


**TRANSACTIONS OF THE MALAYSIAN  
SOCIETY OF PLANT PHYSIOLOGY  
VOL. 13 (2004)**



# **Advances in Plant Science**

**HAWA ZE JAAFAR  
RADZALI MUSE  
JOHARI RAMLI  
MUHAJIR HAMID  
MOHD PUAD ABDULLAH  
JANNA ONG ABDULLAH  
TSAN FUI YING  
AHMAD TARMIZI HASHIM  
NASIR BASIRAN  
SURYANI AHMAD**



**Proceedings of the 15<sup>th</sup> Malaysian Society of  
Plant Physiology Conference 2004  
(MSPPC 2004)**



**TRANSACTIONS OF THE MALAYSIAN SOCIETY OF  
PLANT PHYSIOLOGY**

**Volume 13 (2004)**

---

---

**ADVANCES IN PLANT SCIENCE**

---

---

Proceedings of the 15<sup>th</sup> Malaysian Society of Plant Physiology  
Conference held at Bayu Beach Resort, Port Dickson,  
Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia, 14 – 16 September 2004

**Editors**

Hawa ZE Jaafar  
Radzali Muse  
Johari Ramli  
Muhajir Hamid  
Mohd Puad Abdullah  
Janna Ong Abdullah  
Tsan Fui Ying  
Ahmad Tarmizi Hashim  
Nasir Basiran  
Suryani Ahmad

*with*  
**Compliments**



**Organized By**



Malaysian Society of Plant Physiology (MSPP)

**Co-organized by**

Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)

Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-based Industry Malaysia (MOA)  
Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation Malaysia (MOSTI)

---

---

MSPP is a Professional Scientific body dedicated towards promoting  
research and development in tropical plant biology

**First Edition, 2004**  
**Malaysian Society of Plant Physiology (MSPP)**

All Rights Reserved

No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means,  
electronic, mechanic photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior  
permission of the Copyright owner

Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Malaysian Society of Plant Physiology Conference (15<sup>th</sup>: 2004 : Negeri Sembilan)

Advances in Plant Science : proceedings of the 15<sup>th</sup> Malaysian Society of Plant Physiology Conference held at Bayu Beach Resort, Port Dickson, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia, 14-16 September 2004 / editors Hawa ZE Jaafar ... [et al.] ; organized by Malaysian Society of Plant Physiology ; Co-organized by Universiti Putra Malaysia, Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-based Industry Malaysia, Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation Malaysia.

ISBN 983-3455-62-1 (vol. 13)

1. Plant biotechnology--Congresses. 2. Botanical chemistry--Congresses.
  3. Plant molecular biology--Congresses. I. Hawa ZE Jaafar.
  - II. Malaysian Society of Plant Physiology. III. Universiti Putra Malaysia.
  - IV. Malaysia. Kementerian Pertanian dan Industri Asas Tani.
  - V. Malaysia. Kementerian Sains, Teknologi dan Inovasi. VI. Title.
- 631.5233

Suggested citation: *Trans. Malaysian Soc. Plant Physiol. 13(2004)*

Published by:

**PERSATUAN FISILOGI TUMBUHAN MALAYSIA**  
**Malaysian society of Plant Physiology (MSPP)**

Locked Bag No. 282, UPM Post Office,  
43409 UPM, Serdang  
Selangor D.E., Malaysia  
(<http://www.mspp.org.my>)

Printed by:  
MSPP

## THE EFFECT OF LEAF SHAPE ON THE INTERCEPTION OF SOLAR RADIATION

<sup>1</sup>Teh C.B.S., <sup>2</sup>Henson I.E., <sup>3</sup>Goh K.J. and <sup>1</sup>Husni M.H.A.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Land Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>Malaysian Palm Oil Board, Biological Research Division, No. 6 Persiaran Institusi, Bandar Baru Bangi, Kajang, Selangor

<sup>3</sup>Applied Agricultural Research Sdn. Bhd., Locked Bag 212, Sg. Buloh Post Office, 47000 Sg. Buloh, Selangor

