



**HAL**  
open science

## Effects of light level, time of harvest and position within field on variability of tissue nitrate concentration in commercial crops of lettuce (*Lactuca sativa*) and endive (*Cichorium endiva*)

Richard Mark Weightman, Chris Dyer, John Buxton, Derek Farrington

### ► To cite this version:

Richard Mark Weightman, Chris Dyer, John Buxton, Derek Farrington. Effects of light level, time of harvest and position within field on variability of tissue nitrate concentration in commercial crops of lettuce (*Lactuca sativa*) and endive (*Cichorium endiva*). *Food Additives and Contaminants*, 2006, 23 (05), pp.462-469. 10.1080/02652030500522606 . hal-00577580

**HAL Id: hal-00577580**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00577580>**

Submitted on 17 Mar 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**Effects of light level, time of harvest and position within field on variability of tissue nitrate concentration in commercial crops of lettuce (*Lactuca sativa*) and endive (*Cichorium endiva*)**

Journal:	<i>Food Additives and Contaminants</i>
Manuscript ID:	TFAC-2005-276.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Dec-2005
Complete List of Authors:	Weightman, Richard; ADAS UK Ltd, Centre for Sustainable Crop Management Dyer, Chris; ADAS UK Ltd, Centre for Sustainable Crop Management Buxton, John; ADAS UK Ltd, Centre for Sustainable Crop Management Farrington, Derek; Direct Laboratories Ltd
Methods/Techniques:	Survey
Additives/Contaminants:	Nitrate
Food Types:	Vegetables

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Abstract**

Seven commercial crops of lettuce and one crop of endive were sampled in order to study the variability in plant tissue nitrate concentration (TNC). Assuming that an appropriate sampling pattern was employed, 10 plants were sufficient to give an acceptable estimate of the mean TNC. Short-term shading (24-48 h) had no significant effects on mean TNC, unlike the increase in TNC known to occur following dull periods 10-14 days prior to harvest. The effect on TNC of time of day harvested was significant, but there was no obvious pattern of diurnal variation. Averaged over all experiments, the coefficient of variation for TNC was of the order of 35%. Increasing the sample size from 10 to 40 plants would only be expected to decrease the standard error of measurement of TNC from 16 to 12% of the mean, because of the underlying analytical error which would remain constant.

**Keywords:** lettuce, endive, nitrate, light, shading, variability, sampling directive, *Lactuca sativa*, *Cichorium endiva*

## Introduction

Nitrate is naturally present in all vegetables. Green, leafy vegetables for example lettuce and spinach, contain the highest concentration, and are the major source of nitrate in the diet. The European Commission has set maximum limits for levels of nitrate in lettuce and spinach (Anon. 2005). The limits for tissue nitrate concentration (TNC) in fresh lettuce are as follows (in each case values are presented for crops grown either under cover, or in the open air respectively, on a fresh weight basis): 4500 and 4000  $\text{mgNO}_3^- \text{kg}^{-1}$  for non-Iceberg type lettuces harvested from 1 October to 31 March; 3500 and 2500  $\text{mgNO}_3^- \text{kg}^{-1}$  for non-Iceberg type lettuces harvested from 1 April to 30 September; 2500 and 2000  $\text{mgNO}_3^- \text{kg}^{-1}$  for Iceberg type lettuces (harvested at any time of the year).

Currently, nitrate analysis for monitoring purposes is based on a determination made on a bulked (composite) sample of typically 10 lettuce plants (Anon. 2005). This choice of sample size is based on values found in the sampling Directive 2002/63/EC (Anon. 2002a) for the official control of pesticide residues in, and on, products of plant or animal origin. For the purposes of monitoring contaminants other than nitrate, this sample size would only apply where the unit weight is less than 250 g. This weight covers all lettuce varieties except Iceberg types, which have a higher marketable head weight (Anon. 2001) and where normally five plants or 2 kg of fresh plant tissue would be sampled (Anon. 2002a). However, the regulations pertaining to nitrate stipulate that the minimum number of units per laboratory sample is 10 for Iceberg lettuce types (Anon. 2005). One of the aims of the present study was to determine whether the present method of bulking 10 plants is adequate to provide a representative sample of lettuce, and was part of a larger study designed to provide guidance on sampling lettuce and spinach for nitrate analysis (Weightman *et al.* 2005).

