107 MB in disk. All images were 7016 pixels in height by 5104 pixels width and contained between 5–23 spikes. We used a black velvet as a background for the images which reduced light reflectance. The data collected from the pipeline was obtained using a MacBook Pro 2021 with an Apple M1 Pro chip, a 16 GB memory, and running macOS Monterrey.

Imaging pipeline

This pipeline was developed using Python to segment spike and spikelets before extracting features describing variation in morphology. The system includes functions to visualize, compare, and extract data for a single spike, but it is meant to be used on a set of images containing multiple spikes. Ideally, such images contain inflorescences of the same plots, replication, or plant. The most complete datasets are obtained by running the *SpykBatch.py* function, which only requires the path to the images in a Python list. Once finished, the function returns different datasets containing spikes and spikelets color and shape descriptors. Color data was generated in Python using the spike's binary mask and its RGB version to characterize the pixel distribution across color-spaces and channels. In addition, we developed R functions to generate coefficients of variation (CV) and quartile-based coefficients of variation (QCV) for the color data. The shape data comprises elliptical Fourier descriptors (EFD), as well as geometric properties extracted from the spike's binary mask using the *regionprops* function (Van der Walt et al., n.d.), both available for Python.

Validation and models

We developed multiple machine learning models on SpyProps data from a first-year of production nursery evaluated for seed shattering and other seed yield traits. The nursery was located in the Turfgrass Research, Outreach and Education Center (TROE) at the University of Minnesota, and comprised 20 different maternal clones and their half-sib families (Figure S3), replicated across three blocks. The traits were collected from approximately 10 spikes per plot that were harvested and imaged as described above. In summary, each sample was first given average percentage scores per spike for visual shattering estimate (VSE) at harvest and for total seed retention (RET) after induced detachment with a wrist action

shaker. Next, we weighed the seed detached before and after shaking (DBS and DAS, respectively), hand-threshed the spikes to weigh the seed retained before and after shaking (RBS and RAS, respectively), and derived the rachis weight (RW) and theoretical yield potential (TYP) from the measurements (Barreto Ortiz, 2022). In addition, an averaged developmental rate score (DEV) was also given based on a phenological scale for cool-season perennial grasses (Gustavsson, 2011). Lastly, we simulated a normally distributed trait with mean zero and standard deviation one, as a control to compare predictions.

Combinations of shape and color descriptors were derived from the parents and offspring, and used to train the models with data from 70% of the families. Because spike shape and particularly curvature was affected by storing bags, we removed spikes with curvature greater than 5.5 standard deviations above the mean). In some plots, this induced the need for sampling from the imaging data to match the number of processed spikes in the agronomic data. We filtered out near-zero-variance predictors as well as those with a Pearson correlation coefficient greater than 0.85, and scale and center the remaining variables before training. All models were trained using the Caret package (Kuhn, 2008), cross-validated using leave-one-out (LOOCV) method, and their performance was evaluated based on their root mean squared error (RMSE) and the Pearson correlation coefficient (R) between the predicted and observed values for both the training and testing datasets. The models included: partial least squares (*pls*), ridge (*ridge*), least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (*lasso*), and principal component regression (*pcr*), elastic net (*enet*), gradient boosting machine (*gbm*), support vector machine radial (*svmRadial*) and lineal (*svmLinear*), and random forest (*rf*). The tuning parameters were set based on Caret's default values, which included: up to 30 eigenvectors for *pls* and *pcr*, $C = 1$ for *svmLinear* and *svmRadial*, with the latter including $\sigma = 0.1$; $\lambda = 0.1$ for *ridge* and *enet*, similar to *lasso*, *enet* included $\text{fraction} = 0.1$; finally, *gbm* was evaluated with different values for tree number (50, 100, and 150), interaction depth (1, 5, 9), but fixed shrinkage (0.1) and $n.\text{minobsinnode}$ (10). The model with the highest R^2 was kept when multiple parameters were tested.