### ABSTRACT

*One of the properties of canopy architecture is leaf shape, and its effect on solar radiation interception by a plant is little understood and studied. Consequently, this study was to evaluate the effect of six leaf shapes on both direct and diffuse solar radiation interception using a detailed 3-D solar radiation model. Six hypothetical plant prototypes were computer-generated so that each prototype was equal to each other in all aspects; only the leaf shape for each prototype was varied. The leaf shapes selected were round (RD), square (SQ), triangle (TR), inverted triangle (ITR), ellipse (EL) and lobe (LB). Computer simulations revealed that leaf shape did have an effect on direct and diffuse solar radiation interception. However, its effect was to a rather small extent of not more than 11% increase in solar radiation interception. The mean hourly interception of solar radiation by the prototypes decreased in the following manner: (ITR  $\approx$  EL) > (RD  $\approx$  SQ  $\approx$  TR  $\approx$  LB). Although leaf lobbing is often hypothesised to produce deeper sunflecks within the canopy, this study however revealed that leaf lobbing per se had no effect on solar radiation interception. All properties being equal, solar radiation interception could be increased by having leaf shapes that are: 1) long and narrow, 2) broader at the apex than at the basal, and 3) supported by leaf petioles. These three conditions increase solar radiation interception by causing the canopy to be spread out more uniformly in the aerial space; this, in turn, means less leaf clustering and self-shading. However, the effect of leaf shape on solar radiation interception decreases for near or full canopy cover because at this stage, the canopy is already intercepting solar radiation at near maximum capacity. Leaf shape also did not affect the diurnal variation of direct and diffuse solar radiation interception. This study may help to better select crop varieties having the "proper leaf form" for optimum plant production, as well as to better understand plant adaptation mechanisms in response to environmental stresses.*

### INTRODUCTION

Canopy architecture strongly affects a plant's capability to intercept solar radiation. This is because canopy architecture is the geometrical property and spatial arrangement of the plant's individual foliage elements (Ross 1981), and it includes properties such as leaf area, leaf inclination (angle from zenith), leaf azimuth (angle

from North in a clockwise direction) and leaf shape. Of these properties, the effect of leaf area and orientation (leaf inclination and azimuth) on solar radiation interception is most well understood. Their effect on solar radiation interception can also be mathematically described using Beer's law as shown by Monsi and Saeki (1953), and Ross (1981).

The effect of leaf shape, however, on solar radiation interception is little known. Its relationship with solar radiation interception is also not directly accounted for in Beer's law. All plant properties being equal, it is unclear how leaves having a given shape would *collectively* affect the solar radiation regime within the plant stand and thus the total solar radiation interception. Leaves with lobes, for example, are thought to reduce self-shading and to produce deeper sunflecks within a canopy (Horn 1971). Computer simulations by Niklas (1989), however, revealed no change in the amount of daily solar radiation interception due to leaf lobbing *per se*. That the effect of leaf shape on solar radiation interception is unclear and little studied is not surprising. It is experimentally difficult to assess the effect of leaf shape on solar radiation interception because this factor cannot be isolated and studied independently from other plant or leaf factors (Niklas 1989). It is impossible, for example, to find real plants that are identical in all aspects apart from their leaf shapes. One solution is to use computer-generated plants. By controlling all plant and leaf aspects, it is possible to study the effect of leaf shape *per se* on solar radiation interception.

It is thus the objective of this study to evaluate the effect of various leaf shapes on both direct and diffuse solar radiation interception using a detailed solar radiation model. If the role of leaf shape on solar radiation interception is shown to be important, this could help to better design or select crop varieties that have the "proper leaf form" for optimum plant production. This study would also help to understand the role of leaf shape as a plant adaptation mechanism to adapt to certain environmental conditions or stresses by altering, among others, the amount of solar radiation being captured.

## MATERIALS AND METHOD

### 3-D solar radiation model

Beer's law can be used to determine the fraction or probability  $P(r)$  of incident solar radiation coming from sun direction  $r$  that penetrates into the canopy:

$$P(r) = \exp[-k(r) \cdot L] \quad (1)$$

where  $L$  is the leaf area index, and  $k(r)$  is the canopy extinction coefficient. Eq. (1), however, is too simplistic to assess the effect of leaf shape on solar radiation interception. This is because it is one-dimensional (*i.e.*, solar irradiance varies only in one direction); thus, it does not describe adequately how the spatial distribution of leaf area density is altered given a leaf shape. Consequently, it is essential to

characterise both the canopy architecture and plant-radiation regime in the complete three dimensions.

