

Effects of Fertilization in Biomass and Nutrients of *Eucalyptus urophylla* S.T. Blake in Arenized Soil on Pampa Biome: Macronutrients

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to quantify the biomass and the macronutrient stock in an experiment of fertilization with *Eucalyptus urophylla*, implanted in arenized soil at 12 months old, in the city of Maçambará - Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil. The experiment had a completely randomized design with five treatments (T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5) from different sources and fertilization rates, with three replications. For the determination of the biomass, fifteen trees were felling based on the diametric variation of the stand and separated in the following components: leaves, branches, stem bark, stem wood and roots. Were collected samples of the components and forwarded to the laboratory for dry mass determination and chemical analysis. The total biomass have varied between the different treatments, the highest accumulation of biomass was verified for T5 with 6.82 Mg ha^{-1} and the lowest production was observed in T3 with accumulation of 4.13 Mg ha^{-1} . The T1 presented the highest biomass in the roots, 33.4% of the biomass total. K was the element that presented the highest accumulation in the total biomass in all treatments. In T 5 was observed the highest amount (51.68 kg ha^{-1}) and in T1 the lowest (26.97 kg ha^{-1}). The highest amounts of nutrients followed the distribution in descending order: leaves > roots > stem wood > branches > stem bark. Fertilization influenced the biomass production of *Eucalyptus urophylla* in arenized soil in the Pampa biome, but without significant differences to date (12 months). The leaves present the highest concentration of macronutrients, with the exception of Ca, which has a higher concentration in the bark. The K was the element that presented highest accumulation in the biomass *Eucalyptus urophylla*.

Keywords: forest nutrition, forest production, sandy soil, nutrient doses

1. INTRODUCTION

The Pampa biome has an area of approximately 700 thousand km^2 , present in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay [1]. In Brazil, the Pampa is restricted to the state of Rio Grande do Sul, where it occupies an area of 176,496 km^2 , corresponding to 63% of the state territory and 2.07% of the Brazilian territory [2].

In the west of Rio Grande do Sul, there are areas with intense degradation caused by the arenization process [3]. Arenization, a morphogenic process of arenized soil formation, can

be one of the most intense environmental degradation scenarios in the Pampa biome region [4].

The first works for recover the arenized soils started from the Department of Agriculture of the State of Rio Grande do Sul, through a pilot project installed in the city of Alegrete, with which it was possible to identify that eucalyptus was the species that best suited the arenized soils [5]. However, the arenized soils present very low natural fertility and require chemical supplementation, through fertilization, to enable the implantation of forest stands.

Fertilization should maximize productivity with minimal investment and no negative impacts on the environment [6]. For this, the quantification of biomass and the allocation of nutrients in the different tree components of forest stands are essential for understanding the nutritional balance of the site [7] [8], especially for definitions of sustainable management.

The nutrient requirement of the species and the soil properties are useful information to adjust the fertilization regimes specific to the site, especially when it aims to maintain the nutrient stock in the soil along the rotations [9]. Silva et al. [6] mentions how difficult it is to establish fertilization regimes in sandy soils with low nutrient retention and high hydraulic conductivity, since they are highly susceptible to nutrient leaching and present risks of nutrient loss through deep drainage in this type of soil.

The objective of this study was to verify the effect of fertilization on the production of biomass and stock of macronutrients of *Eucalyptus urophylla*, at 12 months old, established in arenized soil in the Pampa biome.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Characterization of the experimental area

The experiment was conducted in the municipality of Maçambará, western region of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, with geographic coordinates 29° 02' 32.67" S and 55° 19' 40.44" W.

According to Köppen classification the climate in the municipality of Maçambará - RS is of the type Cfa (humid temperate climate). The average annual rainfall is 1628 mm, the average annual temperature is 20.7 °C, while the average of the coldest month is 15.5 °C and the average of the hottest month is 26.3 °C. In winter, negative temperatures and frost formation occur [10].

The soil of the experimental area is characterized as sandy (composed of more than 80% of coarse sand), of low natural fertility, with very low organic matter content and levels below that recommended for all elements analyzed (Table 1). The soil profile presented homogeneity of the attributes analyzed between the different depths and did not present any active biological activity in the soil, nor was to the presence of roots (live or dead).

