

Development of an R Toolbox for Near-Infrared Spectroscopy Data Processing and Analysis of Plant Metabolic Phenotypes

DEGGENDORF INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

MSC. LIFE SCIENCE INFORMATICS

Methun George

Supervised by
PD Dr. habil. rer. nat. Steffen Neumann
Prof. Dr. Melanie Kappelmann-Fenzl

January 4, 2025

Acknowledgements

This Master Thesis has been an incredibly enjoyable experience. In pursuit of my passion for bioinformatics and molecular biology, this master's thesis project has been a profoundly enriching journey. It offered me an incredible platform to implement the knowledge I gained in various programming languages and bioinformatics tools during my master's studies along with the knowledge on botany I gained from my bachelor degree. This thesis not only deepened my technical expertise but also provided an invaluable opportunity to explore the practical applications of these skills in real-world research.

I am deeply indebted to my supervisor, Dr. Steffen Neumann, at the Leibniz Institute of Plant Biochemistry (IPB Halle), for his unwavering support, insightful guidance, and expert advice. Dr. Neumann's mentorship played a pivotal role in navigating the complexities of this project and sharpening my understanding of computational approaches in plant biology. Thank you for making this possible and the always open door.

I extend my heartfelt gratitude to my professor, Dr. Melanie Kappelmann-Fenzl, at the Technische Hochschule Deggendorf (THD), for her academic guidance and constant encouragement throughout my master's degree. Her feedback and insights were instrumental in shaping the direction and quality of my research.

I am profoundly thankful to the Computational Plant Biochemistry (CPB) and MetaCom team at IPB Halle especially, Dr. Henriette Uthe, Dr. Rene Meier, Dr. Michael Wenk, Oliver Duchrow, Dr. Khabat Vahabi, Norman Storz, whose expertise and assistance greatly enriched my learning experience. Their collaborative spirit and support made this research endeavor not only productive but also highly inspiring.

My deepest gratitude goes to my family, whose unending love, unwavering support, and endless encouragement have been my foundation throughout this journey. Their belief in me has been the source of my strength and motivation.

Lastly, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all the faculty members of the Life Science Informatics program at the Technische Hochschule Deggendorf and all the members in Leibniz-Institute for Plant Biochemistry. Their guidance, and encouragement at various stages of my degree have been invaluable.

This thesis is a culmination of the collective support and encouragement I have received from all these individuals and institutions, and I remain ever grateful for their contributions to my academic and professional growth.

0.1 Abstract

The abstract of this is.....

Contents

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Form
NIRS	Near Infrared Spectroscopy
LC-MS	Liquid Chromatography Mass Spectroscopy
CNN	Convolutional Neural Network
DL	Deep Learning
PLSR	Partial Least Squares Regression
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
ML	Machine Learning
NIRS	Near-Infrared Spectroscopy
SLA	Specific Leaf Area
RF	Random Forest
SLA	Specific Leaf Area
LDMC	Leaf Dry Matter Content
R ²	Coefficient of Determination
ADAM	Adaptive Moment Estimation
SGD	Stochastic-Gradient Descent
AdaGrad	Adaptive Gradient Algorithm
RMSProp	Root Mean Square Propagation

Chapter 1

Introduction

The understanding of interplay between plant physiology and its hidden biochemical process is crucial for the improvement of basic plant science and addressing global challenges such as food security, crop resilience and combating climate change [1]. In recent years, advanced High-throughput analytical techniques such as Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS) and Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS) has instigated a paradigm shift in plant biology [2][3]. These High-throughput techniques are mostly used in areas like genomics, imaging and spectroscopy and is known for their ability to collect and analyse the data faster than traditional techniques[3]. High-throughput techniques are widely used since they enable the efficient collection of vast amount of data at various scales, from molecular to field level over significant time periods[4]. The big data generated by these high throughput procedures present both opportunities and challenges at the same time. It requires efficient processing to extract maximum useful results and this is where Machine Learning (ML) or Deep Learning (DL) becomes indispensable [4][5]. ML as a part of Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to the ability of computers to find patterns and learn from the existing data which can be employed in processing high dimensional data [6][4]. The ML algorithms are powerful enough to analyse complex, high dimensional datasets, enabling accurate predictions of plant traits or other features based on the input data. Additionally, integrating these big data with ML could help the researchers to optimize data processing pipelines, enhance predictive accuracy and thereby enter into a new era of data-driven decision-making [4][5]. This project employs linear models, non-linear models and neural networks to predict various plant features and compare their performances.