1  
2  
3  
4 Before an optimum sample size can be estimated, the variance of the population must  
5 be known. However, at the outset of the study, there were no data available regarding  
6 the typical variability in TNC for commercially grown crops of lettuce, particularly  
7 outdoor crops. Moreover in designing sampling plans, it is important to understand the  
8 sources of any variability present.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 It is known that there is considerable variation in TNC in lettuce and spinach, with  
18 typically reported ranges for protected crops (i.e. crops grown under cover) of 2000 -  
19 5000 mgNO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> kg<sup>-1</sup> (mean 3300 mgNO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> kg<sup>-1</sup>) for lettuce, and 2600 - 4900 mgNO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> kg<sup>-1</sup>  
20 (mean 3900 mgNO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> kg<sup>-1</sup>) in spinach (van Eysinga 1984). Soil nitrate is known to  
21 influence TNC in lettuce (Richardson and Hardgrave 1992), and significant spatial  
22 variability in soil nitrate is known to exist in UK soils (Dampney *et al.* 1997).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Soil sampling protocols have been developed in order to address such variability  
33 (MAFF 1983), but there is relatively little information on development of plant sampling  
34 protocols (Needham and Harrod 1973; MAFF 1979). Current field sampling protocols  
35 for advisory purposes in the UK (e.g. Anon. 1991) are based on work carried out in the  
36 1940s and 1950s (Lessells 1959, 1973; Boyd and Simpson 1956). Moreover much of  
37 the data on which the earlier studies are based are not publicly available, and where  
38 documents are available, relate principally to soil rather than plant sampling.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 It has been demonstrated that winter-sown crops have generally higher TNC levels  
51 than summer crops in the same environment (Byrne *et al.* 2004), and that northern  
52 European crops have higher TNC levels than corresponding southern European crops  
53 (Anon. 2005). It is recognised that these differences can be due to both higher  
54 irradiance in summer, which tends to reduce nitrate, and also to higher growth rates  
55 which coincide with periods of high irradiance and warmer temperatures (Kanaan and  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Economakis 1992). Burns (2000) suggested that shading in the 10-14 days prior to  
5 harvest would increase TNC in glasshouse lettuce, even when best agricultural  
6 practice is being followed. Therefore, current guidelines in UK crop assurance  
7 protocols suggest that growers avoid sampling lettuce during dull weather conditions  
8 (Anon. 2002b). However, the importance of short timescale variations in irradiance  
9 (e.g. 24 - 48 h) and how much these contribute to variability in TNC at sampling, is less  
10 clear.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Before nitrate can be incorporated into amino acids, it must be reduced by the enzyme  
23 nitrate reductase (NRD) in the plant, using light generated energy directly. There is  
24 therefore a tendency for nitrate levels to decline in light, causing a diurnal rhythm as  
25 reduction takes place (Carrasco and Burrage 1992). However, in contrast, Hardgrave  
26 (1994) showed that for three glasshouse lettuce experiments (in winter, spring and  
27 summer), time of day (am or pm) had no effect on plant nitrate residues. Moreover, in  
28 two studies with lettuce (one winter and one summer), Byrne *et al.* (2004) showed that  
29 time of day (08.00, 12.00 and 16.00 h) had no significant effects on TNC. In a further  
30 growth room study by the same authors, sampling on 9 occasions through the day,  
31 there was no significant temporal trend in TNC.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 The present work reports the results of three separate studies to address sources of  
46 variability in TNC. In the first, two fields of lettuce were sampled, and TNC determined  
47 for individual lettuce heads for a relatively large sample size (60 plants). These data  
48 therefore allowed the testing of whether 10 plants would give an unbiased estimate of  
49 the mean, and also allowed assessment of the utility of various sampling patterns in the  
50 field. In the second study, the effect of short-term fluctuations in light level on TNC was  
51 investigated. The third study was carried out in order to examine the levels of TNC in  
52 lettuce through the day and to estimate their significance, in four different field  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 situations. In each of these studies, determination of TNC of individual plants enabled  
5 further statistical analysis to be carried out. Based on analysis of variance (ANOVA) the  
6 significance of the effects of shading and time of harvest could be estimated, as well as  
7 the residual error, enabling estimates to be made of the standard error.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

## 13 **Materials and methods**

### 14 *Locations of crops*

15  
16  
17 Seven commercial crops of lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.) and one crop of endive  
18 (*Cichorium endiva* L.) were studied. All crops were located in the Vale of Evesham,  
19 Worcestershire, UK. Experimental situations varied between field, glasshouse and  
20 polytunnel crops. Site and varietal details are shown in Table I. All agronomic decisions  
21 were made by the grower and represented standard commercial practice in that  
22 location. Harvest date was also decided by the grower when plants were judged to  
23 have reached marketable head weight.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36  
37 [Insert Table I about here]  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 *Experiment 1 – variability in TNC in commercial crops*