Table 1. Physical-chemical attributes of the soil in the area of the experiment with *Eucalyptus urophylla* in arenized nucleus in the Pampa biome

Attribute	Unit	Depth (cm)									
		0 20	20 40	40 60	60 80	80 100	100 120	120 140	140 160	160 180	180 200
SD	g cm ⁻³	2.1	2.3	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.6

CS		88.0	88.3	86.0	81.3	82.3	84.0	77.6	81.0	84.0	82.0
FS		3.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	1.6	2.7	4.3	5.4	3.3	3.4
Silt	%	1.0	1.6	1.0	3.0	4.7	2.6	6.0	2.3	1.4	3.3
Clay		8.0	6.6	10.0	11.6	11.3	10.6	12.0	11.3	11.3	11.3
O.M.		0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
pH	1:2,5 H ₂ O	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6
Al		0.7	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9	1.0
Ca	cmol _c dm ⁻³	0.2	0.1	0.1	<0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	<0.1	0.1	<0.1
Mg		0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
P ^a	mg dm ⁻³	4.6	3.4	2.3	2.9	3.5	4.3	5.0	6.9	7.3	6.9
K ^a		13.3	12.7	14.8	13.8	14.1	14.0	13.3	14.5	13.5	13.3
CECef	cmol _c dm ⁻³	0.9	0.7	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.1
CECpH ₇		2.6	2.9	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7
V	%	7.7	4.6	4.6	3.2	4.9	5.1	3.7	2.6	2.9	2.5
m		77.2	82.1	81.7	87.0	82.9	82.3	86.1	90.4	88.6	91.3
S		3.9	10.1	13.9	15.6	15.9	14.4	14.6	7.0	8.9	7.7
B	mg dm ⁻³	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
Cu		0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.4
Zn		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1

Where: SD = soil density; CS = coarse sand; FS = fine sand; O.M = organic matter; CEC = cation exchange capacity; m = aluminum saturation; V = base saturation. ^aExtraction method Melich I.

For the installation of the experiment realized the ant control activities in the areas surrounding the arenized soil, subsoiling, planting and replanting. The subsoiling was performed using subsoiler with a shank 30 cm deep. The planting was done manually, using clonal seedlings of *Eucalyptus urophylla*, spacing 3.0 m x 2.0 m.

The experiment was conducted in completely randomized design with five treatments, containing three replicates for each treatment. Each plot has 60 m x 30 m, with 300 trees, and the effective plot (excluding double border) is composed of 143 trees.

The treatments received different sources and doses of fertilization (Table 2). The treatments T2, T3, T4 and T5, received increasing doses of triple superphosphate, ranging from 112.5 - 225 kg ha⁻¹. On the other hand, the T1 treatment was the only one to receive natural phosphate in planting. The dosages of triple superphosphate and natural phosphate were application in planting for all treatments.

Fertilizers were used in a varied way among treatments, the only equal dosages were for dolomitic limestone, where all received 2 Mg ha⁻¹, and a fertilization with 150 kg ha⁻¹ of K₂O, for all treatments, in the form of potassium chloride 30 days after planting.

Table 2. Description of the nutrients used in the experiment with *Eucalyptus urophylla*, in arenized soil in the Pampa biome.

Fertilization	Days after planting	Fertilizer	Amount of fertilizer applied (g plant ⁻¹)				
			T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5
Planting	0	Superphosphate	-	150	200	250	300
		Natural phosphate	250	-	-	-	-

1 st After Planting	30	NPK 06-30-06	60	65	72	85	96
		Potassium chloride	165	165	165	165	165
2 nd After Planting	75	NPK 22-00-18	66	72	84	96	108
3 rd After Planting	120	NPK 22-00-18	66	72	84	96	108
		NPK 10-25-25	-	-	-	-	137
4 th After Planting	180	NPK 06-30-06	-	66	-	-	-
		FTE BR ^a	-	48	66	84	102
5 th After Planting	300	NPK 06-30-06	-	30	36	42	48
		NPK 22-00-18	-	30	36	42	48
		FTE BR ^a	-	30	36	42	48
6 th After Planting	420	NPK 06-30-06	-	30	36	42	48
		NPK 22-00-18	-	30	36	42	48
		FTE BR ^a	-	30	36	42	48

^aFTE BR = constituted by Calcium (7.1%), Sulfur (5.7%), Boron (1.8%), Copper (0.8%), Manganese (2.0%), Molybdenum (1.0%) and Zinc (9.0%).