A significant shift in the realm of the biomedical community has brought new guidelines to ensure readability, modularity, transparency and extensibility of computational toolboxes. A toolbox, which stores multiple functions, parameters and results in a central location should be maintainable and uncomplicated for the developers and members of the open-source community [7]. R is a powerful and widely used programming language in the analysis and processing of high throughput data. Additionally, R contains a multitude of statistical and high quality visualization packages such as ggplot2 which are capable of processing and integrating big data to different ML methods [8]. Bioconductor is an open source R software for bioinformatics, which contains more than 3000 packages for statistical computing. This offers an object oriented framework for the high dimensional data, cutting edge visualization capabilities and interoperability [9]. Existing tools in Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS) data processing lack functionalities that could simplify and standardize data workflows when integrated with the SummarizedExperiment framework from the Bioconductor package. To address these gaps, the R toolbox, “nearspectRa” was developed for processing NIRS data. This package has a modular structure which creates a SummarizedExperiment object from NIRS data.

Metabolomics, the study of small molecular compounds in biological systems, is a rapidly advancing field of science with applications in biotechnology, medicine, synthetic biology and environmental science [6]. Metabolomics has emerged as a transformative tool in plant biology, enabling cost-efficient and high throughput molecular characterization. The integration of metabolomics with different omics approaches has proven invaluable for functional genes identification and developing trait specific markers [10]. Metabolomics, which is built on the advancement of phenomics and genomics, provides high throughput and precise profiling of metabolites, revealing the physiological state of cells [6][10]. Metabolites play a crucial role in plant metabolism, influencing its biomass and architecture therefore study of these small molecules will aid in uncovering plant regulatory mechanisms and pathway interactions [10]. The coupling of liquid or gas chromatography with mass spectrometry or nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (NMR) facilitates measurement of thousands of metabolites, thereby providing a comprehensive view of biochemical and biological mechanisms [11]. Therefore, Mass spectrometry (MS) remains the most widely used analytical approach among others due to its versatility and sensitivity [6]. Mass spectrometry based metabolomics generate data of high sensitivity and throughput requiring advanced computational methods. Machine learning not only offers a powerful solution to analyse such data, but also helps in resolving the challenges like noise, batch effects and missing values [12]. Integrating ML with Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectroscopy (LC-MS) data helps us to analyse this complex heterogeneous data rapidly, enabling deeper insights.

Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS) is an advanced high throughput and non-destructive analytical technique that uses light in the near-infrared region (700-2500 nm) to assess the chemical composition of samples [13]. The light is either absorbed or reflected by the sample at different wavelengths and thereby creating a spectrum [13]. The NIRS is widely used in plant research due to its ability in predicting sample structure and traits by analysing the spectral patterns. NIRS can also be used in the quantitative analysis of key plant features such as protein and carbohydrate content, secondary metabolites and physiological traits such as Specific Leaf Area (SLA) by developing calibration models between spectra and reflectance trait data [14][13]. The NIRS is not only used in plant biology but also in various fields such as food science, agriculture and pharmaceuticals. When compared to other analytical techniques, NIRS is rapid, requires minimal sample preparation and less expensive, which makes it more attractive and interesting to the scientific communities [13]. However, on the flip side it requires complex statistical methods to extract different complex features due to the highly-correlated nature of NIRS data [13]. To tackle this problem, the conventional methods such as Partial Least Square Regression (PLSR) and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) imply dimension reduction which result in loss of information and often struggles to extract important features from the spectral data [13]. To address the challenge of data complexity and generalizability, different ML methods can be used to predict the traits from the NIRS data [13][15]. In this project different ML and Deep Learning (DL) has been employed to predict different plant leaf traits with use of NIRS data.