Abbreviations

CV: Coefficient of variation

DAS: Detached after shaking

DBS: Detached before shaking

DEV: Developmental stage

DPI: Dots per inch

ED: Euclidean distance

EFD: Elliptical Fourier descriptor

ENET: Elastic net

GB: Gigabytes

GBM: Gradient boosting machine

HSV: Hue, saturation, value

HTP: High throughput phenotyping

LASSO: Least absolute shrinkage and selection operator

MB: Megabytes

PCA: Principal component analysis

PCR: Principal component regression

PLS: Partial least squares

QCV: Quantile-based coefficient of variation

RAS: Retained after shaking

RBS: Retained before shaking

RET: Seed retention

RF: Random forest

RGB: Red, gree, blue

ROI: Region of interest

RMSE: Root mean square error

RW: Rachis weight

SVM: Support vector machine

TYP: Theoretical yield potential

VSE: Visual shattering estimate

2D: Two dimensional image

3D: Three dimensional image

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

SpykProps, along with all its Python components is freely available at <https://github.com/joanmanbar/SpykProps>. All the original and processed images, along with the data files and code to analyze them, can be accessed through the Data Repository for University of Minnesota (DRUM).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This work was supported by the Minnesota Turf Seed Council and the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station (project number 21-096).

Authors' contributions

JBO developed the imaging pipeline, collected and analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscript. NJE, EW conceptualized the study, acquired funding, supervised the work, and reviewed the manuscript text. CNH supervised the work and reviewed the manuscript text.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Andrew Hollman, Dave Grafstrom, and Donn Vellekson for facilitating the conditions to grow fields and controlled plots. We extend our gratitude to the members of the Turfgrass Science Lab at the University of Minnesota, for their help in phenotyping. Finally, we want to thank Dr. Claire Segijn and Dr. Garrett Heineck for their intellectual support on the overall project.

References

1. Abel, S., Gislum, R., & Boelt, B. (2017). Path and correlation analysis of perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*L.) seed yield components. *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science*, 203(4), 338–344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jac.12202>
2. Acar, Z., Ayan, I., Tongel, O., Mut, H., Basaran, U., & Others. (2010). Morphological traits of perennial ryegrass accessions in Black Sea Region of Turkey. *The Contributions of Grasslands to Conservation of Mediterranean Biodiversity*, 117–120. <http://om.ciheam.org/om/pdf/a92/00801227.pdf>
3. A L-Tam, F., Adam, H., Anjos, A. dos, Lorieux, M., Larmande, P., Ghesquière, A., Jouannic, S., & Shahbazkia, H. R. (2013). P-TRAP: a Panicle TRAIT Phenotyping tool. *BMC Plant Biology*, 13, 122. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2229-13-122>
4. Barreto Ortiz, J. (2022). *Uncovering hidden phenotypes to accelerate domestication in perennial Ryegrass for seed production*. <https://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/252487>
5. Bello, C., & Barreto, E. (2021). The footprint of evolution in seed dispersal interactions [Review of *The footprint of evolution in seed dispersal interactions*]. *Science*, 372(6543), 682–683. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abi8160>
6. Berro, I., Varela, J., & Gutiérrez, L. (2023). An image-based methodology to evaluate oat panicle architecture. *Crop Science*, 63(2), 648–661. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csc2.20884>
7. Bradski, G. (2000). The openCV library. *Dr. Dobb's Journal: Software Tools for the Professional*. <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=4934581>
8. Chitwood, D. H., & Otoni, W. C. (2017). Erratum to: Morphometric analysis of Passiflora leaves: the relationship between landmarks of the vasculature and elliptical Fourier descriptors of the blade. *GigaScience*, 6(10), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/gix070>
9. Chitwood, D. H., & Topp, C. N. (2015). Revealing plant cryptotypes: defining meaningful phenotypes among infinite traits. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 24, 54–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2015.01.009>
10. Crowell, S., Falcão, A. X., Shah, A., Wilson, Z., Greenberg, A. J., & McCouch, S. R. (2014). High-Resolution Inflorescence Phenotyping Using a Novel Image-Analysis Pipeline, PANorama. In *Plant Physiology* (Vol. 165, Issue 2, pp. 479–495). <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.114.238626>
11. Crowell, S., Korniliev, P., Falcão, A., Ismail, A., Gregorio, G., Mezey, J., & McCouch, S. (2016). Genome-wide association and high-resolution phenotyping link *Oryza sativa* panicle traits to numerous trait-specific QTL clusters. *Nature Communications*, 7, 10527. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms10527>
12. Farris, M. A., & Lechowicz, M. J. (1990). Functional interactions among traits that determine reproductive success in a native annual plant. *Ecology*, 71(2), 548–557. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1940308>
13. Feldmann, M. J., Gage, J. L., Turner-Hissong, S. D., & Ubbens, J. R. (2021). Images carried before the fire: The power, promise, and responsibility of latent phenotyping in plants. *The Plant Phenome Journal*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppj2.20023>
14. Ferreira, T., & Rasband, W. (2012). *ImageJ User Guide: IJ 1.42 r*. National Institute of Health.

