



#### **OCCASION**

This publication has been made available to the public on the occasion of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.



#### **DISCLAIMER**

This document has been produced without formal United Nations editing. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or its economic system or degree of development. Designations such as "developed", "industrialized" and "developing" are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process. Mention of firm names or commercial products does not constitute an endorsement by UNIDO.

#### FAIR USE POLICY

Any part of this publication may be quoted and referenced for educational and research purposes without additional permission from UNIDO. However, those who make use of quoting and referencing this publication are requested to follow the Fair Use Policy of giving due credit to UNIDO.

#### **CONTACT**

Please contact <u>publications@unido.org</u> for further information concerning UNIDO publications.

For more information about UNIDO, please visit us at www.unido.org

# DEMONSTRATION PROJECT: ALTERNATIVES TO THE USE OF METHYL BROMIDE

FINAL REPORT

ON BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL ANALYSES BY CONTRACT NO: 99/197

**SUBMITTED JANUARY, 2001** 

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL INFORMATION	1
1. WATER ANALYSES	2
2. ANALYSES OF NEMATODES, FUNGI AND BACTERIA	8
3. SOIL ANALYSES	12
4. LEAF QUALITY ANALYSES	14

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

The main objective of the Demonstration project; Alternatives to the Use of Methyl Bromide in Tobacco and Horticultural Production is to test the following alternative techiques: soilles cultivation, use of low doses chemicals and solarization/biofumigation. In the second phase of the Demonstration project; Alternatives to the Use of Methyl Bromide in Tobacco and Horticultural Production is to adopt the accepted alternatives in the first year i.e. Floating Tray System in the tobacco sector and solarization with biofumigation in the horticultural production. The trials have been placed in production conditions, in the largest companies that are in charge for the production and by out of the tobacco from the individual growers in the region. To illistrate the possible effect of the applied alternative techiques it was neccessary several types of bio-chemical analyses to be performed.

The Faculty of Agriculture along with the laboratories of:

- Institute of Agriculture Skopje
- Tobacco Institute Prilep
- Hydrometeorological Department Skopje

has the performing the required analyses of soil, water and tissue quality, as well as nematodes, fungi and bacteria.

Biological analysis are made as required in TOR, prior to treatment, after treatment and before transplanting. The effectivnes of the treatments was assest with quantitative analisys of the patogens present in the soil and by the appearance of sypthoms on the plants and roots. Counting for nematodes was carried out under dissecting microscope, and for Fungae, Phycomicetes and Bacteriae the quantitative method for 1 g air dry soil was used with dillution of 1:10; 1:100 and 1:500.

The analyses made have been included as integral part to the all reports submitted by the Agency for Agricultural Development of the Republic of Macedonia to UNIDO

#### 1. WATER ANALYSES

# Irrigation water analysis - Prilep:

Analized parameters	Unit	Values
SiO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	1
Redox potential	mW	-111
Conductivity	mS/cm	0.212
m-alcalinity		20
p-alcalinity		0
Free CO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	1.8
Total hardness		6.6
Dry residuals on 105°C in		
non filtrated water	ppm	150
filtrated water	ppm	140
Ash residuals in		
non filtrated water	ppm	140
filtrated water	ppm	143
Loss from burning in		
non filtrated water	ppm	10
filtrated water	ppm	7
Suspended matter		1
total	ppm	10
organic	ppm	3
inorganic	ppm	7
Noticable	ppin	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
mechanical residuals		none
color		none
smell		none
рН		8.50
Anions		0.50
Cl	ppm	7.3
SO <sub>4</sub>	ppm	9.1
HCO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	122.0
CO <sub>3</sub>	ppm	0
OH <sup>-</sup>	ppm	0
H <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>	ppm	0.036
NO <sub>2</sub> -	ppm	0
NO <sub>3</sub>	ppm	0.3
Kations	- FF	0,5
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	ppm	< 0.01
Na <sup>+</sup>	ppm	1.4
K <sup>+</sup>	ppm	0.5
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	ppm	39.9
K <sup>+</sup> Ca <sup>2+</sup> Mg <sup>2+</sup>	ppm	4.5
Total Fe	ppm	0.026
Mn <sup>2+</sup>	-	0.012
$\frac{Mn^{2+}}{Zn^{2+}}$	ppm	0.113
Cu <sup>2+</sup>	ppm	0.113
Cu	ppm	<u> </u>