In recent years, studies using NIRS data coupled with PLSR have been used as an alternative for traditional methods such as high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) and mass spectrometry which are both labor-intensive and expensive to predict different plant traits. A notable example is the prediction of glucobrassicin (GBS) concentrations from NIRS data. This has shown that GBS concentrations could be reliably predicted from NIRS data [16]. Another prominent example is the tree and mycorrhizal fungal diversity experiment and trait variation in temperate forests conducted by Pablo Castro Sanchez-Bermejo, where he combined Deep Learning (DL) approaches with leaf-level spectral data to predict 5 different leaf traits [15].

Another good example would be a project involving the development of white-box workflow for regression tasks [17]. The project marks the potential of Regression (Sensitive) Neural Gas (RSNG) for generating interpretable results while maintaining high accuracy [17]. From the above studies, it is evident that NIRS data has a wide range of applications in plant research. This can also be expanded further to predict complex metabolites which are usually assessed via techniques like LC-MS. Moreover, integrating NIRS with advanced ML could further enhance the prediction accuracy and unlock new possibilities in plant science.

The past decade has witnessed the increasing popularity of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in different fields. However, this idea of AI has been under development since 1956, starting from the concept of “programming computers to think and reason” [18]. In other words, AI can be described as “automating intellectual tasks normally done by humans” [18]. Machine learning (ML) and Deep learning (DL) are the methods that fall under the realm of AI [18][19]. Nowadays, there are different ML algorithms in use, in which the most popular ones include Partial Least Square Regression (PLSR), Random Forest (RF) and Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) [20][18]. PLSR is a linear and most simple ML approach. It uses a straight line to solve the regression problem in the high dimensional data [18]. On the other hand, Random forest is a non-linear approach in ML that is primarily used for classification. It can also be used for regression tasks and can be represented as a decision tree with a series of nodes starting from a root node. The terminal node will predict the class of data [18]. The Convolutional neural networks are a specialized type of neural network which are mainly used in the field of image processing [21]. A recent study of mycorrhizal fungal diversity experiment and trait variation in temperate forests conducted by Pablo Castro Sanchez-Bermejo, demonstrated the application of CNN in predicting the leaf trait values from NIRS data, achieving superior results [15]. This outcome strongly suggests the potential of CNN not only for classification tasks such as image processing but also for regression tasks. In another project, CNN was used to predict gene expression status on the basis of sequence of gene transcription start regions. The CNN model had achieved roughly 80% accuracy [22]. These studies highlight the growing versatility of CNN models.

Omics is a term associated with the field of large scale biological data, including genomics, epigenomics, proteomics, transcriptomics and metabolomics [23]. Combination of data from these techniques along with advanced microscopy techniques helps in the study of biomolecules in cellular and subcellular levels [23]. However, the high throughput data from these omics instruments poses challenges in processing and analysing it without the loss of information [23][10]. The complexity and scale of this data make ML essential for effective integration and analysis, raising the critical question: which ML model is best suited to handle this data? How much programming expertise is necessary to implement these models? And, which models are most suitable for regression tasks?. Each ML model handles the data differently. For instance, PLSR uses latent variables to capture the covariance between predictor and response variables. Moreover, PLSR uses the combination of Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and linear regression [20]. In the case of RF, it follows the concept of “a forest made of many trees” which uses the combination of predictions from many trees [18]. Among these ML techniques, CNN is gaining attention on its ability in handling high throughput data and predicting with remarkable accuracy [15][22]. These ML models also require different levels of programming proficiency and computational resources, depending on the scale of data.

In the light of the findings, it is clear that ML can significantly improve the analysis and processing of high throughput data from analytical techniques such as LC-MS and NIRS [15][22][17]. Among these, NIRS stands out as a non-destructive, cost-effective and rapid method,

offering valuable insights into the chemical composition of the biological samples [12] [13] [14]. These qualities make NIRS a promising technique to optimize and integrate with ML and DL models for predictive accuracy.

Given the popularity of R programming within the ecological and bioinformatic community, it was chosen as the foundation for this project [7] [9]. Recognizing the need for specialized tools to process the NIRS data, an R package, `nearspectRa`, was developed to handle data from two widely used NIRS instruments namely “ASD Fieldspec 4” and Spectra Vista Corporation (SVC) HR-1024i. Leveraging supporting packages like “R-FieldSpectra”, the high dimensional data was structured into a “SummarizedExperiment” object, aligning with Bioconductor standards for interoperability and integration.