The canopy space of a plant is divided into a network of 3-D cuboids that is perpendicular to the planting row direction. The height, width and length of the network are equal to the plant height, inter-row and intra-row planting distance, respectively. In this study, the inter-row and intra-row planting distance were set at 0.6 and 0.3 m, respectively, and the planting row was in the North-South direction.

For each cuboid in the network, three kinds of information are required: a) leaf area density, b) leaf orientation distribution, or the G-function, and c) mean travelling distance of a solar beam. This information is required to calculate the probability  $P_{dr,k}(r)$  of a single solar beam penetrating or exiting the  $k$ -th cuboid in the network:

$$P_{dr,k}(r) = \exp[-G_k(r) \cdot \rho_{f,k} \cdot s_k \cdot \sqrt{1-\sigma}] \cdot \prod_{c=1}^{k-1} \exp[-G_c(r) \cdot \rho_{f,c} \cdot s_c \cdot \sqrt{1-\sigma}] \quad (2)$$

where the multiplicative series  $c=1$  to  $(k-1)$  represents every cuboid visited sequentially by the beam in reaching the target cuboid  $k$ ;  $G_c(r)$  is the G-function in the  $c$ -th cuboid;  $\rho_{f,c}$  is the leaf area density in the  $c$ -th cuboid;  $s_c$  is the beam path length in the  $c$ -th cuboid; and  $\sigma$  is the leaf scatter coefficient, taken as 0.2 (Tournebize & Sinoquet, 1995). The so-called G-function  $G(r)$  is regarded as the average projection per unit foliage area in the sun direction  $r$ , (Ross 1981), where the sun direction  $r$  is described by solar inclination  $\theta$  and azimuth  $\phi$ . The  $G_c(r)$  or  $G_c(\theta, \phi)$  in the  $c$ -th cuboid is calculated by

$$G_c(\theta, \phi) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N L_{c,j} |\cos \theta \cos \theta_L + \sin \theta \sin \theta_L \cos(\phi - \phi_L)|_{c,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^N L_{c,j}} \quad (3)$$

where  $L_{c,j}$  is area of the  $j$ -th leaf in the  $c$ -th cuboid;  $N$  is total number of leaves in  $c$ -th cuboid; and  $\theta_L$  and  $\phi_L$  are the leaf normal inclination and leaf normal azimuth of the  $j$ -th leaf in the  $c$ -th cuboid, respectively. (Thanisawanyangkura et al. 1997). Calculations for  $s_c$  are based on simple geometry as described by Gijzen and Goudriaan (1989), and Sinoquet and Bonhomme (1992).

In this study, a simulation run would begin by "pushing" a total of four equally-spaced beams (coming from solar direction  $r$ ) into each cuboid in the uppermost level of the network. The traversal of each of these beams down the network was simulated using ray-tracing principles (Gijzen & Goudriaan 1989; Sinoquet & Bonhomme 1992). And for every cuboid that could be reached by a given beam direction, Eq. (2) was used to calculate the beam's penetration probability. This information is then stored. These steps were repeated for the traversal of the next beam "pushed" into the network. Consequently, at the end of a simulation run, the mean penetration probability for every cuboid in the network

could be determined. The total fraction of direct solar radiation intercepted  $F_{dr}$  is calculated by 
$$F_{dr} = 1 - \overline{P_{dr,k=ground}(r)} \quad (4)$$

where  $\overline{P_{dr,k=ground}(r)}$  is the average direct beam penetration probability for all cuboids on the ground level only (*i.e.*, the overall mean probability of a direct solar beam to reach the soil surface). Unlike direct solar radiation, diffuse solar radiation does not come from a single direction but uniformly from all directions. The penetration probability of diffuse solar radiation  $P_{df,k}$  in the  $k$ -th cuboid is approximated by summing the penetration probability of direct beams over the whole sky at three and four solar inclination  $\theta$  and azimuth  $\phi$  angles, respectively ( $\theta = 15^\circ, 30^\circ$  and  $75^\circ$ , and  $\phi = 45^\circ, 135^\circ, 225^\circ$  and  $315^\circ$ ), and taking the mean of the 12 values (de Castro and Fetcher, 1998), or

$$P_{df,k} = \frac{1}{12} \sum_r P_{dr,k}(r) = \frac{1}{12} \sum_\theta \sum_\phi P_{dr,k}(\theta, \phi) \quad (5)$$

The total fraction of diffuse solar radiation intercepted  $F_{df}$  is calculated by

$$F_{df} = 1 - \overline{P_{df,k=ground}} \quad (6)$$

where  $\overline{P_{df,k=ground}}$  is the average diffuse beam penetration probability for all cuboids on the ground level only. Finally, simulations of hourly solar radiation interception were done from 8:00 to 18:00 local hour, for the year 2003, day of year 152, and for site latitude and longitude of  $3.24^\circ$  N and  $101.47^\circ$  E, respectively.

