

9  
10  
**Selection of models for above-ground biomass  
in a *Eucalyptus urophylla* stand**

---

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
**ABSTRACT**

The quantification of biomass is an important tool that helps the forest manager to define the course of the enterprise and the best management techniques. In view of this situation, the objective of the present study was to perform the modeling of above - ground biomass in the different components in *Eucalyptus urophylla* stands at 4.5 years of age. The stand is located in the south of Brazil, municipality of São Gabriel. Four plots of 577.5 m<sup>2</sup> were installed and all DBH and heights of 20% of the trees were measured. Four diameter classes were defined, with 3 trees being felled in each of them. All the biomass was weighed in leaves, branches, bark and wood and through samples the moisture content in each component was determined. The modeling showed reliability of 96% for wood estimation and biomass total. The total biomass was 65 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, of these, 72% of wood. The modeling with stepwise procedure presented good distribution of the residues. Through the easily obtained variables such as DBH and height it is possible to determine the volume of biomass accurately.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
**Keywords:** Forest biomass; eucalyptus productivity; harvest; management.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
**1. INTRODUCTION**

The planted trees sector had a balance of trade of US \$ 9.0 billion in 2017, currently representing 1.1% of national GDP and 6.1% of industrial GDP. According to data from IBA [1], Brazil has an area of 7.84 million hectares, of which 72.3% are occupied by the genus *Eucalyptus* sp. Among the segments, 35% of the area comes from the pulp and paper industry, 30% from independent producers, 13% from the steel and charcoal segment, 9% from investors, 10% from panels, solid wood products and 3% others [1].

Compared to other countries, Brazil has the highest average productivity, 35.7 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>, in addition to the smallest rotation cycle, 4.8 years [1]. The excellent soil and weather conditions are important factors for such results, however, the selection of superior individuals, hybridization, appropriate techniques of soil management and fertilization, maximized this increase in productivity [2,3].

Wood is the product of higher value, however, components such as bark, branches and tree tops are important bioenergetic sources and are sometimes removed from the site for later conversion through burning [4,5]. However, the complete removal of the tree can cause negative impacts on the soil properties [6], and reductions in the yield of *Eucalyptus globulus* in third rotation after repeated removals of forest residues [7].

The success of a forest enterprise occurs through a great planning, therefore, estimate of the biomass stock, and its projections, trace the direction of the same [8,9]. The low costs and the shortage of time are the main advantages of adopting them [10]. However, it is necessary to quantify a number of individuals through the direct method as a form of adjustment [11].

The selection of the best models should aim at the smallest number of parameters, high precision and independent variables easily obtainable as seen in the present study [12,13]. According to Fonseca et al. [14], the interaction between

the two variables is present in most models. The authors emphasize that the DAP is the easiest variable to obtain and the smallest error, being therefore the one with the best correlation with the volume.

In view of the need to obtain forest productivity data quickly and the dilemma related to the impacts of harvesting, the aim of the present study was to model the different components of the biomass through the stepwise procedure and to estimate the biomass above the soil.

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 2.1 Characterization of the experimental area

The study was conducted in a hybrid of *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *Eucalyptus grandis* stand in the municipality of Alegrete - RS. The experiment was located under the central geographic coordinates 29° 47 'S and 55° 17' W. The trees were between 45 and 57 months old. The spacing was 2.5 m x 3.5 m, with initial density of 1143 ha<sup>-1</sup> trees.


The chemical and physical attributes of the soil are presented in Table 1. The soil of the experimental area was classified as typical Dystrophic Red Argisol. These soils are deep, well drained, sand-free or sandy-loam surface texture, followed by loamy-sandy loam texture in the deepest horizons. Dystrophic soils show low base saturation (V <50%) in most of the first 100 cm representing low natural fertility soils [15].