Apart from developing a Good Scientific Practice (GSP) compliant package, this project involved two key analyses: first, predicting plant leaf traits from NIRS data using three popular ML methods, PLSR, RF and CNN and second predicting LC-MS features from NIRS data using the same models. To evaluate these approaches, performance was compared using metrics such as the coefficient of determination (R^2), Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) and training time of each model. Additionally, extrapolation studies were conducted on PLSR and RF to assess the robustness and performance of those beyond training data. This project not only exemplifies good scientific practice in developing an R toolbox but also provides a comprehensive comparison of linear, non-linear and neural network based NL approaches in predicting plant traits and LC-MS features from NIRS data. By achieving this, the project makes a significant milestone, paving the way for a new era of cost-effective, rapid biochemical analysis in metabolomics.

Chapter 2

Background

The background of this study include

2.1 Related Work

2.2 Near Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS)

2.3 Liquid Chromatography Mass Spectrometry

2.4 R Programming

2.5 Machine Learning

Machine learning (ML) as the name indicates is the field of computer science which applies mathematical models and algorithms to enable the system to learn and make predictions without being programmed explicitly [18][19]. In contrast to classical programming where someone explicitly programmes an algorithm to execute predefined tasks, ML uses a subset of (training) data to learn patterns and relationships within the data to create an algorithm which can generalize to unseen data[18]. This versatility and flexibility enables ML methods to improve performance over time, leading to advanced data driven decision making [23][18]. As a subgroup of Artificial intelligence (AI) is often simply represented as a 3 layer model which includes an inputlayer that receives the data, a hidden second layer which processes the data according to the mathematical backend of the model and finally the third output layer that outputs the prediction [21]. The hidden layer which does the linear regression or classification differs according to the ML model in use and these are often compared to a single human neuron, where dendrite represents input layer, cell body corresponds to hidden layer, and axon functions as output layer [21]. ML employs four primary learning methods namely, supervised, unsupervised, semi-supervised and reinforcement learning [18].

Supervised Learning

Supervised learning is a ML approach that aims to predict a known output based on the input data. It excels in tasks where the patterns in data can augment human decision making [18]. For instance, handwriting recognition or object classification (example, distinguishing an elephant and tiger). These tasks are easily done by humans and supervised learning strives to replicate or enhance this performance [18]. Another example would be in medicine where supervised ML identifies patterns in the electrocardiogram (ECG) which is an easy job for a trained

cardiologist. These classification tasks from supervised learning are achieved through training an algorithm on labeled datasets containing ECG features (heart rate, rhythm and waveform shape) and their corresponding diagnosis. By mapping these features (X) to diagnostic outcomes (Y), the algorithm learns the function $f(X)$ to accurately predict for new unseen ECG data [18][24]. Another common application of supervised learning is in regression and classification tasks [18]. Regression focuses on predicting continuous numerical values such as LC-MS values from NIRS data and test scores. In contrast, classification predicts which category does the given instance belong such as elephant or tiger as seen in the previous example [23][24].

Unsupervised Learning

Unsupervised learning is considered to be more challenging compared to supervised learning since the former focuses on discovering patterns or groupings within data without predefined targets [18]. Common unsupervised learning tasks include clustering, association and anomaly detection, where the algorithm independently identifies underlying structures in the data [23][18]. For instance, clustering data points into separate groups based on the shared features (Figure 2.1). This approach has already proven successful in genomics, where identifying an eosinophilic subtype of asthma led to a novel therapy targeting interleukin-13, a cytokine secreted by eosinophils. Unlike supervised learning, there were no predicted outcomes, in fact there was a greater interest in identifying the patterns within the data [24].




Figure 2.1: Different machine learning models illustrating the four primary learning methods: supervised, unsupervised, semi-supervised, and reinforcement learning.