15. Gage, J. L., Miller, N. D., Spalding, E. P., Kaeppler, S. M., & de Leon, N. (2017). TIPS: a system for automated image-based phenotyping of maize tassels. *Plant Methods*, 13, 21.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13007-017-0172-8>
16. Gustavsson, A.-M. (2011). A developmental scale for perennial forage grasses based on the decimal code framework. *Grass and Forage Science*, 66(1), 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2494.2010.00767.x>
17. Hamsa Poorna Prakash, S. R., Saxena, R. R., & S. B. Verulkar and Ravi R. Saxena. (2022). Analyzing rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) panicle structure of 122 RILs using P-TRAP software for spikelet related traits. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, 13(4), 1226–1233. <https://doi.org/10.37992/2022.1304.167>
18. Hasan, M. M., Chopin, J. P., Laga, H., & Miklavcic, S. J. (2019). Correction to: Detection and analysis of wheat spikes using Convolutional Neural Networks. *Plant Methods*, 15, 27.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13007-019-0405-0>
19. Kellogg, E. A., Camara, P. E. A. S., Rudall, P. J., Ladd, P., Malcomber, S. T., Whipple, C. J., & Doust, A. N. (2013). Early inflorescence development in the grasses (Poaceae). *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 4, 250.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2013.00250>
20. Kimball, S., Gremer, J. R., Huxman, T. E., Lawrence Venable, D., Angert, A. L., Associate Editor: Oswald J. Schmitz, & Editor: Mark A. McPeck. (2013). Phenotypic Selection Favors Missing Trait Combinations in Coexisting Annual Plants. *The American Naturalist*, 182(2), 191–207.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/671058>
21. Kuhl, F. P., & Giardina, C. R. (1982). Elliptic Fourier features of a closed contour. *Computer Graphics and Image Processing*, 18(3), 236–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0146-664X\(82\)90034-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0146-664X(82)90034-X)
22. Kuhn, M. (2008). Building Predictive Models in R Using the caret Package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 28, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v028.i05>
23. Li, L., Zhang, Q., & Huang, D. (2014). A review of imaging techniques for plant phenotyping. *Sensors*, 14(11), 20078–20111. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s141120078>
24. Misra, T., Arora, A., Marwaha, S., Chinnusamy, V., Rao, A. R., Jain, R., Sahoo, R. N., Ray, M., Kumar, S., Raju, D., Jha, R. R., Nigam, A., & Goel, S. (2020). SpikeSegNet-a deep learning approach utilizing encoder-decoder network with hourglass for spike segmentation and counting in wheat plant from visual imaging. In *Plant Methods* (Vol. 16, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13007-020-00582-9>
25. Norris, R. F. (1992). Relationship Between Inflorescence Size and Seed Production in Barnyardgrass (*Echinochloa crus-galli*). *Weed Science*, 40(1), 74–78. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043174500056988>
26. Otsu, N. (1979). A threshold selection method from gray-level histograms. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 9(1), 62–66. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tsmc.1979.4310076>
27. Perreta, M. G., Ramos, J. C., & Vegetti, A. C. (2009). Development and structure of the grass inflorescence. *The Botanical Review; Interpreting Botanical Progress*, 75(4), 377–396.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12229-009-9038-8>
28. Prusinkiewicz, P., Erasmus, Y., Lane, B., Harder, L. D., & Coen, E. (2007). Evolution and development of inflorescence architectures. *Science*, 316(5830), 1452–1456.