**Table 1 - Chemical and physical soil attributes of the experimental area in Alegrete-RS.**

Variable	Unidade	Deph (cm)				
		0-20	20-40	40-60	60-80	80-100
DS	g cm <sup>-3</sup>	1,5	1,6	1,5	1,5	1,4
MO	g kg <sup>-1</sup>	8,7	8,2	8,3	7,0	5,8
pH (H <sub>2</sub> O)		4,4	4,5	4,6	4,6	4,7
Al		1,1	1,3	1,0	0,9	0,6
Ca	cmol <sub>c</sub> dm <sup>-3</sup>	0,5	0,9	1,3	1,4	1,5
Mg		0,4	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,5
P		2,0	1,7	2,0	1,9	2,0
K	mg dm <sup>-3</sup>	13,5	10,3	8,1	7,8	8,2
Al+H		4,9	4,4	4,1	3,4	3,4
CTC ef.	cmol <sub>c</sub> dm <sup>-3</sup>	2,0	2,5	2,7	2,7	2,7
CTC pH <sub>7</sub>		5,8	5,6	5,7	5,2	5,5
V		17,7	22,4	29,5	35,5	38,0
M	%	53,3	50,8	38,4	32,2	23,6

Where: MO = organic matter; T = CTC pH<sub>7</sub>; t = effective CTC; SB = sum of bases; V% = base saturation; m = saturation by aluminum.

According to the climatic classification of Köppen, the climate is of type Cfa, presenting homogeneous distribution of the precipitation throughout the year. The minimum average temperatures are in the month of June with 14°C and the hottest month in January 26°C [16]. Figure 1 shows the meteorological diagram for the municipality of Alegrete during present study. Data were obtained from the Alegrete automatic climatic station [17].



**Figure 1 - Diagram of the meteorological variables for the city of Alegrete with the minimum quarterly averages of evapotranspiration (EVT) (mm), precipitation (mm), minimum and maximum temperatures (°C) and relative and minimum relative humidity.**

Source: [17].

## 2.2 Experimental design and data collection

At random, 4 plots with dimensions of 21 m x 27.5 m were demarcated. For the inventory, all the diameters at breast height (DBH) of the individuals were measured in the plot with diametric tape. The height of 20% of the individuals was obtained with the Vertex hypsometer, and the other heights were estimated by means of regression.

In the possession of the data, by means of the formula of Sturges the number of classes was defined.

$$K = 1 + 3,322 \cdot (\log_{10} N)$$

Where: K = number of classes by the Sturges formula; N = number of observations.

Four classes of diameter were defined: 9.0 - 12.0; 12.1-15.0; 15.1 - 18.0 and 18.1 - 21.0. For each diametric classes three trees were felled (DBH lower, upper and middle limit.).

Trees were felled 5-10 cm above ground level. The trunk was subdivided into base, middle and top. The tree trunk was peeled and separated from the bark. The leaves were separated from the branches and then all components of the biomass were weighed in the field.

For the determination of dry biomass, 3 wood samples and 3 bark samples at the base, middle and top positions of the tree were removed. For the leaf and branch component, a sample of each was obtained. The samples were weighed in a precision field scale, packed in paper containers and then dried in a greenhouse for renovation and forced air circulation at 70 °C until reaching constant weight. By means of the difference between wet and dry weight it was possible to determine the moisture content for each component of the tree and in the sequence the dry biomass. By means of the difference between wet and dry weight, the dry biomass content was defined.

$$\text{Dry content (\%)} = 1 - \frac{(ww-dw)}{ww}$$

Where: ww = wet sample weight; dw = dry sample weight.

To obtain the leaf area, 150 g of leaves were collected from each tree. They were weighed in the field on a precision digital scale (0.01 g), taken to the laboratory. The specific leaf area (AFE) was determined through an aliquot of leaves (100 g). The leaves of the sample were photographed and then processed in the UTHSCSA software, Image tool for Windows version 3.0 © [18], to determine leaf area.

The leaf area and wet weight of the samples were determined, and the specific leaf area was determined. Leaf area (m<sup>2</sup>) and wet weight of the sample (kg) were determined.

The leaf area index was calculated using the equation:

$$IAF = (\sum PUFF \times AFE) / AP$$

In what: IAF: leaf area index; PUFF: total wet weight of the leaves of the plot kg; AFE: specific leaf area kg m<sup>-2</sup>; AP: plot area.