Semi-supervised and Reinforcement Learning

Semi-supervised learning bridges the gap between supervised and unsupervised learning by utilizing datasets that have both labelled and unlabelled data. For instance, the labelling of medical images is time-consuming and expensive. A physician might label a few medical images and this is then used to train a preliminary model which then aids in classification of the unlabelled images. This newly created labelled dataset will then be used to train a more robust final model[24]. On the other hand, reinforcement learning mimics the human learning process, where it relies on trial and error then solely on data [24].

In the era of modern molecular plant breeding, integration of ML with the large, noisy and heterogeneous data is important to uncover complex patterns and enable accurate predictions of plant features [23]. The “big data” resulting from high throughput techniques in plant sci-

ences can be leveraged to drive discoveries, enhanced precision and accelerate advancement in plant research [23]. A plant genetic makeup (genotype) has a significant influence in its growth, development and biochemical composition. This results in the expression of plant traits such as yield, stress tolerance and pest resistance. Understanding how genotype and environment influences on phenotypes is crucial for insights into regulatory mechanisms, and development of plants [23]. This knowledge enables the prediction of yield and other plant traits based on the genotypes under different environmental conditions, which in turn paves the way for modern molecular plant breeding [23]. Different ML approaches such as Partial Least Square Regression (PLSR), Random Forest (RF) and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) can be employed to make predictions by leveraging patterns in the data.

2.5.1 Partial Least Square Regression (PLSR)

In machine learning, Partial Least Square Regression (PLSR) is a statistical method which combines the benefits of Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and linear regression to predict the outcomes [26]. It is a linear regression model which is arguably the simplest machine learning algorithm that uses a straight line to solve a regression problem [18]. PLSR uses the advantage of PCA for dimensionality reduction and the regression for prediction [27]. This fitting of linear regression between two data matrices has a wide range of application in plant biology, especially in crop breeding, ecosystem monitoring and predicting plant traits from its spectral data [25]. In PLSR, the predictor variable (often denoted as X) refers to a set of independent variables or features that are used to predict response variable (y). The predictor variables are typically high dimensional and often include multiple correlated features. The response variable (y) represents the outcome or dependent variable. PLSR works by identifying the latent variables, which summarizes the covariance between predictor and response variables. This latent variable captures the most relevant information from the predictors (X) in relation to response (y) variables, allowing the model to predict y more effectively [25][27][28].




Figure 2.2: A comparison of PCA (A) and PLS (B). In the PCA plot, the x-axis represents a combination of variables (e.g., three metabolites) that captures the greatest variation in the dataset, independent of group classification. In contrast, PLS focuses on explaining the relationship with an explanatory variable, such as "Treatment" in this example

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) uses the principal components as explanatory vari-

ables to capture 90% of variance in predictor variables (X), ensuring dimensionality reduction while retaining most of the data's variability. Partial Least Squares (PLS) prioritize relevance to both X (predictor) and y (response) variables, rather than maximising the variance in X alone (Figure 2.2) [27]. By combining the PCA with linear regression, PLSR constructs the latent variable that summarizes predictor variables and maximises their relevance to the response variables. This makes PLSR particularly suitable for high dimensional datasets such as spectral data from NIRS instruments.

2.5.2 Random Forest (RF)

Random Forest (RF) is a non-linear ensemble technique used in machine learning which is also depicted as a forest of decision trees [18][29]. Random forest is commonly used for classification tasks, though it can also be applied to regression such as predicting the leaf trait values from the NIRS data [18]. It is a supervised learning method consisting of decision trees and the root node serves as the initial point for dividing the dataset. Recursive partition in which the data is separated into two binary part begins with the root node [18]. RF combines multiple trees to improve accuracy, robustness and reduce overfitting [18][29]. In the classic tree based model, the dataset is divided into two groups based on the certain criteria until it encounters a predetermined stopping condition. The endpoints of a decision tree, known as leaf nodes, represents the final data division. A random forest model consisting of an ensemble of decision trees, can be utilized for both regression and classification tasks, depending on the partitioning strategy and stopping criteria [30]. RF has proven its importance in many scientific domains and one of which was in environmental science, in a study employed learning algorithms such as Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) Regression, RF and neural network to predict ragweed pollen concentrations, with RF delivering the most accurate predictions [30][31]. A graphical representation of the RF model with decision trees can be found in Figure 2.3 .