2.2 Biomass

Through the inventory data, the average diameter tree of each of the plots for biomass determination was selected. The selected tree was separated in the following components: leaves; branches; stem bark and stem wood. The root system of the trees was removed by manual excavation of the useful area of each tree (6 m²), up to 1 meter deep.

All components were weighed individually on a table scale to obtain the total wet mass in the field. Afterwards, 150 g wet mass sample was collected from each component, was placed in paper packaging, duly identified and sent to the laboratory. The samples were submitted to drying in a circulation oven and air renewal at 70 °C for 72 hours to determine the dry mass.

2.3 Nutrients

After weighing, the samples were ground in a Wiley type mill with 20 mesh sieve and sent to the chemical analysis, were determined where the macronutrients (N, P, K, Ca, Mg and S). Nitrogen was determined by the Kjeldahl method (sulfur digestion = H₂SO₄ + H₂O₂). Phosphorus and boron by spectrophotometry (P by nitric-perchloric digestion and B by dry digestion). Potassium by flame photometry, sulfur by turbidimetry and calcium, magnesium, copper, iron, manganese and zinc by atomic absorption spectrometry (all by nitric-perchloric digestion), following the methodology described by Tedesco et al. [11] and Miyazawa et al. [12].

The amount of nutrients in each of the components of the trees was obtained through the product between the biomass and the concentration of nutrients. The estimate of the nutrient stock in the biomass per hectare was performed by extrapolating the stock of nutrients based on the area sampled.

2.4 Statistical analysis

The results were statistically analyzed through the SAS for Windows [13] package, using the Tukey test at the 0.05 error probability level, considering the completely randomized design, where each sampled tree corresponded to one repetition, for each component of the biomass studied.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Biomass

The biomass components do not present statistical difference for the different treatments evaluated (Table 3). However, evaluating the management of fertilizers in eucalyptus plantations in sandy soil in Brazil, Silva et al. [6] concluded that eucalyptus responds positively to increased fertilizer doses, resulting in higher productivity.

Table 3. Distribution of biomass in the different components of *Eucalyptus urophylla*, at 12 months of age, in arenized soil in the Pampa biome

Components	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5
	Mg ha ⁻¹				
Leaves	1.02 a	1.13 a	1.14 a	1.45 a	1.58 a
Branches	0.68 a	0.79 a	0.71 a	1.24 a	1.12 a
Stem bark	0.24 a	0.31 a	0.29 a	0.34 a	0.39 a
Stem wood	0.96 a	1.45 a	1.39 a	1.59 a	1.81 a
Roots	1.45 a	1.44 a	1.30 a	1.26 a	1.92 a
Total	4.35 a	5.13 a	4.84 a	5.87 a	6.83 a

Where: Different horizontal letters indicate significant differences between the biomass distribution in the different treatments, at the 0.05 level of significance, by the Tukey test.

The highest value of biomass was found in Treatment 5 with 6.82 Mg ha⁻¹ (treatment with higher doses of fertilizers) and the lowest value observed for T1 (treatment with lower dose of fertilizer), with 4.35 Mg ha⁻¹, which represents a 36.8% difference between treatments (Table 3). The production of above-ground biomass found by Schumacher & Caldeira [14] and Gatto et al. [15] for *Eucalyptus globulus* subspecies *maidenii* and *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *Eucalyptus grandis* was 83.2 Mg ha⁻¹ and 74.5 Mg ha⁻¹, respectively. Both studies with stand at 4 years of age.

The biomass distribution among the different components, it was observed that the following decreasing order: roots > stem wood > leaves > branches > stem bark, presented predominance among the different treatments (Figure 1). The higher biomass share of the stem wood component was observed for T3 with 28.8% of the total biomass. The lowest percentage was observed for T1 with 22.0%, which also presented the highest amount of biomass in the roots, with 33.4% of the total biomass.