# Irrigation water analysis - Radovis:

Analized parameters	Unit	Values
SiO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	4
Redox potential	mW	-53
Conductivity	mS/cm	0.298
m-alcalinity		19
p-alcalinity		0
Free CO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	8.6
Total hardness		7.3
Dry residuals on 105°C in		
non filtrated water	ppm	180
filtrated water	ppm	165
Ash residuals in	ppin	
non filtrated water	ppm	168
filtrated water	ppm	160
Loss from burning in	ppin	100
non filtrated water	ppm	12
filtrated water		5
Suspended matter	ppm	3
		1.6
total	ppm	15
organic	ppm	7
inorganic	ppm	8
Noticable		
mechanical residuals		none
color		none
smell		none
рН		7.06
Anions		
Cl	ppm	12.2
SO <sub>4</sub>	ppm	26.9
HCO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	116.0
CO <sub>3</sub>	ppm	0
OH.	ppm	0
$H_2PO_4$	ppm	0.003
$NO_2$	ppm	0
NO <sub>2</sub> - NO <sub>3</sub> -	ppm	2.8
Kations	tinang 2200 tina Mesagain sestima	11000
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	ppm	< 0.01
Na <sup>+</sup>	ppm	4.7
K <sup>+</sup>	ppm	0.8
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	ppm	33.4
Mg <sup>2+</sup>	ppm	11.3
Total Fe	ppm	0.139
Mn <sup>2+</sup>	ppm	0.011
$Zn^{2+}$	ppm	0.075
Cu <sup>2+</sup>	ppm	0

# Irrigation water analysis - Kumanovo:

Analized parameters	Unit	Values
SiO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	3
Redox potential	mW	-41
Conductivity	mS/cm	0.619
m-alcalinity		5.5
p-alcalinity		0
Free CO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	26.6
Total hardness		17.5
Dry residuals on 105°C in		
non filtrated water	ppm	370
filtrated water	ppm	358
Ash residuals in		
non filtrated water	ppm	345
filtrated water	ppm	339
Loss from burning in	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
non filtrated water	ppm	25
filtrated water	ppm	19
Suspended matter		
total	ppm	12
organic	ppm	6
inorganic	ppm	6
Noticable		
mechanical residuals		none
color		none
smell		none
рН		6.86
Anions		
Cl	ppm	18.3
SO <sub>4</sub>	ppm	24.1
HCO <sub>2</sub> -	ppm	335.5
CO <sub>3</sub>	ppm	0
OH.	ppm	0
$H_2PO_4$	ppm	0.09
NO <sub>2</sub>	ppm	0
NO <sub>3</sub> -	ppm	5.9
Kations	071044(50)	
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	ppm	< 0.01
Na <sup>+</sup>	ppm	5.4
$K^{\dagger}$	ppm	0.3
$Ca^{2+}$	ppm	89.1
$Mg^{2+}$	ppm	22.0
Total Fe	ppm	0.76
$\frac{Mn^{2+}}{Zn^{2+}}$	ppm	0.007
$Zn^{2+}$	ppm	0.084
Cu <sup>2+</sup>	ppm	0

Analysis of weal water in Valandovo

		Macro	elemen	its (mmol/l	)	7,4		
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	N	a <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>		Mg <sup>2+</sup>	Si <sup>4+</sup>	
<0.1	0.4	0	.9	1.7		1.0	0.33	
NO <sub>3</sub>	Cl <sup>-</sup>	-		SO <sub>4</sub>		HCO <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>	
0.2	0.5			0.4		5.4	<0.01	
Application of the second	Microelements (µmol/l)							
Fe total	Mn <sup>2+</sup>	Zn <sup>2-</sup>	+	B <sup>3+</sup>		Cu <sup>2+</sup>	Mo <sup>\$+</sup>	
<0.1	0.3	<0.		34		< 0.1	<0.1	