Figure 2.3: Schematic representation of a Random Forest model.

Random Forest often outperforms linear regression models since, linear regression assumes a linear relationship between the variables. Even though this makes linear regression easier to interpret, it limits their flexibility in capturing complex patterns in the dataset. On the flip side, RF can easily adapt to non linear relationships, making them better flexible and suited

for such tasks [30]. The RF algorithm estimates the error rate by out-of-bag (OOB) during training time. Each tree in the model is built using a subset of data, called a bootstrap sample and about one third of the data is left out during this process. These excluded data points are the OOB. Hence, minimizing the OOB is crucial for better model performance and robustness [30]. In this project, we will be using RF models to do regression tasks on NIRS data and compare the coefficient of determination R^2 , RMSE and training time with that of linear model and neural network, we will also discuss developing the RF model and associated functionalities.

2.5.3 Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)

Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) is a type of deep learning (DL) model inspired by the way neurons in the brain process visual information [32][33]. It is primarily composed of three core components: A convolutional layer that extracts features, a pooling layer to reduce the dimensionality of data and a fully connected layer that produces the final output [32]. Out of these three main layers, the convolutional layer is considered as a fundamental component of a CNN, consisting of a series of mathematical operations, including convolution, which is a distinct form of linear regression [32]. It involves the application of kernels, which is a small array of numbers across the input (tensor) to compute elementwise products. These results are summed to create an output called feature map. Each kernel extracts a different feature of the input data and thereby different feature maps with different characteristics of the input data. The number of kernels determines the depth of the data and is also selected based on the scale of input data. A stride is known as the step size for moving the kernel across the tensor, commonly a stride of 1 is used. To capture the outermost element in the tensor, zero padding technique, which involves adding rows and columns of zero on the sides of input tensor is used to prevent downsizing in the convolutional layer [32]. After the convolutional layer the feature map is then processed through a nonlinear activation function and then to the pooling layer for downsampling [32]. In CNN the widely used pooling method is max pooling, which divides the feature map into small patches and then keeps only the highest values from each patch and ignores the rest. The output from the last pooling layer is flattened to 1 dimensional array and passed to fully connected layers, where each input is connected to every output with a learnable weight. These layers map the extracted features to the final output [32].




Figure 2.4: Comparison of artificial neurons and real neurons

A loss function evaluates how well the predicted values match the actual ones. For classification cross-entropy loss is commonly used whereas mean squared error (MSE) is preferred for regression tasks. Choosing the right loss function is essential and is determined according to the given task [32]. In deep neural network training, the weights of each neuron is estimated to establish an accurate relationship between inputs and outputs with a desired level of precision [34]. It is categorized into supervised learning, for classification and regression tasks, and unsupervised learning, for clustering with input data only. Several methods are employed for training deep neural networks, including Backpropagation, Gradient Descent, Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD), and others. Among these, SGD stands out as one of the simplest and most widely used optimization algorithms in machine learning [34]. Adaptive Moment Estimation (ADAM) is an advanced optimization algorithm which combines the benefits of two SGD variants: Adaptive Gradient Algorithm (AdaGrad) and Root Mean Square Propagation (RMSProp) [34]. It requires minimal memory and dynamically adjusts the learning rate for each parameter, making it more computationally efficient [34]. In this project CNN is employed to predict the output values from NIRS data.