## 2.3 Statistics and Data Analysis

For the modeling of the independent variables DBH (diameter at breast height) and H (height), SPSS Software 20.0 was used [19]. The choice of equations and variables considered the Stepwise method (Criterion: Probability of  $P \leq 0.05$ ). The combination of the independent variables were as follows: d (diameter at breast height), h (total height), d<sup>2</sup>, d<sup>3</sup>, h<sup>2</sup>, h<sup>3</sup>, dh, (dh)<sup>2</sup>, (dh)<sup>3</sup>, d<sup>2</sup>.h, d.(dh), 1 / d<sup>2</sup>, 1 / d<sup>3</sup>, 1 / h, 1 / h<sup>2</sup>, 1 / h<sup>3</sup>, 1 / dh, 1 / d<sup>3</sup>, 1 / d<sup>2</sup>.h, 1 / d.h<sup>2</sup>, 1 / d<sup>3</sup>.h, 1 / d.h<sup>3</sup>, in addition to the neperian logarithms of each of these combinations above.


The verification of the determinants was by the Durbin-Watson test in which it evaluates the independence of the residues, that is, the dependence between the terms or correlation. The choice of the models considered the analysis of the following statistical indices: adjusted coefficient of determination R<sup>2</sup> aj., Standard error of the absolute estimate Syx, standard error of the relative estimate Syx (%), probability of error  $P \leq 0.05$ , F and residue graphical analysis%. The chosen models were used to estimate the biomass of the other trees of the plot, being the same in the sequence extrapolated per hectare.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Dendrometric characteristics

The diameter classes showed normal distribution, that is, the largest number of trees are around the mean diameter of the stand. When considering the sum of classes 2 and 3, about 91% of the trees have a diameter between 12.1 and 18 cm. Figure 2. According to Finger [20], the highest frequencies in commercial plantations are around the average.

The inventory carried out at 4.5 years showed a density of 900 trees per hectare. The average diameter was 15.2 cm and an average height of 17.3 meters. The total volume of wood was 171.9 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>, representing an average annual increase of 38.2 m<sup>3</sup>.



**Figure 2 - Diameter distribution and frequency of trees by class.**

Evaluating the growth in diameter and height of a clone of *E. urophylla* x *E. grandis* implanted under agrosilvipastoral management with 4.5 years, Neto et al [21] found average DHB of 16.8 and 16.4 cm, being thus similar to the present study.

In an inventory carried out on a hybrid *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *E. globulus* at 10 years of age, Viera et al [22] found an average DBH of 20.2 cm, height of 28.7 and volume with bark of 444 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>. As expected the population maturity reflected in the findings by the researchers.

For Viera et al [22] the DBH, high and volume were higher, but the leaf area index was apparently lower: 2.55. Studies point to exponential behavior for the LAI as a function of population maturity. In the early stages the IAF grows rapidly and reaches a peak, then a reduction is observed until the harvest period of the trees [23,24].

**Table 2 - Dendrometric characteristics in *Eucalyptus urograndis* stands at 4.5 years in Alegrete, southern Brazil.**

Inventário				
N (ha <sup>-1</sup> )	DAP	H (m)	G (m <sup>2</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Vcc (m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> )
900	15,2	17,3	16,5	171,9
IMA Vcc (m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> )		IAF (m <sup>2</sup> m <sup>-2</sup> )		
38,2		3,4		

### 3.2 Biomass modeling

The variables tested by the stepwise procedure in the SPSS statistical software show that for the shell, branch and height components, only the DBH variable was selected to estimate its biomasses. For the leaf, wood and total biomass components, the interaction between the DBH and the height Table 3 was selected.

Developing modeling in a 10-year-old *Eucalyptus saligna* stand Momolli et al, [25] found interaction between DBH and height for all models chosen. In *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *E. globulus* at 10 years old, Viera et al [22] also selected the DBH variable to estimate the bark component. These variations may be related to species characteristics, with *Eucalyptus saligna* showing natural peeling. The species of the present study does not have natural mismatch, thus, the increase or decrease of DBH explains considerably the amount of bark.