### 3-D plant geometry

Located at the centre of the 3-D network of cuboids is a computer-generated plant (prototype) where, in this study, its leaf number, leaf azimuth, leaf position, planting distance, and plant height were held constant. Only its leaf shape, area and inclination were varied. Six simple shaped leaves were selected in this study to assess their effect on solar radiation interception: round (RD), square (SQ), triangle (TR), inverted triangle (ITR), ellipse (EL) and lobe (LB) (Figure 1). The effect of these leaf shapes on solar radiation interception was examined in the following three conditions: a) leaf area index (LAI) 0.5, 1.0 and 3.0; b) leaf inclination  $22.5^\circ$ ,  $45^\circ$  and  $90^\circ$ ; and c) leaves with and without petioles.

In all of the above conditions, total plant height was set at 1.0 m, and the number of leaves per plant was set at 12 where the leaves were arranged in a whorled phyllotaxy with three leaves per node. Therefore every three leaves were positioned at four different plant heights (1.0, 0.7, 0.4 and 0.1 m), and for each height, the azimuth of the three leaves were separated from each other by  $120^\circ$ . The azimuths of the three leaves positioned at plant height 1.0 and 0.4 m were  $0^\circ$ ,  $120^\circ$  and  $240^\circ$ , respectively, and the azimuths of three leaves positioned at plant height 0.7 and 0.1 m were  $60^\circ$ ,  $180^\circ$  and  $300^\circ$ , respectively.

The area of every leaf in a plant was set equal to each other. Area per leaf was calculated by taking into account the leaf shape, number of leaves, planting distance and LAI. For example, given 12 leaves per plant, LAI 1.0 and planting distance of 0.6x0.3 m, the area and dimension (width by length) of every square leaf (SQ) per plant would be 0.0150 m<sup>2</sup> and 0.1225 by 0.1225 m, respectively. Note that the leaf shapes for prototypes SQ, TR and ITR were set as equilateral; that is, for a given shape, all its sides are equal (Figure 1). For the EL prototype, the length of its elliptic leaf shape was set approximately double the leaf length of SQ prototype, and the widest leaf width for the EL occurred at half the leaf length. The length of the lobed leaves, LB, was set approximately equal to the leaf length of SQ prototype, and the length of the three equally-spaced lobes was set as half the total leaf length LB.




Figure 1. Leaf shapes for the six plant prototypes: round (RD), square (SQ), triangle (TR), inverted triangle (ITR), ellipse (EL) and lobe (LB)

One of the properties required by Eq. (2) is the leaf area density within a cuboid. Because a leaf may not lie entirely within a cuboid, the leaves were described as 3-D polygons so that the Sutherland-Hodgman's 3-D polygon clipping algorithm (Sutherland & Hodgman 1974) could be used to determine the section of a leaf polygon encompassed by a given cuboid. Applying this algorithm to all the leaves of the plant would give the total leaf area encompassed within any cuboid. Leaf area density was calculated by dividing the enclosed leaf area by the cuboid volume.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As expected, the mean hourly interception of solar radiation was effected by the leaf inclination and LAI (Table 1), where the interception of both direct and diffuse solar radiation increased with increasing LAI and leaf inclination (i.e., increasingly larger and more horizontally inclined leaves).