44  
45 Sixty lettuce plants were harvested at each of two commercial field sites, individually  
46 numbered according to their field positions, and measurements were made of the  
47 individual plant fresh weights and TNC levels. Two contrasting sites were chosen, with  
48 site A having more weeds and a more uneven crop than site B (based on visual  
49 assessment by the sampler), but both being representative of commercial practice. At  
50 site A, the lettuce variety was of a 'Cos' type which has long, upright leaves, and forms  
51 a loose head. At site B, an 'Iceberg' (or 'Crisphead') type of lettuce was grown, which  
52 forms a tight, crisp, white head. At both sites, plants were harvested from six adjacent  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 beds, from within a larger field area. Actual areas harvested were 480 and 60 m<sup>2</sup> at  
5  
6 sites A and B respectively.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Further analysis was carried out on the data, by retrospectively selecting 10 data points  
12  
13 from the field layout as if they had been sampled by conventional W or X shaped  
14  
15 sampling patterns. This selection was repeated twice for each sampling pattern at each  
16  
17 site.  
18  
19

20  
21 For each site, individual TNC values for 10 plants, selected from both W shaped and X  
22  
23 shaped patterns were used to calculate means, by two different methods:  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 a). An estimate of the TNC which would have been measured on a pooled/composite  
29  
30 sample of 10 lettuce heads, using a weighted mean, calculated as follows;  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 TNC of composite sample =  $(TN_1+TN_2\dots TN_{10})/(PW_1+PW_2\dots PW_{10})$ , where,  
36  
37

38  
39 TN<sub>n</sub> = amount of nitrate-N (mg) in an individual lettuce head,  
40  
41

42  
43 TN<sub>n</sub>= TNC<sub>n</sub>\*PW<sub>n</sub>/1000 for n = 1....10, and  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 TNC is tissue nitrate concentration (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>); PW is plant fresh weight (g) and n = 1 to  
49  
50 10.  
51  
52

53  
54 b). From the individual TNC values measured, the arithmetic mean, and associated  
55  
56 standard error (SE) and coefficient of variation (CV) were calculated.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 *Experiment 2 – short term effects of shading on TNC*

6  
7 The aim of this experiment was to assess the effect of short term (24 h) periods of  
8 shading on TNC in lettuce and endive crops. Differential treatments were achieved by  
9 placing shade cloth over the plants in the experimental area using the design described  
10 below. Prior to starting the experiment, the amount of light transmitted through the  
11 shade material was determined using a 'sunfleck' ceptometer (Decagon) placed above  
12 and below the shading material. The ceptometer gave an instantaneous measurement  
13 of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR), and observations of 10 repeated  
14 measurements showed that the material absorbed 85% (SD=3.1) of the incident PAR.  
15 This level of shading would be representative of incident light on a dull day, with full  
16 cloud cover.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 The experiment was repeated four times in separate commercial crops (Table I). The  
31 plants in shading treatment 1 were shaded for 24 hours, then left unshaded for the  
32 remainder of the experiment (24 – 48 h), while treatment 2 remained unshaded  
33 throughout the experiment (total duration 48 h). Ten plants were taken from each  
34 shading treatment at each of two harvests, either (a) after 24 h, or (b) after 48 h.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 At each site, there were four replicates of each treatment, arranged within the  
44 commercial crop, and 40 plants were harvested in total (10 plants for each shading x  
45 harvest treatment combination). Plants were weighed and then frozen prior to nitrate  
46 analysis.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to estimate the significance of the various  
54 treatment effects and to partition the total variance, thereby allowing assessment of the  
55 magnitude of the residual variation (or residual error). The treatments were studied in a  
56 fully factorial design and the results subjected to ANOVA, where the main treatment  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 effects (shading and harvest timing each with 1 df) and their interactions (each with 1  
5  
6 df) were compared to the residual error (df=36).  
7  
8  
9

### 10 *Experiment 3 – magnitude of diurnal variation in TNC*

11  
12 Plants from commercially grown crops of lettuce were harvested from two sites each  
13  
14 (Table I). Samples were harvested over a 24 h period on six occasions, at 3 h intervals  
15  
16 (times; 07.00, 10.00, 13.00, 16.00, 19.00 and 22.00 h). On the day prior to sampling,  
17  
18 60 plants were numbered in the field, and randomly sampled the following day. At each  
19  
20 sampling occasion, 10 plants were harvested, plant fresh weights were recorded, and  
21  
22 individual plants bagged and frozen, prior to analysis.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Each data set was analysed separately by ANOVA in order to assess the significance  
29  
30 of time of harvest during the day, assuming that each timing had equal variance. The  
31  
32 main treatment effect (harvest timing with 5 df) was tested for significance against the  
33  
34 residual error (variation between plants within harvests; 54 df).  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 *Analytical methodology*