EC - 0.6 mS/cm pH-7.5

Analysis of river water in Valandovo

		Section 3	Macro	oelements (m	mol/l)			
NO <sub>3</sub>		Cl <sup>-</sup>		SO <sub>4</sub>		HCO <sub>3</sub> -	H <sub>2</sub> P	O <sub>4</sub> -
0.2		0.6		0.5		7.2	<0.0	1
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	<u> </u>	Na <sup>+</sup>		Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>		Si <sup>4+</sup>
<0.1	0.3		0.9		2.4	1,1		0.33
Microelements (μmol/l)								
Fe total	N	In <sup>2+</sup>		Zn <sup>2+</sup>	B <sup>3+</sup>	Cu <sup>2+</sup>	Mo <sup>\$</sup>	+
<0.1		).1		<0.1	24	<0.1	<0.1	

EC= 0.8 mS/cm pH- 8.0

## Valandovo - irrigation system

		Anions (mmol/l)						
pН	EC	NO <sub>3</sub>	Cl	SO <sub>4</sub>	HCO <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>		
in water	mS/cm							
7.4	4.3	16.5	7.1	15.2	0.9	0.09		
			Kations (mm	iol/l)		L		
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>		K <sup>+</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	Si <sup>4+</sup>		
<0.1		3.4	6.8	15.5	8.8			
-			Mikroelementi (	μmol/l)				
Fe total	• • •	Mn <sup>2+</sup>	Zn <sup>2+</sup>	B <sup>3+</sup>	Cu <sup>2+</sup>	Mo <sup>\$+</sup>		
0.2		<0.1	<0.1	65	0.9	<0.1		

Valandovo -well water

	Anions (mmol/l)								
pН	EC mS/cm	NO <sub>3</sub>	Cl	SO <sub>4</sub>	HCO <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>			
7.2		0.5	0.4	0.7	5.8	<0.01			
			Kations (mm	ol/l)					
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>		K <sup>+</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	Si <sup>4+</sup>			
<0.1		0.6	0.8	1.6	1.1	0.23			
			Microelements (	μmol/l)					
Fe tota	1	Mn <sup>2+</sup>	Zn <sup>2+</sup>	B <sup>3+</sup>	Cu <sup>2+</sup>	Mo <sup>\$+</sup>			
<0.1		0.4	<0.1	30	<0.1	<0.1			

Analysis of irrigation water in Prilep

		Macroelem	ents (ppm)		
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	Si <sup>4+</sup>
<0.01	0.4	1	40.8	5.6	0.25
NO <sub>3</sub>	Cl		SO <sub>4</sub>	HCO <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>
0.8	8.1		8.3	111.2	< 0.01
15 and 15	***	Microelem	ents (ppm)	The state of the s	
Fe total	Mn <sup>2+</sup>	Zn <sup>2+</sup>	$B^{3+}$	Cu <sup>2+</sup>	Mo <sup>\$+</sup>
<0.1	0.011	<0.122	12	0	<0.1

EC - 0.201 mS/cm pH-8.23

Analysis of irrigation water in Kumanovo

		Macr	oeleme	nts (ppm)			Lita Nill
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	N	Ja <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>		Mg <sup>2+</sup>	Si <sup>4+</sup>
<0.1	0.4	<	0.1	25.0		22.0	0.12
NO <sub>3</sub>	Cli	Cl <sup>-</sup>		SO <sub>4</sub>		HCO <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>
4.6	20:	2	4	21.8		320.3	<0.01
		Mice	oeleme	nts (ppm)		San Carlo	
Fe total	Mn <sup>2+</sup>	Zn²	!+	B <sup>3+</sup>		Cu <sup>2+</sup>	Mo <sup>\$+</sup>
<0.1	0.009	<0.9	)2	30		<0.1	<0.1

EC - 0.812 mS/cm pH-6.76 Analysis of irrigation water in Radovis

		Macroe	lements (ppm)	The state of the s				
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	Si <sup>4+</sup>			
<0.01	0.9	4.8	38.2	13.8	0.18			
NO <sub>3</sub>	Cl		SO <sub>4</sub>	HCO <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>			
3.1	10.8	3	27.8	128.4	<0.01			
Microelements (ppm)								
Fe total	Mn <sup>2+</sup>	Zn <sup>2+</sup>	B <sup>3+</sup>	Cu <sup>2+</sup>	Mo <sup>\$+</sup>			
<0.1	0.013	<0.82	31	<0.1	<0.1			