<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1140429>

29. Rebolledo, M. C., Peña, A. L., Duitama, J., Cruz, D. F., Dingkuhn, M., Grenier, C., & Tohme, J. (2016). Combining Image Analysis, Genome Wide Association Studies and Different Field Trials to Reveal Stable Genetic Regions Related to Panicle Architecture and the Number of Spikelets per Panicle in Rice. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 7, 1384. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01384>
30. Robledo-Arnuncio, J. J., Klein, E. K., Muller-Landau, H. C., & Santamaría, L. (2014). Space, time and complexity in plant dispersal ecology. *Movement Ecology*, 2(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40462-014-0016-3>
31. Schulthess, A. W., Reif, J. C., Ling, J., Plieske, J., Kollers, S., Ebmeyer, E., Korzun, V., Argillier, O., Stiewe, G., Ganai, M. W., Röder, M. S., & Jiang, Y. (2017). The roles of pleiotropy and close linkage as revealed by association mapping of yield and correlated traits of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 68(15), 4089–4101. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erx214>
32. Sun, P., Zhang, W., Wang, Y., He, Q., Shu, F., Liu, H., Wang, J., Wang, J., Yuan, L., & Deng, H. (2016). OsGRF4 controls grain shape, panicle length and seed shattering in rice. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology*, 58(10), 836–847. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jipb.12473>
33. Thomson, F. J., Moles, A. T., Auld, T. D., Ramp, D., Ren, S., & Kingsford, R. T. (2010). Chasing the unknown: predicting seed dispersal mechanisms from plant traits. *The Journal of Ecology*, 98(6), 1310–1318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2010.01724.x>
34. Thorwarth, P., Liu, G., Ebmeyer, E., Schacht, J., Schachschneider, R., Kazman, E., Reif, J. C., Würschum, T., & Longin, C. F. H. (2019). Dissecting the genetics underlying the relationship between protein content and grain yield in a large hybrid wheat population. *TAG. Theoretical and Applied Genetics. Theoretische Und Angewandte Genetik*, 132(2), 489–500. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-018-3236-x>
35. Van der Walt, S., Schönberger, J., Nunez-Iglesias, J., Boulogne, F., Warner, J. D., Yager, N., Gouillart, E., Yu, T., & Others. (n.d.). *scikit-image: image processing in Python*. *PeerJ* 2, e453 (2014).
36. Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., Haberland, M., Reddy, T., Cournapeau, D., Burovski, E., Peterson, P., Weckesser, W., Bright, J., van der Walt, S. J., Brett, M., Wilson, J., Millman, K. J., Mayorov, N., Nelson, A. R. J., Jones, E., Kern, R., Larson, E., ... SciPy 1.0 Contributors. (2020). SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nature Methods*, 17(3), 261–272. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2>
37. W D Grieve, S. (2017). spatial-efd: A spatial-aware implementation of elliptical Fourier analysis. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 2(11), 189. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00189>
38. Wu, W., Liu, X., Wang, M., Meyer, R. S., Luo, X., Ndjiondjop, M.-N., Tan, L., Zhang, J., Wu, J., Cai, H., Sun, C., Wang, X., Wing, R. A., & Zhu, Z. (2017). A single-nucleotide polymorphism causes smaller grain size and loss of seed shattering during African rice domestication. *Nature Plants*, 3, 17064. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2017.64>
39. Yang, W., Feng, H., Zhang, X., Zhang, J., Doonan, J. H., Batchelor, W. D., Xiong, L., & Yan, J. (2020). Crop Phenomics and High-Throughput Phenotyping: Past Decades, Current Challenges, and Future