40  
41 Tissue nitrate concentration was determined using high performance liquid  
42  
43 chromatography with UV detection, following hot water extraction of nitrate from the  
44  
45 plant tissue. The method was reported by Farrington (2001) based on British Standard  
46  
47 BS EN 12014-2: 1997, and meets the requirements of EC document VI/4800/96 and  
48  
49 Council Directive 93/99. The relative repeatability of the method, estimated from  
50  
51 duplicate analyses was 10.5%.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Results and discussion

### *Experiment 1*

Appreciable variability in lettuce head weights was measured within a site. Reinink and Eenink (1988) examined diverse genotypes of lettuce and found significant differences in TNC, although they noted that these were confounded with differences in plant weight between varieties. Smaller lettuce plants tend to have higher TNC levels. However, in the present study, sorting data on the basis of the plant weight showed no significant differences in mean TNC for plants above, or below the mean plant weight in each case at  $p=0.05$ : Site A; 933 (SE 93.8,  $n=27$ ) vs 760 (SE 68.3,  $n=33$ )  $\text{mgNO}_3^- \text{kg}^{-1}$  for plants  $<170\text{g}$  and  $>170\text{g}$  respectively, and site B; 1486 (SE 128.9,  $n=29$ ) vs 1226 (SE 91.4,  $n=31$ )  $\text{mgNO}_3^- \text{kg}^{-1}$  for plants  $<300\text{g}$  and  $>300\text{g}$  respectively. Since plant weights had relatively little effect on TNC within a site and plant fresh weights were distributed evenly around the mean, the effect of head weight was not considered further.

The distribution of individual plant TNC within the two sites was not uniform, and areas of more than six continuous sampling positions were identified, which had individual TNC lower than the site mean, at both sites. Table II shows the grand mean TNC ( $n=60$ ) for each site, and the mean TNC's based on groups of 10 plants. All analyses described here were based on arithmetic means. The grand means differed significantly between the two sites, with site B being highest.

[Insert Table II about here]

Having a detailed field plan allowed assessment of different options for estimating TNC within the field, based on standard sample numbers ( $n=10$ ). In the first example, plants were grouped by plot order (Table II). This would be representative of a sampling

1  
2  
3  
4 pattern whereby 10 plants were sampled contiguously along a row. There was  
5 appreciable within site variation, with plots 41-50 at Site A having significantly higher  
6 mean TNC levels than plots 11-20, 21-30 and 31-40 at  $p=0.05$ . More importantly,  
7 certain groups of 10 plants, gave mean TNC values which were significantly different to  
8 that of the grand mean. For example, at site A, plots 21-30 had significantly lower  
9 mean TNC than the grand mean, whereas plots 41-50 had mean significantly higher  
10 mean TNC than the grand mean at  $p=0.05$ . Similarly for site B, the mean TNC for plots  
11 11-20 was significantly lower than that of plots 21-30, and also of the grand mean at  
12  $p=0.05$ . This spatial variability in plant TNC probably reflects underlying variation in soil  
13 mineral nitrogen within the field, but also differences in individual plant growth in  
14 response to localised areas of soil compaction, or variability in soil pH.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 For plants sampled along the row, the coefficient of variation had an approximate two-  
31 fold range between plant groups within a site (31-56% for Site A and 20-67% for Site  
32 B).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Next, rather than using plot order, individual plant TNC data was allocated to 6 groups  
40 of 10 plants chosen at random. Each of these randomisations was repeated 10 times at  
41 each site (data not presented here for the sake of brevity). In all cases, the mean and  
42 the median were very similar (838 vs 840 for Site A and 1352 vs 1333  $\text{mgNO}_3^- \text{kg}^{-1}$  for  
43 Site B). There was some evidence from these randomised data that the SE increased  
44 as TNC levels increased within a site. However, it should be noted that coefficients of  
45 variation tended to be lower at Site B, with the higher mean TNC.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 The estimates of the TNC for bulked/composite samples gave values which in three out  
57 of eight cases, appeared to be outside the confidence limits of their respective grand  
58 means. However, considering the greatest deviation of a pooled value from the grand  
59 means. However, considering the greatest deviation of a pooled value from the grand  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 mean was equal to 16.5% of the grand mean, and the analytical error represents *c.*  
5  
6 10.5% of the mean, a deviation of this magnitude can be considered acceptable. The  
7  
8 estimates of TNC based on arithmetic means calculated here using data from either X  
9  
10 or W sampling patterns, gave values which were not significantly different from one  
11  
12 another, or significantly different from the grand means for TNC, at their respective  
13  
14 sites at  $p=0.05$  based on their confidence intervals (Table III).  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 [Insert Table III about here]  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 Spatial variability in  $\text{NO}_3^-$  is appreciable in most UK soils and this means that sampling  
25  
26 protocols need to be designed robustly in order to obtain a reliable estimate of the  
27  
28 mean. The data confirm that the choice of 10 plants, sampled randomly using an X or  
29  
30 W shaped sampling pattern, provided acceptable measures of the overall mean, for the  
31  
32 two fields of lettuce sampled in this study. For vegetable crops harvested from narrow  
33  
34 beds, it is assumed that a number of beds being harvested on the same day could be  
35  
36 pooled to make one block, and also harvested using similar shaped sampling patterns.  
37  
38