Most importantly, however, given a leaf inclination and LAI, the mean hourly interception of solar radiation was effected by the leaf shape, albeit to a rather small extent (Table 1). The differences in solar radiation interception among the six plant prototypes were not more than 11% from each other. Moreover, their differences declined to not more than 5% from each other for full or near canopy cover (i.e., LAI 3.0). At near or full canopy cover, the total fraction of direct or diffuse solar radiation intercepted was at near maximum 1.0; consequently, any further advantages of having a particular leaf shape to increase solar radiation interception at this stage would be small. As shown in Table 1, the mean hourly interception of both direct and diffuse solar radiation by the plant prototypes can be distinguished into two groups, where solar radiation interception decreased in the following manner: (ITR  $\approx$  EL) > (RD  $\approx$  SQ  $\approx$  TR  $\approx$  LB). Lobed leaves are often thought to alter the plant-radiation regime significantly by producing deeper sunflecks within the canopy (Horn 1971). Nonetheless this study showed no effect of leaf lobbing per se (LB prototype) on solar radiation interception, as also reported by Niklas (1989). In his simulation study, the gaps between the leaf lobes of the short ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia* L.) were approximately 45% of the leaf area, and the gaps were numerous with each gap small and shallow. But in this study the gaps between the lobes for the LB prototype were approximately 30% of the leaf area, and these gaps were few with each gap wide and deep. Despite these differences in both these studies, leaf lobbing has so far been shown not to affect solar radiation interception.

The interception of both direct and diffuse solar radiation for all prototypes could however be further increased by the presence of leaf petioles (Table 2). Compared to sessile (non-petiole) leaves, leaves with petioles (100 mm in length) further increased the solar radiation interception by not more than 12%, but this increase generally declined for full or near canopy cover. Additionally, the interception of both direct and diffuse solar radiation by ITR and EL petiole leaves was at average 14% higher than that by RD sessile leaves. The increase in solar radiation interception due to the presence of petioles was generally most

pronounced for RD, SQ, TR and LB plant prototypes (an average gain of 7%) as compared to ITR and EL prototypes (an average gain of 3%; Table 2). This difference is because, as shown earlier, ITR and EL prototypes intercepted the most fraction of direct and diffuse solar radiation as compared to other plant prototypes. Thus, additional advantages of having leaf petioles to further increase solar radiation interception would be small for the EL and ITR prototypes.

Results indicated that leaf shape does have an effect on solar radiation interception (though to a rather small extent) by altering the spatial distribution of leaf area density. Solar radiation interception is augmented for plants having leaves that are shaped in such a way that causes the canopy to be "spread out" more uniformly or homogeneously; thus, reducing self-shading or clustering of leaves. Plants with long, narrow leaves, for example, increases solar radiation interception as compared to plants with short, wide leaves. This indicate that, all properties being equal, grass species, maize and oil palm trees, due to their long, narrow leaves, would intercept more solar radiation than plants that have short, wide leaves. Leaves that are broader at the apex than at the basal would also increase solar radiation interception because this reduces the bunching or clustering of leaves near the plant stem, causing a more uniform spread of leaf area. This would mean that, all properties being equal, plants having leaf shapes that are broad at the apex such as oblanceolate, obovate and spatulate (Glattstein 2003) would intercept more solar radiation than plants having leaf shapes that are broad at the basal such as ovate and cordate. Leaf petioles also increase solar radiation interception in particular by reducing leaf clustering around the plant stem, but the advantages of having leaf petioles are least pronounced for plants that have long, narrow leaves. This may indicate why plants having such leaves rarely have petioles (e.g., maize and oil palm) as they already capture solar radiation effectively.

The results here may indicate that crop yields could be increased, albeit slightly, by designing or selecting crop varieties that have longer and narrower leaves, leaves with longer petioles, or leaves that are broader at their apex than at their basal. Nonetheless, in stressed environments, having such leaves may be detrimental due to the heavy solar radiation load on them. In such conditions, short and wide sessile leaves may instead be more preferable. Bailey and Sinnott (1916) reported that environment factors have a stronger effect on leaf form and size than the plants' genetic make-up. This highlights the importance of plant adaptation mechanisms in certain environment conditions or stresses. For a given leaf area, narrow leaves are found to have lower evaporation rates as compared to broad leaves (Taylor 1975) due to the thicker boundary layer of non-moving air on the narrow leaves. Leaf rolling and drooping are also mechanisms to reduce thermal load and evaporation losses (Campbell & Norman 2000). Results from this study and from Niklas (1989) indicate that the function of leaf lobes is probably more associated to the adaptation to heat and water loss rather than to adaptation to solar radiation interception. Leaves with lobes are found to convectively dissipate heat most easily as compared to other leaf shapes as found by Vogel (1970), which are advantageous in hot, dry environments.