**Table 3 - Equations used to estimate the biomass of each component and height of a stand of *Eucalyptus urograndis* at 4.5 years.**

Variable	Model
Wood	$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot (DBH^2 H)$
Bark	$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot (\sqrt[2]{DBH})$
Branch	$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot (\sqrt[2]{DBH})$
Leaf	$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot (DBH^2 H)^2$
Total	$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot (DBH^2 H)$

High

$$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot (1/DBH^2)$$

Table 4 presents the coefficients of the models and the statistics for each of the selected models. It is observed that all ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) were 0. Coefficients of determination higher than 0.9 were verified for the components wood, leaf and total of the biomass. The lowest coefficients were verified for height and bark. Regarding the standard error of the estimate relative to the bark presented the highest percentage.


The modeling of the different components of the biomass was also performed by Viera et al 2013. While in the present study the lowest adjustment was for the shell component  $R^2$  aj 0.74, Viera et al [22] show that the lowest adjustment occurred for the leaves 0.86. For Momolli et al [25] the adjustments were much higher than the other authors, being the smallest adjustment for height with  $R^2$  aj of 0.97.

The quality of the genetic material influences the results obtained. When genetic materials from clones are studied, the variability between individuals is reduced, thus better model adjustments are obtained.

**Table 4 - Statistics of the regression equations and coefficients for each component of the biomass and height of a stand of *Eucalyptus urograndis* at 4.5 years.**

Variable	b0	b1	$P \leq 0,05$	$R^2$ aj.	Syx	Syx%	F	DW
Wood	3,408596	0,011229	0	0,965	5,06	10,1	302	2,48
Bark	-21,084554	7,231694	0	0,74	2,04	30,0	32	1,65
Branch	-25,162592	8,854434	0	0,885	1,55	17,2	84	2,98
Leaf	1,984312	$1,162 \times 10^{-7}$	0	0,939	0,68	14,3	155	2,22
Total	4,736105	0,015582	0	0,964	7,06	9,7	299	2,71
High	21,413268	-700,204056	0	0,897	0,71	4,02	97	2,14

In Figure 3 we observed the graphical distribution of the residues as a function of the DAP for each dependent variable. The best way to validate the model statistics is through the graphical distribution of the residues [26]. The residue analysis (%) shows good adjustments of the models, that is, they are distributed around the zero mean. It is observed, however, that the best adjustments were for the variables wood, total and height. Momolli et al [25] also observed greater variability of the residues for the branches, leaves and bark components.



**Figure 3 - Distribution of residues (%) as a function of DBH for the different dependent variables adjusted.**

### 3.3 Quantification of biomass

Quantifying the biomass of different eucalyptus clones in the state of Pernambuco, Brazil, Alves et al [27] found 62 mg ha<sup>-1</sup> for the *Eucalyptus tereticornis* hybrid. However, other clones were much more productive, such as the hybrid *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *E. tereticornis* x *E. pellita* with 139 mg ha<sup>-1</sup> and *Eucalyptus urophylla* natural crossing with 132 mg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The authors concluded that 70, 13, 9 and 8% of the average biomass was allocated on the stem, branches, bark and leaf respectively. The productivity among the clones for the researchers varied between 50 and 132 mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, however, the percentage allocation among the different biomass components was very similar to the present study: 71.9; 12.4; 9.4 and 6.2% for stem, branches, bark and leaf respectively.

Some factors determine the accumulation of total biomass and the different compartments. We can generally cite plant genetics and environmental variability as determinants of these variations [28].


For Viera et al [22] in a stand of *E. urophylla* x *E. globulus* at 10 years of age, the percentage of leaf + branches was 6.3%, with wood + bark accounting for 93.7%. When considering the sum of wood + bark the contribution reaches 81.3%,

while branch + leaf represents 18.6%. According to Larcher [29], during the initial phase of development of the plant the top priority is the production of canopy (leaves and branches). When the crowns are closed, competition increases, so the trunk diameter begins to increase and the participation of this component increases considerably while the crown biomass decreases.