#### 39 40 41 *Experiment 2*

42  
43 In the short term shading experiment the main treatment effects on TNC were small.  
44  
45 Averaged across both times of harvest, shading had no significant influence on plant  
46  
47 TNC (Table IV). However, in two of the four trials (experiments E and F), the overall  
48  
49 effect of time of harvest on plant TNC was significant (means averaged across the two  
50  
51 shading treatments).  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 [Insert Table IV about here]  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 In addition to the main treatment effects, there were significant interactions noted  
5 between shading and harvest treatments in experiments C and F ( $p < 0.01$  and  $p < 0.05$   
6 respectively; Table IV). In both these experiments, shading in the 0-24 h immediately  
7 prior to harvest (timing a) increased TNC. However, there was no significant difference  
8 in TNC between shaded and unshaded treatments 24 h after the shading treatments  
9 had been removed (timing b). These interactions were only significant in two out of four  
10 cases. Given that the shading treatment employed here was relatively severe  
11 compared to average light levels experienced on a dull day under normal conditions, it  
12 is unlikely that these short term effects on shading will be of importance in commercial  
13 practice. These results support the conclusions of Byrne *et al.* (2001) who found that  
14 extending daylength with supplementary light for four days prior to harvesting lettuce  
15 had no significant effect on plant nitrate levels.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 *Experiment 3*

34 There were no significant effects of time of harvest on plant fresh weight (data not  
35 presented), but a significant effect on TNC ( $p < 0.05$  at both sites; Table V). At both  
36 sites, harvest at 07:00 and 13:00 h gave the lowest TNC levels and at 16:00 h gave the  
37 highest TNC levels. The sampling at 16:00 h gave TNC values significantly higher than  
38 those at the previous sampling at 13:00 h, based on the SED.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 [Insert Table V about here]  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Although the time of day the plants were harvested was shown to have a significant  
effect on variability in TNC values in lettuce, there were no consistent temporal trends.  
It should also be noted that the differences recorded between sampling times would not  
solely be due to environmental effects, but also included some variability associated  
with sampling (e.g. operator, speed of transfer of samples to cold storage etc).

1  
2  
3  
4 However, studies on lettuce by Reinink (1991), Hardgrave (1994) and Byrne *et al.*  
5  
6 (2004) all failed to detect a significant relationship between TNC and time of harvest  
7  
8 within the day. It is most likely that any true diurnal variation due to nitrate uptake and  
9  
10 cycling of NRD, is masked by variation due to transient wilting in high light and  
11  
12 temperature conditions (which would tend to increase TNC during the day) and  
13  
14 differences in overall growth rate of the plant.  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 *Summary of data from experiments 1-3 and effect of increasing sample size on error*  
20  
21 *estimates*  
22

23  
24 The data from these experiments are summarised in Table VI as mean, SE and CV.  
25  
26 Burns (2000) showed that CVs for hydroponic and soil-grown glasshouse in winter  
27  
28 were low in the range 8-17% and higher in summer soil-grown lettuce (44%). Based on  
29  
30 the data in Table VI, a similar range was seen in the present study and the average CV  
31  
32 was c. 35%. Based on a population with a mean TNC of  $1000 \text{ mgNO}_3^- \text{ kg}^{-1}$ , variation of  
33  
34 this magnitude would imply that increasing the sample size from 10 to 40 plants would  
35  
36 decrease the SE from 12 to 6% of the mean. However, within the estimates of residual  
37  
38 variation, is also contained the analytical, or measurement error, which has been  
39  
40 estimated at 10.5%. Therefore, however large the sample size becomes, there is a  
41  
42 point beyond which the standard error cannot decrease any further, and it is likely that  
43  
44 the SE would not fall below c. 12% of the mean without any reduction in the analytical  
45  
46 error.  
47  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 [Insert Table VI about here]  
53  
54