40. Zhang, T. Y., & Suen, C. Y. (1984). A fast parallel algorithm for thinning digital patterns. In *Communications of the ACM* (Vol. 27, Issue 3, pp. 236–239). <https://doi.org/10.1145/357994.358023>
41. Zhou, Y., Srinivasan, S., Mirnezami, S. V., Kusmec, A., Fu, Q., Attigala, L., Salas Fernandez, M. G., Ganapathysubramanian, B., & Schnable, P. S. (2019). Semiautomated Feature Extraction from RGB Images for Sorghum Panicle Architecture GWAS. *Plant Physiology*, 179(1), 24–37. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.18.00974>

Figures




Figure 1

Overview of the SpykProps pipeline in the context of agronomic or breeding research.

Spikes from field or control conditions, can be imaged in situ or harvested for further processing in a dry lab. SpykProps segments spikes and quantifies color and shape, using univariate and multivariate

descriptors. This enables rapid, holistic, and less biased characterization of multidimensional spike architecture variations, offering researchers improved phenotyping tools, especially when combined with machine learning techniques.




Figure 2

Spike segmentation methods included in SpykProps. A Segmentation based on input threshold for the red channel. B Otsu segmentation scaled by a factor. RMSE (y-axis) is the root mean squared error. Error bars represent the standard deviation.




Figure 3

Spike length approximation methods included in SpykProps. Figures A-D show in the top: a binary mask with an overlaid red line indicating the approximated length; and the bottom: the scatterplot with a regression line of predicted (x-axis) and observed (y-axis) lengths, with the Pearson correlation coefficient (R ; $p < 0.001$). The spike length in A and B are approximated as twice the major axis (longest red line) of a fitted ellipse on the spike (A) or its convex hull (B). The spike length in C and D are determined by Zhang's (C) or medial axis (D) skeletonization algorithms. (E) Average execution time per spike in seconds across methods with standard error calculated from execution time of 810 binary images.




Figure 4

Assessment of the spikelet detection method included in SpykProps. A-B Output images from the spikelet_seg function where each color in A represents an approximated spikelet region, to which a numbered ellipse and its major axis line will be fitted (B). C Root mean squared error (RMSE) across minimum Euclidean distances in pixels expected between the center of a spikelet. D Scatterplots of the

predicted (x-axis) versus observed (y-axis) number of spikelets per spike, with their Pearson correlation coefficient (R ; $p < 0.001$).




Figure 5

Spike shape reconstruction using Fourier series with different numbers of harmonics (n). A $n = 1$, B $n = 10$, C $n = 30$, D $n = 81$ (optimal), and E $n = 100$. The shape of the spike is outlined in black, and the outline

approximation is fitted in red.




Figure 6

Effect of additional color descriptors on separability of spikes with similar color profile. A Example of three spikes with similar color profiles selected from a random image (Figure S1). B-E Standardized (0 - 1) principal components with their percentage of variance explained, derived from various number of color descriptors for 8892 spikes encompassing 694 images. Circles and numbers correspond to a subset of all spikes in Figure S2; colored circles refer to spikes in A. Descriptors are mean RGB values (B); different descriptors of the pixel frequency distribution for R, G, and B (C); same descriptors as in B, for all channels in RGB, HSV, and Lab color spaces (D); same descriptors as in C in addition to the coefficient of variation (CV) and quantile-based CV for each channel (E).




Figure 7

Correlation between predicted and observed agronomic values on three agronomic traits. Scatterplots with a regression line of predicted (x-axis) and observed (y-axis) trait value, with their Pearson correlation coefficient (R ; $p < 0.001$). Gradient boosting machine (gbm) models were trained using a different set of descriptors from SpykProps.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Supplemental.pdf](#)