EC - 0.359 mS/cm

## 2. ANALYSES OF NEMATODES, FUNGI AND BACTERIA

Table 2. Number of colonies in 10 g of air dry soil - cucumbers (during vegetation)

Time of sampling	Control	Methyl Bromide	<del>,,,_,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</del>	S&B
	F	Tusarium sp.		
Before treatment	19	16	13	14
After treatment	16	6	6	2
During vegetation	11	13	6	32
	Tri	ichoderma sp.		
Before treatment	11	10	10	12
After treatment	10	1	7	6
During vegetation	-	5	6	6
	$P\epsilon$	enicillium sp.		
Before treatment	-	-	-	-
After treatment		•••	-	2
During vegetation	50	3	60	10
	As	spergillus sp.		
Before treatment		-	bar	_
After treatment	<u>-</u>			-
During vegetation	11	-	-	2
	A	Utrnaria sp.		
Before treatment	-	-		
After treatment		-	-	-
During vegetation	4	-	5	-
	P	hycomicetes		
Before treatment	-	-	-	-
After treatment	*** ***	-	-	-
During vegetation	-		8	-

<sup>\*</sup>Saprophytic forms of Bacteria present in all samples

Total nematode density per m<sup>2</sup>- cucumbers (during vegetation)

Time of sampling	Control	Methyl Bromide	Dazomet	S&B
Before treatment	58018	31051	39490	63330
After treatment	212314	4542	28693	36943
During vegetation	57141	6066	10840	22480

S&B-Solarization+Biofumigation

Total nematode density per m<sup>2</sup>- tomatoe (during vegetation)

Time of sampling	Control	Methyl Bromide	Dazomet	S&B
Before treatment	78471	40366	78471	43221
After treatment	366242	2548	28693	21736
During vegetation	220392	6066	3220	4646

S&B-Solarization+Biofumigation

Number of colonies in 1 g of air dry soil - tomato (during vegetation)

Time of sampling	Control	Methyl Bromide	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	S&B
	I	Tusarium sp.		
Before treatment	53	80	49	75
After treatment	13	-	13	8
During vegetation	9	9	1	7
	Tr	ichoderma sp.		
Before treatment	10	8	10	9
After treatment	3	4	. 5	2
During vegetation	-	-	1	12
	$P_{\epsilon}$	enicillium sp.		
Before treatment	<u>-</u>	-	-	_
After treatment	-	-	_	-
During vegetation	43	16	63	-
	$\overline{A}$ .	spergillus sp.		
Before treatment	:: :::		-	-
After treatment	11	-	-	-
During vegetation	9	3	-	7
	A	lternaria sp.		
Before treatment	<u> </u>		1	-
After treatment	11	-	-	-
During vegetation	3	-	6	-
	P	hycomicetes		
Before treatment	2	2	2	2
After treatment	-	_	-	-
During vegetation		-	-	-

<sup>\*</sup>Saprophytic forms of Bacteria present in all samples

Total nematode density per m<sup>2</sup>- cucumbers (year -2000)

Time of sampling	Control	Methyl Bromide	Dazomet	S&B
Before treatment	64212	58712	61236	63520
After treatment	8427	6595	4434	3255
During vegetation	9276	7843	8721	5515

S&B-Solarization+Biofumigation

Number of colonies in 10 g of air dry soil - cucumbers (year 2000)

Time of sampling	Control	Methyl Bromide	Dazomet	S&B
	1	usarium sp.		
Before treatment	35	39	46	35
After treatment	13	10	8	7
During vegetation	14	10	12	18
	Tr	ichoderma sp.		
Before treatment	13	11	12	16
After treatment	9	7	4	8
During vegetation	5	9	8	9
	Pe	enicillium sp.	No.	
Before treatment	29	28	25	32
After treatment	5	20	12	18
During vegetation	21	15	17	22
	A.	spergillus sp.		
Before treatment	9	10	12	_
After treatment	<u>-</u>	4	8	-
During vegetation	_ 5	8	7	-
	A	lternaria sp.		
Before treatment	<b>-</b>	-	-	-
After treatment	<u>-</u>		-	-
During vegetation	-		-	-
	P	hycomicetes		
Before treatment		-	_	-
After treatment		-	-	
During vegetation	-	-	-	_