55  
56 **Conclusions**  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 The studies were designed to quantify the relative importance of short-term effects of  
5 irradiance and diurnal variation, and to gain an estimate of the residual variation in TNC  
6  
7 in commercial lettuce crops.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 It is concluded that short-term differences in light levels on mean TNC are relatively  
13 small, compared to the differences in mean TNC seen between harvest at different  
14 times of the year, or shading 10-14 days prior to harvest (Burns 2000). Although the  
15 time of day at which plants are harvested appeared to influence TNC levels, there was  
16  
17 no trend in TNC with time which could be used as a basis for improving advice  
18 regarding time of sampling during the day.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Since a sample of 10 lettuce plants, assuming they are harvested using an appropriate  
29 random (e.g. W or X shaped) sampling pattern gives a reasonable estimate of the  
30 grand mean, it would appear that 10 is an acceptable sample size for surveillance  
31 purposes. However, similar data have not been collected at other points in the supply  
32 chain e.g. from packhouses or warehouses, where such sampling patterns may not be  
33 appropriate and where the possibility of non-compliance can result in serious financial  
34 penalties to the grower.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Acknowledgements**

46 The authors would like to thank the commercial growers for generously allowing  
47 harvesting of their crops during the course of this study, and Ms Jo James from ADAS  
48 Rosemaund for carrying out sampling. The financial support of the UK Food Standards  
49 Agency is gratefully acknowledged.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **References**

1  
2  
3  
4 ANON. (1991). *Soil sampling - it has to be right*. Unpublished Agricultural Development  
5 and Advisory Service paper, SS/91/6 3pp.  
6  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 ANON. (2001). *Commission regulation (EC) No 1543/2001 of 27<sup>th</sup> July 2001, laying*  
12 *down the marketing standard for lettuces and curled-leaved and broad-leaved*  
13 *(Batavian) endives*. Official Journal of the European Communities, L203/9,  
14 28.7.2001.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 ANON. (2002a). Commission directive 2002/63/EC of 11<sup>th</sup> July 2002. *Methods of*  
22 *sampling products of plant and animal origin for the determination of pesticide*  
23 *residues for checking compliance with MRLs*. Official Journal of the European  
24 Communities, L 187, 16.7.2002.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30  
31 ANON. (2002b). *Cultural advice to growers*. In Crop Specific Protocol – Protected  
32 lettuce 302. Assured Produce Ltd. Issue No 1/2002. p13.  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38  
39 ANON. (2005). *Commission regulation (EC) No 1822/2005 of 8<sup>th</sup> November 2005,*  
40 *amending Regulation (EC) No 466/2001 as regards nitrate in certain*  
41 *vegetables*. Official Journal of the European Communities, L293/11, 9.11.2005.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 BOYD, D. A. and SIMPSON, E. P. (1956). *Report on the investigation into the*  
49 *technique of soil sampling 1954-55*. Unpublished Agricultural Development and  
50 Advisory Service paper, SC/C/203, 19pp. Duplicated report EPS/18/5/56.  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56  
57 BURNS, I. (2000). *Development of a decision support system for nitrogen fertiliser*  
58 *application in glasshouse lettuce (LINK)*. Final report on project PC88a (LINK  
59 project LK 0438) to the Horticultural Development Council, East Malling, Kent.  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

BYRNE, C., HENNERTY, M. J. and MAHER, M. J. (2001). *Can the nitrate content of Irish protected lettuce be reduced ?* University College Dublin, Faculty of Agriculture Research Report, 2000-2001.

BYRNE, C., MAHER, M. J., HENNERTY, M. J., MAHON, M. J. and WALSHE, P. A. (2004). *Reducing nitrate content of protected lettuce*. Teagasc research report, Teagasc, Kinsealy Research Centre, Malahaide Rd, Dublin 17, Ireland. Available from: <http://www.teagasc.ie/research/reports/horticulture/4561/eopr-4561.htm> [Accessed 2005 Sept 20].

CARRASCO, G. A. and BURRAGE, S. W. (1992). Diurnal fluctuations in nitrate accumulation and reductase activity in lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.) grown using nutrient film technique. *Acta Horticulturae*, **323** Soil and Soilless Media under Protected Cultivation; 51-59.

DAMPNEY, P. M. R., GOODLASS, G., RIDING A. E. and FROMENT, M. A. (1997). *The spatial variation of soil mineral nitrogen in two arable fields in England, and the implications for decision processes on nitrogen fertiliser use*. Proceedings, Vol III of the 11<sup>th</sup> World Fertiliser Congress, Fertilisation for Sustainable Plant Production and Soil Fertility, Gent, September 7-13, 1997. pp155-162.

FARRINGTON, D. S. (2001). *A comparison of the accuracy of extraction methods used in nitrate residues monitoring programme*. Final report on Project C03016 to the UK Food Standards Agency.