Figure 1. Relative biomass distribution in the different components of *Eucalyptus urophylla*, at 12 months of age, in arenized soil in the Pampa biome

Similar results were observed by Viera et al. [16], when studying a stand of *Eucalyptus urograndis*, at 18 months, established in Neosol, with above-ground biomass of 18.5 Mg ha⁻¹, the wood com the component with the highest biomass (37.0%), followed by branches (34.2%), leaves (21.3%) and bark (7.6%).

The order of distribution of the biomass of *Eucalyptus dunnii*, four years old, also in the Pampa biome, presented by Guimarães et al. [17] was of stem wood (63%) > roots (14%) > branches (11%) > stem bark (8%) > leaves (4%), with total biomass of 121.9 Mg ha⁻¹. The difference of the results is explained by the stand in study being in an early stage of development (12 months of age) with a tendency of accumulation of biomass in the crown (leaves + branches).

In the Pampa biome, in the same region of the present study, a clonal stand of *Eucalyptus saligna*, four years old, showed above-ground biomass production at 88.81 Mg ha⁻¹, 76.8% being composed of the wood component, 9.3% bark, 7.9% branches and 6.0% leaves [18]. In *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *Eucalyptus grandis* stands, at 4.5 years of age, Carvalho et al. [19] observed a total biomass production of 74.94 Mg ha⁻¹, distributed in the following decreasing sequence: stem wood (61.2%) > roots (15.4%) > branches (10.2%) > stem bark (7.7%) > leaves (5.5%).

Genetic, environmental and silvicultural factors directly influence the productive capacity of plantations. However, for Barros & Comerford [20], soil type and nutritional availability are the main factors influencing production in forest plantations. This stand explains the low biomass production of the present study when compared to the other studies, which is due to the very low fertility of the arenized soil, as presented in Table 1.

Considering the results obtained in other biomass studies on the genus *Eucalyptus*, it can be seen that the values obtained in the present study are below, but close to those observed in sandy soils in the same region. However, plantations with the genus *Eucalyptus* in the sandstone cores of the Pampa biome, besides presenting biomass accumulation that makes forest production feasible, contributes to the soil cover, helping to soften the erosive processes that accelerate the arenized soil.

3.2 Nutrients

The leaves, the organ with the highest metabolic activity in the tree (photosynthesis and transpiration), present the highest concentration of macronutrients when compared to the other components, with the exception of Ca with the highest concentration in the bark (Table 4). This predominance of nutrient concentration in leaves, with the exception of Ca, was also observed by several authors in studies with species of the genus *Eucalyptus* [16] [19] [21].

O P and S were the only elements that presented differences ($P = .05$) between treatments, being found in treatment 1 the lowest concentration of P in leaves (compared to T2 and T3) and in stem bark (compared to T5) and S in the stem bark in relation to T4 and T5.

Table 4. Macronutrients concentration in the tree components of the different treatments with *Eucalyptus urophylla*, at 12 months old, in arenized soil in the Pampa biome