**Table 5 - Biomass (Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in the different components in *Eucalyptus urograndis* stands at 4.5 years old.**

Biomass					
	Wood	Bark	Branch	Leaf	Total
Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>	46,84	6,14	8,10	4,04	65,12
%	71,9	9,4	12,4	6,2	100,0

Figure 4 shows the percentage allocation between the different aerial biomass components in the four diametric classes evaluated. It is observed that there was no apparent variation between the percentages of each component in the different diametric grades. Schumacher et al. [30] evaluated the percentage allocation in different stages of maturation and verified that the wood + bark participation did not reach 45% initially, however, with the advancement of age and with the increment in diameter, these indexes represent more than 85%.



**Figure 4 - Relative biomass by diameter classes in *Eucalyptus urograndis* stands at 4.5 years old.**

To assess the production of biomass in different genetic materials and eucalyptus age, Santana et al [31] find that with twelve months old, about 58% of the biomass is constituted by the tree tops. This percentage decreases as age increases, reaching 10% at 4.5 years and reducing to 7.5% at 8 years of age.

Quantifying the average of 13 *Eucalyptus urograndis* stands in the Amazon, Spangenberg et al [32] found values very similar to the present study 68,9; 10.5; 17.6 and 3% for wood, bark, branch and leaf respectively. These findings are compatible with the percentages found for the present study.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The modeling of the biomass showed excellent coefficients of adjustments and low relative errors. Through the graphical distribution of the residues, we conclude that there is no overestimation or underestimation of the estimated biomass.

The total biomass estimated was 65 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, being constituted mainly by the wood component with 72%. The volume of bark was 172 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>, representing an average annual increase of 38 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>.



## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. IBÁ - Indústria Brasileira de Árvores. (2017). Relatório anual 2017: ano base 2016. 80p. Portuguese.
2. Assis, CO, Trugilho, PF, Goulart, SL, Assis, MR, Bianchi, ML. (2018). Efeito da Aplicação de Nitrogênio na Produção e Qualidade da Madeira e Carvão Vegetal de um Híbrido de *Eucalyptus grandis* x *Eucalyptus urophylla*. *Floresta e Ambiente*, 25(1), e00117914.
3. Castro CAO. et al. Brief history of *Eucalyptus* breeding in Brazil under perspective of biometric advances. *Ciência Rural*, 2016;46(9), 1585-1593.
4. Farine D. et al. An assessment of biomass for bioelectricity and biofuel, and for greenhouse gas emission reduction in Australia. *Global Change Biol. Bioenergy*, 2012;4, 148–175.
5. Scarlat N, Dallemand JF, Banja M. Possible impact of 2020 bioenergy targets on European Union land use. A scenario-based assessment from national renewable energy action plans proposals. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev*, 2013;18, 595–606.
6. Achat, D. L., Deleuze, C., Landmann, G., Pousse, N., Ranger, J., & Augusto, L. (2015). Quantifying consequences of removing harvesting residues on forest soils and tree growth – A meta-analysis. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 348, 124–141. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.03.042
7. Mendham, D. S., Ogden, G. N., Short, T., O'Connell, T. M., Grove, T. S., & Rance, S. J. (2014). Repeated harvest residue removal reduces *E. globulus* productivity in the 3rd rotation in south-western Australia. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 329, 279–286. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2014.06.033
8. Chave J. et al. Tree allometry and improved estimation of carbon stocks and balance in tropical forests. *Oecologia*, v. 145, n. 1, p. 87–99, 2005.
9. Sales FCV et al. Ajustes de modelos volumétricos para o clone *Eucalyptus grandis* x *E. urophylla* cultivados no agreste de pernambuco. *Floresta*. 2015;45(4):663–670.
10. Winck RA et al. Modelos predictivos de biomasa aérea de *Eucalyptus grandis* para el noreste de argentina. *Ciência Florestal*. 2015;25(3):595–606.
11. Qureshi A, et al. A review of protocols used for assessment of carbon stock in forested landscapes. *Environmental Science and Policy*. 2012; 16: 81-89.
12. Mcleod AI, Parsimony model adequacy and periodic correlation in time series forecasting. *Internat. Stat. Rev*. 1993;61:387–393.
13. Ribeiro SC et al. Above-and belowground biomass in a brazilian cerrado. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 2011; 262 (3): 491-499,
14. Fonseca-G W, Alice-G F, Rey-BB JM. Modelos para estimar la biomasa de especies nativas en plantaciones y bosques secundarios en la zona caribe de costa rica. *Bosque*. 2009;30(1):36–47.
15. SBCS-CQFS – Sociedade Brasileira de Ciência do Solo-Comissão de Química e Fertilidade do Solo – RS/SC. Manual de calagem e adubação para os Estados do Rio Grande do Sul e de Santa Catarina. 11ª ed. Solo – Núcleo Regional Sul. Porto Alegre. 2016, 376 p.
16. Alvares CA, Stape JL, Sentelhas PC, Gonçalves JLM, Sparovek G, Köppen's climate classification map for Brazil. *MeteorologischeZeitschrift*. 2014; 22 (6): 711-728.