1  
2  
3  
4 HARDGRAVE, M. (1994). *Glasshouse lettuce: Reduction of nitrate residues*. Final  
5  
6 report on project PC88 to the Horticultural Development Council, East Malling,  
7  
8 Kent.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 KANAAN, S. S. and ECONOMAKIS, C. D. (1992). Effect of climatic conditions and time  
14  
15 of harvest on growth and tissue nitrate content of lettuce in nutrient film culture.  
16  
17 *Acta Horticulturae*, **323** Soil and Soilless Media under Protected Cultivation; 75-  
18  
19 80.  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 LESSELLS, W. J. (1959). *Report on the investigation into the technique of soil*  
25  
26 *sampling, 1957-58. Grassland*. Unpublished Agricultural Development and  
27  
28 Advisory Service paper, SS/C/296, 19pp. Duplicated report WJL/9/10/59.  
29  
30

31  
32  
33 LESSELLS, W. J. (1973). *Soil sampling investigations, 1947-58 – a summary*.  
34  
35 Unpublished Agricultural Development and Advisory Service paper, SS/SAF/7,  
36  
37 Rothamsted Experimental Station.  
38  
39

40  
41 MAFF (1979). *Sampling of soils, soilless growing media, crop plants and miscellaneous*  
42  
43 *substances for chemical analysis*. Booklet 2082. Ministry of Agriculture  
44  
45 Fisheries and Food (Publications), Tolcarne Drive, Pinner, Middlesex HA5 2DT.  
46  
47 Crown copyright, 1979.  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 MAFF (1983). *Sampling for soil analysis*. Leaflet 655, amended 1983. Ministry of  
53  
54 Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Publications), Lion House, Willowburn Estate,  
55  
56 Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 2PF. Crown copyright, 1979.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 NEEDHAM, P. & HARROD, M. F. (1973). *Sampling Plants for Analysis*. Unpublished  
5  
6 Agricultural Development and Advisory Service paper, SS/Phys/29. Closed  
7  
8 conference of soil scientists plant physiology and horticultural committees,  
9  
10 November 1972.  
11

12  
13  
14  
15 REININK, K. (1991). Genotype x Environment interaction for nitrate concentration in  
16  
17 lettuce. *Plant Breeding*, **107**; 39-49.  
18

19  
20  
21 REININK, K. and EENINK, A. H. (1988). Genotypical differences in nitrate  
22  
23 accumulation in shoots and roots of lettuce. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **37**; 13-24.  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 RICHARDSON, S. J. and HARDGRAVE, M. (1992). Effect of temperature, carbon  
29  
30 dioxide enrichment, nitrogen form and rate of nitrogen fertiliser on the yield and  
31  
32 nitrate content of two varieties of glasshouse lettuce. *Journal of the Science of*  
33  
34 *Food and Agriculture*, **59**; 345-349.  
35  
36

37  
38  
39 VAN EYSINGA, J. P. N. L. R. (1984). Nitrate in vegetables under protected cultivation.  
40  
41 *Acta Horticulturae*, **145**, *The Use of Fertiliser in Protected Vegetable*  
42  
43 *Production*; 251-256.  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 WEIGHTMAN, R. M., BUXTON, J., DYER, C. and FARRINGTON, D. (2005).  
49  
50 *Investigation of sampling and sources of variation in nitrate levels in lettuce and*  
51  
52 *spinach*. Final report on Project CO3030 to the UK Food Standards Agency,  
53  
54 June 2005.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table I.** Site, variety details and harvest dates for lettuce and endive crops sampled in 2003.

Site code	Site type	Species	Variety	Date harvested
<i>Experiment 1</i>				
A	Field	Lettuce	Goodison	16 <sup>th</sup> September
B	Field	Lettuce	Iceberg	16 <sup>th</sup> September
<i>Experiment 2</i>				
C	Tunnel	Endive	Glory	15 <sup>th</sup> April
D	Glasshouse	Lettuce	M'lady	16 <sup>th</sup> April
E	Field	Lettuce	Little Gem	29 <sup>th</sup> May
F	Field	Lettuce	Lobjoits	30 <sup>th</sup> May
<i>Experiment 3</i>				
G	Field	Lettuce	Pinnocchio	4 <sup>th</sup> July
H	Field	Lettuce	Pinnocchio	17 <sup>th</sup> July

**Table II.** Mean TNC levels, with associated standard errors and coefficients of variation, for either Cos or Iceberg type lettuce plants sampled in experiment 1, each based on either 60 plants, or 10 plants chosen in successive plot order.