Finally, the differences in leaf shapes did not appear to affect the diurnal variation of direct solar radiation interception where for each plant prototype, the interception of direct solar radiation depended on the solar position, whereby the solar radiation interception decreased gradually as the sun began to align in parallel to the planting row direction (N-S) at 13:00 hours at this site. Direct solar radiation interception decreased and was at the lowest at 13:00 hours, and after this hour solar radiation interception gradually increased. The effect of a pronounced planting row direction on solar radiation capture has often been observed (Wallace 1997). This effect arises because when the sun is parallel to the planting row direction the impediment by the canopies on solar beams is less as compared to that when the sun is non-parallel to the planting row direction. With increasing leaf inclination, the diurnal variation of direct solar radiation interception would decrease; that is, becoming more constant throughout the day. It is widely known that the interception of solar radiation by horizontal leaves is not effected by the solar position (Goudriaan & van Laar 1994). Unlike the diurnal variation in direct solar radiation interception, the diffuse solar radiation interception was constant throughout the day (no diurnal variation) because diffuse solar radiation was considered in this study to radiate uniformly from all directions of the whole sky; thus, the canopy architecture and solar position have no effect on the diurnal variation of the fraction of diffuse solar radiation intercepted.

### CONCLUSION

Leaf shape was shown to have an effect on solar radiation interception, although its effect was to a rather small degree of not more than 11% increase in solar radiation interception. All plant properties being equal, solar radiation interception could be increased by having leaf shapes that are: 1) long and narrow, 2) broader at the apex than at the basal, and 3) supported by leaf petioles. These three conditions increase solar radiation interception by reducing leaf clustering and self-shading especially near the plant stem. In short, leaf shapes that increase solar radiation interception are those that cause the canopy to be spread out more uniformly or homogenously in the aerial space.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We wish to thank the FELDA Foundation for the research grant and their permission granted to present these findings.

## REFERENCES

- Bailey IW, Sinnott EW.** 1916. The climatic distribution of certain types of angiosperm leaves. *American Journal of Botany* 3: 24-39
- Campbell GS, Norman JM.** 1998. **An Introduction to Environmental Biophysics.** 2nd. edn. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- de Castro F, Fetcher N.** 1998. Three dimensional model of the interception of light by a canopy. *Agriculture For. Meteorology* 90: 215-233
- Gijzen H, Goudriaan J.** 1989. A flexible and explanatory model of light distribution and photosynthesis in row crops. *Agriculture For. Meteorology*: 48: 1-20
- Glattstein J.** 2003. *Consider the Leaf: Foliage in Garden Design.* Timber Press, Portland, Oregon.
- Goudriaan J, van Laar HH.** 1994. *Modelling Potential Crop Growth Processes. A Textbook with Exercise. Current Issues in Production Ecology. Vol 2.* Kluwer Academic, Netherlands.
- Horn HS.** 1971. *The Adaptive Geometry of Trees.* Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ.
- Monsi M, Saeki T.** 1953. Über den lichtfactor in den pflanzengesellschaften und seine bedeutung für die stoffproduktion. *Japanese Journal of Botany* 14: 22-52
- Niklas KJ.** 1989. The effect of leaf-lobbing on the interception of direct solar radiation. *Oecologia* 80: 59-64
- Ross J.** 1981. *The Radiation Regime and Architecture of Plant Stands.* W. Junk, The Hague.
- Sinoquet H, Bonhomme R.** 1992. Modelling radiative transfer in mixed and row intercropping systems. *Agriculture For. Meteorology* 62: 219-240
- Stewart DW, Dwyer LM.** 1993. Mathematical characterization of maize canopies. *Agriculture For. Meteorology* 66: 247-265
- Sutherland IE, Hodgman GW.** 1974. Reentrant polygon clipping. *CACM* 17: 32-42
- Taylor SE.** 1975. Optimal leaf form. *Perspectives in Biophysical Ecology.* In: Gates, D.M., Schmerl, R.B. (Eds.) Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 73-86.
- Thanisawanyangkura S, Sinoquet H, Rivet P, Cretenet M, Jallas E.** 1997. Leaf orientation and sunlit leaf area distribution in cotton. *Agriculture For. Meteorology* 86: 1-15
- Tournebize R, Sinoquet H.** 1995. Light interception and partitioning in a shrub/grass mixture. *Agriculture For. Meteorology* 72: 277-294
- Vogel S.** 1970. Convective cooling at low airspeeds and the shapes of broad leaves. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 21: 91-101
- Wallace JS.** 1997. Evaporation and radiation interception by neighbouring plants. *Quarterly Journal of Royal Meteorological Society* 123: 1885-1905

Table 1. Mean hourly fraction of intercepted solar radiation for all plant prototypes with sessile (non-petiole) leaves. Note: in the same table column, values in the brackets indicate the difference (in percent) from the fraction of solar radiation intercepted by the RD prototype.