<sup>\*</sup>Saprophytic forms of Bacteria present in all samples

Total nematode density per m<sup>2</sup>- tomato (year 2000)

Time of sampling	Control	Methyl Bromide	Dazomet	S&B
Before treatment	79848	55213	59824	62384
After treatment	5487	3359	6686	4900
During vegetation	5763	6422	7727	9132

S&B-Solarization+Biofumigation

Number of colonies in 10 g of air dry soil – tomato (year 2000)

Time of sampling	Control	Methyl Bromide	Dazomet	S&B
	I	usarium sp.		
Before treatment	29	49	43	33
After treatment	15	20	28	17
During vegetation	17	29	19	12
	Tr	ichoderma sp.	100	
Before treatment	23	21	30	26
After treatment	12	17	14	14
During vegetation	15	19	18	15
	$P\epsilon$	enicillium sp.		
Before treatment	-	-	-	-
After treatment	<u>-</u>	-	-	-
During vegetation	15	36	25	37
	As	spergillus sp.		
Before treatment	15	-	10	9
After treatment	11	2	5	3
During vegetation	7	3	4	7
	$\overline{A}$	lternaria sp.		
Before treatment	7	3		_
After treatment	-	-	_	-
During vegetation	5		-	4

<sup>\*</sup>Saprophytic forms of Bacteria present in all samples

## 3. SOIL ANALYSES

## Valandovo - greenhouses

		Anions (mmol/l)							
pН	EC mS/cm	NO <sub>3</sub> -	Cl	SO <sub>4</sub>	HCO <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>			
7.5	1.7	5.2	1.2	4.7	1.0	0.05			
			Kations (1	nmol/l)					
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>		K <sup>+</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	$Mg^{2+}$	Si <sup>4+</sup>			
<0.1		1.2	1.8	5.1	2.5				
			Microelement	ts (µmol/l)					
Fe total	1	Mn <sup>2+</sup>	Zn <sup>2+</sup>	B <sup>3+</sup>	Cu <sup>2+</sup>	Mo <sup>\$+</sup>			
0.3		<0.1	<0.1	48	0.5	<0.1			

# Jegunovce - peat analysis (Profile 1)

Depth		0-12	12-32	32-45	45-85
Organic i	nater %	78.90	81.98	65.11	5.65
Mineral 1	nater%	21.10	18.02	34.89	94.35
pH in wa	ter	6.2	6.4	6.1	6.8
pH in KC	l	6.0	6.2	6.0	6.4
e Q	N	37.97	35.47	26.93	6.20
Available in mg/100 g soil	K <sub>2</sub> O	10.0	10.0	12.0	12.0
Av. in r	P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	35.20	37.00	25.40	3.60
	N	2.88	2.47	1.38	0.11
1%	CaO	4.59	2.46	0.61	4.39
Total in %	MgO	3.80	2.36	1.3	3.86
	K <sub>2</sub> O	0.54	1.40	0.94	0.60
	P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	0.290	0.178	0.223	0.192

# Jegunovce - peat analysis (Profile 2)

Depth		0-20	20-40	40-60	60-100
Organic n	nater %	63.87	61.35	62.23	9.72
Mineral n	nater%	36.13	38.65	37.77	90.28
pH in wat	er	5.0	4.1	3.0	5.1
pH in KC	1	4.9	3.8	2.8	5.0
e Q	N	23.63	20.60	17.30	5.13
Available in mg/100 g soil	K <sub>2</sub> O	18.0	12.0	10.8	18.8
Ava in n ge se	P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	35.40	31.80	10.60	3.72
	N	2.31	1.64	1.48	0.25
% !	CaO	0.58	1.85	0.36	0.64
Total in %	MgO	0.78	1.38	0.46	1.64
Tot	K <sub>2</sub> O	1.10	1.16	0.60	0.94
	P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	0.131	0.197	0.172	0.296