Grouping	Mean TNC (mgNO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup> )	SE	CV (%)
Grand means		<i>Site A (Cos)</i>	
Plots 1-60	838	57.1	52.8
		<i>Site B (Iceberg)</i>	
Plots 1-60	1352	79.3	45.4
Ranked by plot order		<i>Site A (Cos)</i>	
Plot 1-10	771	135.2	55.5
Plot 11-20	684	99.8	46.1
Plot 21-30	575	57.1	31.4
Plot 31-40	681	107.0	49.7
Plot 41-50	1329	182.0	43.3
Plot 51-60	987	97.7	31.3
		<i>Site B (Iceberg)</i>	
Plot 1-10	1448	243.1	53.1
Plot 11-20	832	180.0	68.5
Plot 21-30	1775	206.4	36.8
Plot 31-40	1537	168.3	34.6
Plot 41-50	1001	64.5	20.4
Plot 51-60	1348	107.8	25.3

**Table III.** TNC estimated for a pooled (composite) sample of 10 heads, and the corresponding arithmetic mean from TNC values of individual lettuce heads, with its associated standard errors and coefficients of variation, for lettuce plants sampled in experiment 1. Each estimate is based on 10 plants selected using a W or X shaped sampling pattern, compared to the grand mean for each site.

Sampling pattern	N <sup>*</sup>	Pooled TNC <sup>†</sup> (mgNO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Mean TNC (mgNO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup> )	SE	LCL <sup>‡</sup>	UCL <sup>‡</sup>	CV (%)
<i>Site A</i>							
W1	10	969	1016	212.3	592	1140	66.1
W2	10	733	716	114.9	486	945	50.8
X1	10	886	929	168.0	593	1265	57.2
X2	10	976	952	105.3	741	1163	34.9
Grand Mean	60		838	57.1	723	952	52.8
<i>Site B</i>							
W1	10	1440	1402	198.5	1005	1799	44.8
W2	10	1400	1421	215.9	989	1853	48.0
X1	10	1192	1204	216.1	772	1636	56.8
X2	10	1388	1359	249.2	860	1857	58.0
Grand Mean	60		1352	79.3	1193	1511	45.4

<sup>\*</sup>, Number of observations.

<sup>†</sup>, Weighted mean, estimated from the individual fresh weights and TNC values, bulked to give a pooled/composite sample.

<sup>‡</sup>, LCL & UCL = Lower and upper confidence limits respectively at p=0.05.

**Table IV.** Tissue nitrate concentrations in early or late season lettuce grown with or without shading, at two harvest timings either (a), during shading or (b) 24 hours after removal of shading material.

Site code	Time of season	Shading treatment	Tissue nitrate concentration (mg NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup> )	
			<i>Harvest timing</i>	
			(a)	(b)
C	Early	<i>Unshaded</i>	1505	2390
		<i>Shaded</i>	2158	1939
		Harvest*Shade SED	235.6	(**) <sup>†</sup>
		Harvest timing means	1831	2164
		Harvest SED	166.6	(ns)
D	Early	<i>Unshaded</i>	1680	1747
		<i>Shaded</i>	1915	1871
		Harvest*Shade SED	245.7	(ns)
		Harvest timing means	1797	1809
		Harvest SED	173.7	(ns)
E	Late	<i>Unshaded</i>	886	818
		<i>Shaded</i>	1259	714
		Harvest*Shade SED	208.8	(ns)
		Harvest timing means	1072	766
		Harvest SED	147.6	(*)
F	Late	<i>Unshaded</i>	562	535
		<i>Shaded</i>	815	457
		Harvest*Shade SED	106.7	(*)
		Harvest timing means	688	496
		Harvest SED	75.4	(*)

<sup>†</sup>Significance of effects (df = 36); \*\*, p<0.01; \*, p<0.05; ns, not significant.

**Table V.** Diurnal variation in tissue nitrate concentration for lettuce at two sites.

Site code		Tissue nitrate concentration (mg NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup> )					
		Time (h)					
		7:00	10:00	13:00	16:00	19:00	22:00
G	Mean	1983	2173	1812	2511	2138	2155
	SED	197.4	(*) <sup>†</sup>				
H	Mean	2591	2896	2627	3111	2950	2701
	SED	179.7	(*)				

<sup>†</sup>Significance of effects (df = 54); \*, p<0.05.

**Table VI.** Summary of mean TNC, with associated standard errors and coefficients of variation from Experiments 1-3.

Site code	Tissue nitrate concentration Grand mean (mgNO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup> )	SE	CV (%)
A	838	57.1	52.8
B	1352	79.3	45.4
C	1998	166.6	26.3
D	1803	173.7	30.5
E	919	147.6	50.8
F	592	75.4	40.3
G	2129	139.6	20.7
H	2813	127.0	14.3