2.6 High Performance Computing

Chapter 3

Implementation

3.1 Packages

Github, testing, actions

3.2 Contributions elsewhere

3.3 HPC runs

Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

4.1 Data charecterestics

histogram, spectra

4.2 Baseline Machine Learning Models Pablo

PLS, RF, CNN

4.2.1 Variable importance

4.3 Variations in Baseline systems

4.3.1 modifying the Test and Training split

4.3.2 input data length

4.4 Sues

Chapter 5

Reference

1. Pieruschka R, Schurr U. Plant Phenotyping: Past, Present, and Future. *Plant Phenomics*. 2019 Mar 26;2019:7507131. doi: 10.34133/2019/7507131. PMID: 33313536; PMCID: PMC7718630.
2. Pulok K. Mukherjee, Quality control and evaluation of herbal drugs, Evaluating natural products and traditional medicine. 2019, doi:10.1016/C2016-0-042328, ISBN:978-0-12-813374-3.
3. Nizamani, M. M., Zhang, Q., Muhae-Ud-Din, G., Wang, Y. (2023). High-throughput sequencing in plant disease management: A comprehensive review of benefits, challenges, and future perspectives. *Phytopathology Research*, 5(44). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42483-023-00215-7>.
4. Lane, H. M., Murray, S. C. (2021). High throughput can produce better decisions than high accuracy when phenotyping plant populations. *Crop Science*, 61(3), 1473–1484. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csc2.20514>.
5. Zhang, N., Zhou, X., Kang, M., Hu, B.-G., Heuvelink, E., Marcelis, L. F. M. (2023). Machine learning versus crop growth models: An ally, not a rival. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 74(4), 1259–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erac517>.
6. Zhu H. Big Data and Artificial Intelligence Modeling for Drug Discovery. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol*. 2020 Jan 6;60:573-589. doi: 10.1146/annurev-pharmtox-010919-023324. Epub 2019 Sep 13. PMID: 31518513; PMCID: PMC7010403.
7. Kelsey Chetnik, Elisa Benedetti, Daniel P Gomari, Annalise Schweickart, Richa Batra, Mustafa Buyukozkan, Zeyu Wang, Matthias Arnold, Jonas Zierer, Karsten Suhre, Jan Krum-siek, maplet: an extensible R toolbox for modular and reproducible metabolomics pipelines, *Bioinformatics*, Volume 38, Issue 4, February 2022, Pages 1168–1170, <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btad001>.
8. Peng, Roger D. R programming for data science. Victoria, BC, Canada: Leanpub, 2016.
9. www.bioconductor.org
10. Kumar, R., Bohra, A., Pandey, A. K., Pandey, M. K., Kumar, A. (2017). Metabolomics for plant improvement: Status and prospects. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 8, 1302. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00130>.
11. González-Domínguez, R., García-Barrera, T., Gómez-Ariza, J. L. (2014). Metabolite profiling for the identification of altered metabolic pathways in Alzheimer’s disease. *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, 107, 75–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpba.2014.10.010>.
12. Liebal, U. W., Phan, A. N., Sudhakar, M., Raman, K., Blank, L. M. (2020). Machine learning applications for mass spectrometry-based metabolomics. *Metabolites*, 10(6), 243. <https://doi.org/10.3390/metabo10060243>.
13. Vaillant, A., Beurier, G., Cornet, D., Rouan, L., Vile, D., Violle, C., Vasseur, F. (2024). NIRSpredict: a platform for predicting plant traits from near infra-red spectroscopy. *BMC Plant Biology*, 24(1), 1100. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12870-024-05776-0>.
14. Marr S, Hageman JA, Wehrens R, van Dam NM, Bruelheide H, Neumann S. LC-MS

based plant metabolic profiles of thirteen grassland species grown in diverse neighbourhoods. *Sci Data*. 2021 Feb 9;8(1):52. doi: 10.1038/s41597-021-00836-8. PMID: 33563993; PMCID: PMC7873126.

15. Sánchez-Bermejo, P. C., Monjau, T., Goldmann, K., Ferlian, O., Eisenhauer, N., Bruehlheide, H., Ma, Z., Haider, S. (2024). Tree and mycorrhizal fungal diversity drive intraspecific and intraindividual trait variation in temperate forests: Evidence from a tree diversity experiment. *Functional Ecology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.14549>.

16. Renner, I.E., Fritz, V.A. Using Near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy (NIRS) to predict glucobrassicin concentrations in cabbage and brussels sprout leaf tissue. *Plant Methods*16, 136 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13007-020-00681-7>.

17. R. Schubert et al., "A White-Box Workflow for the Prediction of Food Content From Near-Infrared Data Based on Fourier-Transformation," 2023 13th Workshop on Hyperspectral Imaging and Signal Processing: Evolution in Remote Sensing (WHISPERS), Athens, Greece, 2023, pp. 1-5, doi: 10.1109/WHISPERS61460.2023.10430694.