## 4. LEAF QUALITY ANALYSES

Chemical analyses of the leaf - Kumanovo 1999

Treatments	Nicotine %	Total N %	N in proteins %	Proteins %	Soluble sugars%	Polyphenols %	Total reduction	Ash %	Schmooks number	Polyphenolic number
C 1	1.29	2.05	0.82	5.12	7.59	2.03	9.62	13.81	1.48	21.10
C 2	1.17	2.08	0.88	5.55	8.87	2.11	10.98	12.40	1.60	19.22
1	0.89	1.43	1.16	7.25	14.47	4.84	19.3	10.21	2.00	25.06
2	1.20	2.58	1.02	6.39	6.23	1.64	7.87	13.62	0.97	20.84

C1 - Non treated

C 2 - Methyl bromide

1 - Floating tray system

2 - Solarization + Biofumigation

Chemical analyses of the leaf - Prilep 1999

Treatments	Nicotine %	Total N %	N in proteins	Proteins %	Soluble sugars%	Polyphenois %	Total reduction	Ash %	Schmooks number	Polyphenolic number
C 1	1.59	2.82	1.19	7.45	15.46	3.53	18.99	10.77	2.08	18.59
C 2	2.40	2.14	1.76	10.98	11.72	0.70	12.42	11.73	1.07	5.64
1	1.85	2.72	1.14	7.11	19.17	2.50	21.67	9.62	2.70	11.54
2	1.22	3.54	1.03	6.48	27.69	5.67	33.36	8.99	4.27	17.00

C1 - Non treated

C 2 - Methyl bromide

1 - Floating tray system

2 - Solarization + Biofumigation

#### Chemical analysis of the leaf - Radovis 1999

Treatments	Nicotine %	Total N %	N in proteins %%	Proteins %	Soluble sugars%	Polyphenols %	Total reduction	Ash %	Schmooks number	Polyphenolic number
C 1	1.59	2.82	1.19	7.45	15.46	3.53	18.99	10.77	2.08	18.59
C 2	2.40	2.14	1.76	10.98	11.72	0.70	12.42	11.73	1.07	5.64
1	1.85	2.72	1.14	7.11	19.17	2.50	21.67	9.62	2.70	11.54
2	1.22	3.54	1.03	6.48	27.69	5.67	33.36	8.99	4.27	17.00

Chemical analyses of the leaf - Kumanovo 2000

		Nicotine %	Total N %	N in proteins %	Proteins %	Soluble sugars%	Polyphenois %	Total reduction	Ash %	Schmooks number	Polyphenolic number
mixture	1	1.57	2.23	1.08	7.76	13.47	3.22	16.69	15.32	1.99	19.29
	2	1.49	2.60	1.04	7.02	13.89	3.52	17.41	14.81	1.97	20.24
substrate	3	1.60	2.44	1.11	6.20	10.18	3.82	14.00	13.44	1.64	21.11
ns	4	1.52	2.18	0.98	7.11	13.69	3.94	17.69	15.48	1.92	19.81

# Chemical analyses of the leaf - Prilep 2000

O.		Nicotine %	Total N %	N in proteins	Proteins %	Solubie sugars %	Polyphenols %	Total reduction	Ash %	Schmooks	Polyphenolic number
ixt	1	1.22	2.05	1.10	7.12	16.35	2.18	18.53	13.12	2.29	18.59
te m	2	1.17	2.07	0.89	8.14	18.19	2.02	20.21	13.58	2.23	17.02
substrate mixture	3	1.29	2.58	1.16	7.52	15.58	2.31	17.89	14.08	2.07	19.80
sub	4	1.20	2.70	0.92	7.67	16.22	2.50	18.77	13.72	2.11	18.64

## Chemical analyses of the leaf - Radovis 2000

	Nicotine %	Total N %	N in proteins	Proteins %	Soluble sugars%	Polyphenols.	Total reduction	Ash %	Schmooks number	Polyphenolic number
mixture 1	1.37	2.50	1.07	6.66	14.81	4.68	19.49	13.98	2.22	24.01
	1.25	2.58	1.01	6.42	15.15	4.52	19.67	13.21	2.35	23.80
substrate 3 4	1.42	2.20	1.01	6.51	14.82	4.53	19.35	13.80	2.27	23.17
7ns 4	1.30	2.47	1.10	6.33	14.78	4.27	19.05	13.58	2.33	22.80