Treatment	Components	N	P	K	Ca	Mg	S
g kg ⁻¹							
T1	Leaves	15.75 a	0.84 b	8.61 a	5.04 a	1.90 a	1.07 a
	Branches	2.07 a	0.30 a	5.67 a	3.56 a	0.69 a	0.34 a
	Stem bark	2.65 a	0.33 b	7.82 a	8.26 a	1.24 a	0.31 b
	Stem wood	0.69 a	0.21 a	5.30 a	0.60 a	0.39 a	0.35 a
	Roots	2.58 a	0.29 a	5.11 a	2.94 a	0.61 a	0.45 a
T2	Leaves	18.69 a	1.30 a	12.39 a	6.45 a	2.12 a	1.28 a
	Branches	2.61 a	1.02 a	6.27 a	5.10 a	0.77 a	0.39 a
	Stem bark	3.16 a	0.47 ab	11.03 a	6.85 a	1.47 a	0.38 ab
	Stem wood	1.17 a	0.57 a	6.89 a	0.79 a	0.48 a	0.16 b
	Roots	1.52 a	0.27 a	5.68 a	4.22 a	1.13 a	0.39 a
T3	Leaves	18.59 a	1.39 a	9.82 a	6.21 a	2.01 a	1.41 a
	Branches	3.71 a	1.32 a	8.14 a	4.42 a	0.89 a	0.44 a
	Stem bark	2.42 a	0.47 ab	8.16 a	6.05 a	1.16 a	0.38 ab
	Stem wood	0.62 a	0.62 a	6.44 a	0.89 a	0.45 a	0.38 a
	Roots	1.81 a	0.31 a	4.67 a	3.64 a	0.75 a	0.43 a
T4	Leaves	17.10 a	1.02 ab	8.61 a	7.03 a	1.89 a	1.09 a
	Branches	2.66 a	0.63 a	4.73 a	2.88 a	0.55 a	0.44 a
	Stem bark	2.97 a	0.51 ab	7.91 a	8.26 a	1.26 a	0.45 a
	Stem wood	0.68 a	0.45 a	6.20 a	0.87 a	0.47 a	0.36 a
	Roots	1.42 a	0.34 a	5.09 a	3.82 a	1.27 a	0.56 a
T5	Leaves	16.44 a	1.19 ab	9.56 a	6.46 a	1.76 a	1.07 a
	Branches	3.70 a	1.20 a	8.02 a	3.41 a	0.72 a	0.44 a
	Stem bark	3.36 a	0.60 a	10.44 a	6.40 a	1.22 a	0.43 a
	Stem wood	1.82 a	0.69 a	7.67 a	0.83 a	0.50 a	0.38 a
	Roots	2.45 a	0.36 a	5.01 a	3.30 a	0.70 a	0.49 a

Where: Equal vertically letters do not differ statistically between treatments, at the 0.05 level of significance, by Tukey's test.

Considering an average of all the components of the biomass, of the different treatments, the concentration of nutrients presented the following trend $K > N > Ca > Mg > P > S$. Different from the order obtained by Guimarães et al. [17] in *Eucalyptus dunnii*, at four years old, also in the Pampa biome ($Ca > N > K > Mg > S > P$).

The concentration of nutrients in the different components of the biomass followed a distribution in the order: leaves > stem bark > branches > roots > stem wood for all the

233 treatments. The observed sequence was similar to that found by Guimarães et al. [17] with
 234 *Eucalyptus dun nii*, at four years old and Viera et al. [16] with *Eucalyptus urograndis*, at 18
 235 months old.

236
 237 Analyzing the amount of macronutrients present in the biomass, K was the element that
 238 presented the highest value in all treatments. In the treatment 5, K accumulated 51.68 kg ha⁻¹
 239 and the smallest accumulated amount was observed in T1 with 26.97 kg ha⁻¹ (Table 5).
 240

241 **Table 5. Amount of macronutrients in the components of Eucalyptus urophylla trees,**
 242 **at 12 months old, in arenized soil in the Pampa biome**