## (a) Direct solar radiation

Proto- type	LAI 0.5				LAI 1				LAI 3			
	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean
RD	0.258 (0.0)	0.278 (0.0)	0.279 (0.0)	0.272 (0.0)	0.401 (0.0)	0.458 (0.0)	0.472 (0.0)	0.443 (0.0)	0.722 (0.0)	0.812 (0.0)	0.848 (0.0)	0.794 (0.0)
SQ	0.267 (3.4)	0.283 (1.9)	0.281 (0.8)	0.277 (2.0)	0.407 (1.6)	0.464 (1.3)	0.473 (0.1)	0.448 (0.9)	0.729 (0.9)	0.816 (0.4)	0.849 (0.1)	0.798 (0.5)
TR	0.261 (1.1)	0.280 (0.9)	0.275 (-1.1)	0.272 (0.3)	0.415 (3.6)	0.462 (1.0)	0.469 (-0.7)	0.449 (1.2)	0.731 (1.3)	0.812 (0.0)	0.842 (-0.6)	0.795 (0.2)
ITR	0.279 (8.2)	0.306 (10.2)	0.299 (7.4)	0.295 (8.6)	0.440 (9.8)	0.498 (8.8)	0.505 (7.0)	0.481 (8.5)	0.751 (4.0)	0.839 (3.3)	0.876 (3.3)	0.822 (3.5)
EL	0.275 (6.3)	0.307 (10.6)	0.305 (9.3)	0.295 (8.6)	0.442 (10.2)	0.496 (8.4)	0.508 (7.7)	0.482 (8.7)	0.750 (3.9)	0.833 (2.6)	0.878 (3.6)	0.820 (3.3)
LB	0.264 (2.3)	0.280 (0.8)	0.258 (-7.4)	0.267 (-1.5)	0.417 (4.2)	0.462 (1.0)	0.456 (-3.5)	0.445 (0.4)	0.734 (1.7)	0.812 (0.0)	0.839 (-1.1)	0.795 (0.1)

## (b) Diffuse solar radiation

Proto- type	LAI 0.5				LAI 1				LAI 3			
	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean
RD	0.283 (0.0)	0.293 (0.0)	0.303 (0.0)	0.293 (0.0)	0.438 (0.0)	0.482 (0.0)	0.509 (0.0)	0.476 (0.0)	0.726 (0.0)	0.813 (0.0)	0.874 (0.0)	0.804 (0.0)
SQ	0.291 (3.0)	0.300 (2.5)	0.305 (0.8)	0.299 (2.1)	0.445 (1.7)	0.486 (0.8)	0.511 (0.3)	0.481 (0.9)	0.700 (-3.7)	0.814 (0.1)	0.874 (0.0)	0.796 (-1.1)
TR	0.295 (4.5)	0.300 (2.5)	0.298 (-1.6)	0.298 (1.7)	0.463 (5.7)	0.491 (1.8)	0.509 (-0.1)	0.487 (2.3)	0.739 (1.8)	0.810 (-0.4)	0.867 (-0.8)	0.805 (0.1)
ITR	0.295 (4.5)	0.324 (10.6)	0.326 (7.7)	0.315 (7.6)	0.472 (7.9)	0.521 (8.1)	0.538 (5.7)	0.510 (7.2)	0.758 (4.3)	0.845 (4.0)	0.907 (3.8)	0.837 (4.0)
EL	0.303 (7.3)	0.325 (10.8)	0.331 (9.1)	0.319 (9.1)	0.476 (8.8)	0.520 (7.8)	0.546 (7.3)	0.514 (7.9)	0.753 (3.7)	0.851 (4.7)	0.908 (4.0)	0.838 (4.2)
LB	0.294 (4.1)	0.301 (2.9)	0.280 (-7.5)	0.292 (-0.3)	0.462 (5.5)	0.491 (1.8)	0.493 (-3.2)	0.482 (1.2)	0.742 (2.1)	0.813 (0.0)	0.863 (-1.2)	0.806 (0.2)

Table 2. Mean hourly fraction of intercepted solar radiation for all plant prototypes with petiole leaves. Note: the values in the brackets indicate the difference (in percent) between the fraction of solar radiation intercepted by sessile (non-petiole) and petiole leaves of the same prototype, LAI and leaf inclination (i.e, compare with Table 1).