18. Choi RY, Coyner AS, Kalpathy-Cramer J, Chiang MF, Campbell JP. Introduction to Machine Learning, Neural Networks, and Deep Learning. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*. 2020 Feb 27;9(2):14. doi: 10.1167/tvst.9.2.14. PMID: 32704420; PMCID: PMC7347027.

19. Pichler, M., Hartig, F. (2022). Machine learning and deep learning—A review for ecologists. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 13(9), 1984–2000. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14061>.

20. Ji, F., Li, F., Hao, D., Shiklomanov, A. N., Yang, X., Townsend, P. A., Dashti, H., Nakaji, T., Kovach, K. R., Liu, H., Luo, M., Chen, M. (2024). Unveiling the transferability of PLSR models for leaf trait estimation: Lessons from a comprehensive analysis with a novel global dataset. *New Phytologist*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.19807>.

21. Georgios Kourounis, Ali Ahmed Elmahmudi, Brian Thomson, James Hunter, Hassan Ugail, Colin Wilson, Computer image analysis with artificial intelligence: a practical introduction to convolutional neural networks for medical professionals, *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, Volume 99, Issue 1178, December 2023, Pages 1287–1294, <https://doi.org/10.1093/postmj/qgad095>.

22. Liu S, Cheng H, Ashraf J, Zhang Y, Wang Q, Lv L, He M, Song G, Zuo D. Interpretation of convolutional neural networks reveals crucial sequence features involving in transcription during fiber development. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2022 Mar 15;23(1):91. doi: 10.1186/s12859-022-04619-9. PMID: 35291940; PMCID: PMC8922751.

23. van Dijk ADJ, Kootstra G, Kruijer W, de Ridder D. Machine learning in plant science and plant breeding. *iScience*. 2020 Dec 5;24(1):101890. doi: 10.1016/j.isci.2020.101890. PMID: 33364579; PMCID: PMC7750553.

24. Deo, R. C. (2015). Machine Learning in Medicine. *Circulation*, 132(20), 1920–1930. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.001593>.

25. Angela C Burnett, Jeremiah Anderson, Kenneth J Davidson, Kim S Ely, Julien Lamour, Qianyu Li, Bailey D Morrison, Dedi Yang, Alistair Rogers, Shawn P Serbin, A best-practice guide to predicting plant traits from leaf-level hyperspectral data using partial least squares regression, *Journal of Experimental Botany*, Volume 72, Issue 18, 30 September 2021, Pages 6175–6189, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erab295>.

26. Xin, Y., Sheng, J., Miao, M., Wang, L., Yang, Z., Huang, H. (2022). A review of imaging genetics in Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience*, 93, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocn.2022>

27. Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C. M. (2013). Collinearity: A review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography*, 36(1), 27-46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07348.x>.

28. Wold, S., Esbensen, K., Geladi, P. (1987). Principal component analysis. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, 2(1-3), 37-52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-7439\(87\)80084-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-7439(87)80084-9).

29. Couronné, R., Probst, P. Boulesteix, AL. Random forest versus logistic regression: a large-scale benchmark experiment. *BMC Bioinformatics* 19, 270 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-018-2264-5>.
30. Schonlau, M., Zou, R. Y. (2020). The random forest algorithm for statistical learning. *The Stata Journal*, 20(1), 3-29. DOI: 10.1177/1536867X20909688.
31. Liu X, Wu D, Zewdie GK, et al. Using machine learning to estimate atmospheric Ambrosia pollen concentrations in Tulsa, OK. *Environmental Health Insights*. 2017;11. doi:10.1177/117863021769939
32. Yamashita, R., Nishio, M., Do, R.K.G. et al. Convolutional neural networks: an overview and application in radiology. *Insights Imaging* 9, 611–629 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13244-018-0639-9>.
33. Alzubaidi, L., Zhang, J., Humaidi, A.J. et al. Review of deep learning: concepts, CNN architectures, challenges, applications, future directions. *J Big Data* 8, 53 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s4021-00444-8>.
34. Reyad, M., Sarhan, A. Arafa, M. A modified Adam algorithm for deep neural network optimization. *Neural Comput Applic* 35, 17095–17112 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-023-08568-z>.