Treatment	Components	N	P	K	Ca	Mg	S
		kg ha ⁻¹					
T1	Leaves	16.06	0.85	8.78	5.14	1.94	1.09
	Branches	1.42	0.20	3.88	2.44	0.47	0.23
	Stem bark	0.63	0.08	1.84	1.95	0.29	0.07
	Stem wood	0.66	0.20	5.06	0.58	0.37	0.34
	Roots	3.74	0.42	7.41	4.27	0.88	0.65
	Total	22.51	1.76	26.97	14.36	3.96	2.39
T2	Leaves	21.18	1.47	14.05	7.31	2.41	1.45
	Branches	2.07	0.81	4.95	4.03	0.61	0.31
	Stem bark	0.99	0.15	3.46	2.15	0.46	0.12
	Stem wood	1.71	0.83	10.01	1.14	0.70	0.24
	Roots	2.19	0.39	8.17	6.07	1.62	0.56
	Total	28.14	3.65	40.64	20.69	5.79	2.67
T3	Leaves	21.17	1.58	11.18	7.07	2.28	1.61
	Branches	2.62	0.93	5.75	3.12	0.63	0.31
	Stem bark	0.71	0.14	2.39	1.77	0.34	0.11
	Stem wood	0.86	0.87	8.98	1.24	0.63	0.53
	Roots	2.37	0.40	6.10	4.75	0.97	0.56
	Total	27.73	3.92	34.40	17.96	4.86	3.12
T 4	Leaves	24.78	1.48	12.48	10.19	2.73	1.59
	Branches	3.31	0.79	5.88	3.58	0.69	0.55
	Stem bark	1.01	0.17	2.65	2.77	0.42	0.15
	Stem wood	1.08	0.71	9.83	1.37	0.74	0.57
	Roots	1.78	0.43	6.40	4.80	1.60	0.71
	Total	31.96	3.57	37.25	22.71	6.18	3.57
T 5	Leaves	26.01	1.88	15.11	10.21	2.78	1.70
	Branches	4.15	1.34	8.98	3.82	0.81	0.50
	Stem bark	1.32	0.23	4.09	2.51	0.48	0.17
	Stem wood	3.29	1.24	13.87	1.51	0.91	0.70
	Roots	4.71	0.68	9.63	6.36	1.35	0.94
	Total	39.48	5.38	51.68	24.40	6.32	4.00

243
 244 The highest amounts of nutrients among the different components followed the distribution in
 245 descending order: leaves > roots > stem wood > branches > stem bark. Viera et al. [16]

observed that the branches presented highest accumulation of nutrients than the wood, changing the sequence of accumulation for leaves > branches > wood > bark.

The same tendency of accumulation of nutrients, following the decreasing order of accumulation: K > N > Ca > Mg > P > S, were observed in all treatments. Distinct from the the sequence observed by Guimarães et al. [17] with *Eucalyptus dunnii* (Ca > N > K > Mg > P > S), and Viera et al. [16] and Carvalho et al. [19] with *Eucalyptus urograndis* (Ca > N > K > Mg > P > S and Ca > K > N > Mg > S > P, respectively). As the amount of nutrients is directly related to the biomass, the difference between the studies, mainly for Ca, can be explained by the low biomass of the components that present the highest concentration of this element (bark), compared to other studies.

4. CONCLUSION

Fertilization influenced the biomass production of *Eucalyptus urophylla* in arenized soil in the Pampa biome, but without significant differences to date (12 months).

The leaves present the highest concentration of macronutrients, with the exception of Ca, which has a higher concentration in the stem bark.

The K was the element that presented highest accumulation in the biomass *Eucalyptus urophylla* in arenized soil in the Pampa biome, independent of the fertilization management.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. MMA. Ministry of the Environment. Priority areas for conservation, sustainable use and sharing of benefits of Brazilian Biodiversity. 1st ed. Brasília: Ministry of the Environment / Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forests; 2007.
2. IBGE. Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics. Map of Biomes and Vegetation of Brazil. 2004. Accessed 08 August 2017. Available: <http://www.ibge.gov.br/home/presidencia/noticias/21052004biomashtml.shtm>
3. Souza AC, Pires CAF. Dynamics of arenization in the Arroio Puitã basin, west of RS, through multitemporal mapping from 1984 to 2014. *Revista Brasileira de Geomorfologia*. 2017; 18 (1): 185-196. English. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20502/rbg.v18i1.1051>
4. Bertê AMA. Environmental problems in Rio Grande do Sul. In: Verдум R, Basso LA, Suertegaray DMA, editors. Rio Grande do Sul: landscapes and territories in transformation. Porto Alegre: UFRGS; 2004.
5. Souto JJ. Desert a threat? Porto Alegre: Secretary of Agriculture; 1984.