- 280 17. AGRITEMPO (2019). Weather data - Santiago-RS. Campinas, 2019. Available: <<http://www.agritempo.gov.br>>. Accessed: Feb 14 2019. Portuguese.
- 282 18. UTHSCSA ImageTool Version 3.0 Final [Internet]. [cited 2019 03 Mar]. Available from: [http://en.bio-](http://en.bio-soft.net/draw/ImageTool.html)  
283 [soft.net/draw/ImageTool.html](http://en.bio-soft.net/draw/ImageTool.html)
- 284 19. IBM Corp. Released (2011). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 20.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
- 285 20. Finger CAG. Fundamentos de biometria florestal. Santa Maria: UFSM/CEPEF/FATEC, 1992. 269 p.
- 286 21. Neto SBM, et al. Distribuição diamétrica e altimétrica do híbrido *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *Eucalyptus grandis* em  
287 Sistema agrossilvipastoril. Bol. Pesq. e Desenv. Embrapa Cerrados. 2014; 26p.
- 288 22. Viera M, Schumacher MV, Trüby P, Araújo EF. Biomassa e nutrientes em um povoamento de *Eucalyptus urophylla* x  
289 *Eucalyptus globulus*, em Eldorado do Sul-RS. Ecologia e Nutrição Florestal. 2013;1(1):1-13.
- 290 23. Paiva YG. Estimativa do índice de área foliar por métodos óticos e sensoriamento remoto para calibrar modelo  
291 ecofisiológico em plantios de eucalipto em áreas de relevo ondulado [dissertação]. Viçosa: Universidade Federal de  
292 Viçosa; 2009. 62 p
- 293 24. Almeida AQ, Ribeiro A, Delgado RC, Rody YP, Oliveira AS, Leite FP. Índice de Área Foliar de *Eucalyptus* Estimado  
294 por Índices de Vegetação Utilizando Imagens TM - Landsat 5. Floresta e Ambiente. 2015;22(3):368-376.
- 295 25. Momolli DR. et al. Modeling and biomass quantification in *Eucalyptus saligna* Smith stand at the end rotation in the  
296 south of Brazil. Journal of Experimental Agriculture International. 2019 *in print*.
- 297 26. Paula GA. Modelos de Regressão: com apoio computacional. São Paulo: IME/USP, 2004.
- 298 27. Alves AMC, Silva JAA, Ferreira RLC, Barreto LP. Quantificação da produção de biomassa em clones de eucaliptos  
299 com 4,5 anos, no polo gesseiro do Araripe-PE. Ver. Ciên. Agrá. 2007;48:161-173.
- 300 28. Barnes BV, et al. Forest ecology. 4 ed. New York. John Wiley and Sons Inc. 1998. 704p.
- 301 29. Larcher, W. Ecofisiologia vegetal. São Carlos: RiMA Artes e Textos, 2000. 531p.
- 302 30. Schumacher MV, Witschorek R, Calil FN. Biomassa em povoamentos de *Eucalyptus* spp. de pequenas propriedades  
303 rurais em Vera Cruz, RS. Ciência Florestal. 2011;21(1):17-22.
- 304 31. Santana et al. Estimativa de biomassa de plantios de eucalipto no Brasil. Revista Árvore, 32(4):697-706, 2008.
- 305 32. Spangenberg A, et al. Nutrient store and export rates of *Eucalyptus urograndis* plantations in eastern Amazonia (Jari).  
306 Forest Ecology and Management, 1996;80(1-3): 225–234,.
- 307