(a) Direct solar radiation

Proto- type	LAI 0.5				LAI 1				LAI 3			
	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean
RD	0.283 (9.6)	0.302 (8.6)	0.291 (4.5)	0.292 (7.5)	0.438 (9.4)	0.488 (6.5)	0.488 (3.5)	0.472 (6.3)	0.743 (2.9)	0.826 (1.8)	0.874 (3.1)	0.815 (2.6)
SQ	0.287 (7.2)	0.309 (9.3)	0.302 (7.5)	0.299 (8.0)	0.446 (9.5)	0.499 (7.7)	0.501 (6.1)	0.482 (7.7)	0.749 (2.7)	0.839 (2.8)	0.882 (3.9)	0.823 (3.2)
TR	0.287 (9.7)	0.311 (11.0)	0.306 (11.0)	0.301 (10.6)	0.453 (9.2)	0.502 (8.7)	0.507 (8.2)	0.488 (8.7)	0.753 (3.0)	0.838 (3.3)	0.881 (4.6)	0.824 (3.6)
ITR	0.299 (7.1)	0.314 (2.8)	0.303 (1.3)	0.306 (3.7)	0.458 (4.2)	0.495 (-0.5)	0.513 (1.5)	0.489 (1.6)	0.766 (2.1)	0.849 (1.1)	0.885 (1.0)	0.833 (1.4)
EL	0.295 (7.4)	0.316 (2.9)	0.316 (3.8)	0.309 (4.6)	0.460 (4.2)	0.505 (1.8)	0.524 (3.0)	0.496 (3.0)	0.764 (1.9)	0.835 (0.2)	0.872 (-0.7)	0.824 (0.4)
LB	0.289 (9.2)	0.312 (11.3)	0.284 (9.9)	0.295 (10.1)	0.456 (9.2)	0.502 (8.6)	0.482 (5.8)	0.480 (7.8)	0.750 (2.2)	0.838 (3.3)	0.872 (4.0)	0.820 (3.2)

(b) Diffuse solar radiation

Proto- type	LAI 0.5				LAI 1				LAI 3			
	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean	22.5°	45°	90°	Mean
RD	0.315 (11.5)	0.319 (8.8)	0.318 (4.8)	0.317 (8.3)	0.477 (9.0)	0.512 (6.1)	0.531 (4.2)	0.507 (6.3)	0.750 (3.3)	0.842 (3.6)	0.905 (3.6)	0.832 (3.5)
SQ	0.321 (10.2)	0.328 (9.4)	0.329 (7.6)	0.326 (9.1)	0.485 (9.0)	0.524 (7.7)	0.542 (6.2)	0.517 (7.6)	0.755 (7.9)	0.849 (4.4)	0.913 (4.4)	0.839 (5.4)
TR	0.322 (9.0)	0.332 (10.8)	0.331 (10.9)	0.328 (10.2)	0.492 (6.3)	0.530 (8.0)	0.547 (7.5)	0.523 (7.3)	0.755 (2.0)	0.847 (4.6)	0.910 (5.0)	0.837 (4.0)
ITR	0.325 (10.3)	0.331 (2.1)	0.334 (2.5)	0.330 (4.8)	0.492 (4.2)	0.527 (1.2)	0.552 (2.6)	0.524 (2.6)	0.768 (1.4)	0.865 (2.3)	0.913 (0.7)	0.849 (1.5)
EL	0.322 (6.1)	0.335 (3.3)	0.343 (3.8)	0.333 (4.4)	0.492 (3.4)	0.534 (2.6)	0.563 (3.0)	0.530 (3.0)	0.776 (3.0)	0.866 (1.7)	0.902 (-0.7)	0.848 (1.2)
LB	0.323 (10.0)	0.333 (10.6)	0.305 (9.0)	0.321 (9.9)	0.495 (7.1)	0.530 (8.0)	0.519 (5.3)	0.515 (6.8)	0.755 (1.7)	0.847 (4.2)	0.903 (4.7)	0.835 (3.6)