- 297 6. Silva PHM, Poggiani F, Libardi PL, Gonçalves AN. Fertilizer management of eucalypt
298 plantations on sandy soil in Brazil: Initial growth and nutrient cycling. *Forest Ecology and*
299 *Management*. 2013; 301 (1): 67-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2012.10.033>
300
- 301 7. Viera M, Schumacher MV, Trüby P, Araújo EF. Nutritional implications based on different
302 biomass harvesting intensities of *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *Eucalyptus globulus*. *Rural Science*.
303 2015; 45 (3): 432-439. English. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0103-8478cr20120367>
304
- 305 8. Schumacher MV, Witschorek R, Calil FN. Biomass in stands of *Eucalyptus* spp. of small
306 rural properties in Vera Cruz, RS. *Forest Science*. 2011; 21 (1): 17-22. English.
307 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5902/198050982743>
308
- 309 9. Laclau JP, Ranger J, Gonçalves JLM, Maquère V, Krusche, AV, M'Bou AT, et al.
310 Biogeochemical cycles of nutrients in tropical *Eucalyptus* plantations: main features shown
311 by intensive monitoring in Congo and Brazil. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 2010;259(9):
312 1771-1785. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.06.010>
313
- 314 10. Matzenauer R, Radin B, Almeida IR. Climate Atlas of Rio Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre.
315 Secretary of Agriculture, Livestock and Agribusiness; State Foundation for Agricultural
316 Research (FEPAGRO); 2011. English.
317
- 318 11. Tedesco MJ, Ginello C, Bissani CA, Bohnen H, Volkweiss SJ. Analysis of soil, plants and
319 other materials. 2nd ed. Porto Alegre: UFRGS; 1995. English.
320
- 321 12. Miyazawa M, Pavan MA, Muraoka T, Carmo CAFS, Melo WJ. Chemical analysis of plant
322 tissue. In: Silva FC, editor. Manual of chemical analyzes of soils, plants and fertilizers. 2nd
323 ed. Brasília: Embrapa; 2009. English.
324
- 325 13. SAS. Statistical analysis system: Computer program, VM environment Version 6.08.
326 Cary; 2003.
327
- 328 14. Schumacher MV, Boiler MVW. Estimation of biomass and nutrient content of a
329 *Eucalyptus globulus* (Labillardière) sub-species maidenii. *Forest Science*. 2001; 11 (1): 45-
330 53. English. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5902/19805098494>.
331
- 332 15. Gatto A, Bussinguer AP, Ribeiro FC, Azevedo GB, Bueno MC, Monteiro MM, et al. Cycle
333 and nutrient balance in the soil-plant system in a plantation of *Eucalyptus* sp. in the Federal
334 District. *Brazilian Journal of Soil Science*. 2014; 38 (3): 879-887.
335 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-06832014000300019>
336
- 337 16. Viera MV, Bonacina DM, Schumacher MV, Calil FN, Boiler MVW, Watzlawick LF.
338 Biomass and nutrients in *Eucalyptus urograndis* stands in the Serra do Sudeste-RS.
339 *Semina: Agrarian Sciences*. 2012; 33 (1): 2481-2490. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5433/1679-0359.2012v33Supl1p2481>
340
- 341 17. Guimarães CC, Schumacher MV, Witshoreck R, Souza HP, Santos JC, Vieira FCB.
342 Biomass and nutrients in *Eucalyptus dunnii* Maiden stands in Pampa Gaúcho. *Tree Review*.
343 2015; 39 (5): 873-882. English. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0100-67622015000500010>
344
- 345 18. Beulch LS. Biomass and nutrients in a stand of *Eucalyptus saligna* Smith submitted to
346 the first thinning [dissertation]. Santa Maria, RS: Federal University of Santa Maria, 2013.
347 English.
348
349

- 350 19. Carvalho RR, Guimarães CC, Silva JCM, Momolli DR. Biomass and nutrient stocks in a
351 hybrid *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *Eucalyptus grandis* hybrid in the Pampa Biome - RS. *Revista*
352 *Ecologia e Nutrição Florestal*. 2016; 3 (3): 71-81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5902/2316980X18275>.
353
354 20. Barros NF, Comerford NB. Sustainability of the production of planted forests in the
355 tropical region. In: Alvarez VVH et al. editors. *Topics in soil science*. Viçosa: Brazilian
356 Society of Soil Science; 2002. English.
357
358 21. Frantz BC. Biomass and nutrient stock in *Eucalyptus urophylla* x *Eucalyptus grandis* in
359 sandstone area of Pampa biome - RS [dissertation]. Santa Maria, RS: Federal University of
360 Santa Maria, 2016. Portuguese.
361