Erratum to: Reduced N supply limits the nitrate content of flue-cured tobacco

Fabio Castelli • Enrico Ceotto • Renato Contillo

Published online: 19 October 2011
© INRA and Springer-Verlag, France 2011

Erratum to: Agron. Sustain. Dev. 31 (2011) 329–335
DOI 10.1051/agro/2010033

In Tables I and II, and Figs. 4 and 5, nitrate should be read as NO₃ instead of N-NO₃.

New versions of Tables I and II, and Figs. 4 and 5.

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/agro/2010033>.

F. Castelli
CRA-CAT, Unità di Ricerca per le Colture alternative al Tabacco,
via Canton 14,
37051 Bovolone, VR, Italy

E. Ceotto (✉)
CRA-CIN, Centro di Ricerca per le Colture Industriali,
via di Corticella 133,
40128 Bologna, Italy
e-mail: enrico.ceotto@entecra.it

R. Contillo
CRA-CAT, Unità di Ricerca per le Colture alternative al Tabacco,
via Vitiello 108,
84018 Scafati, SA, Italy

Table I Analysis of variance and mean values of yield, nitrate concentration, total alkaloids reducing sugars, and total nitrogen in tobacco cured leaves. Separate analyses were carried out on 1997 data, due to the different amount of N supplied to the crops with respect to 1998 and 1999

Year	Effects	N rates	Yield DM (Mg ha ⁻¹)	NO ₃ (g 100 g ⁻¹)	Total alkaloids (g 100 g ⁻¹)	Reducing sugars (g 100 g ⁻¹)	Total N (g 100 g ⁻¹)
Analysis of variance							
1997	N rate		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
1998–99	N rate		NS	***	NS	**	NS
	Year		*	***	NS	***	NS
	Year × N rate		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Comparisons among N rates							
1997		N0	1.95 ab	0.4 a	3.0 a	6.8 a	4.2 a
		N15	2.46 a	0.8 ab	3.4 a	7.0 a	4.6 a
		N30	2.17 ab	0.7 ab	3.4 a	6.2 a	4.7 a
		N45	1.31 b	0.8 ab	3.0 a	4.9 a	4.4 a
		N60	2.00 ab	1.1 b	3.3 a	6.8 a	4.8 a
		Means	1.98	0.8	3.2	6.3	4.5
1998–99		N0	3.75 a	0.3 a	2.4 a	10.9 a	2.3 a
		N20	3.95 a	0.4 a	2.4 a	10.3 ab	2.3 a
		N40	4.08 a	0.7 b	2.6 a	8.5 bc	2.6 a
		N60	3.98 a	1.0 bc	2.5 a	7.5 cd	2.7 a
		N80	3.85 a	1.2 c	2.6 a	6.6 d	3.0 a
		Means	3.92	0.7	2.5	8.8	2.6
1998	Means		4.10 a	0.3 a	2.8 a	4.8 a	2.9 a
1999	Means		3.74 b	1.1 b	2.2 a	12.7 b	2.2 a

NS, *, ** and *** refers to non significant at the 0.05, and significant at the 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001, probability levels, respectively. Mean comparisons: means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.05 probability level. *DM* Dry Matter

Table II Analysis of variance and mean values of nitrate concentration in tobacco dried leaves collected during the growing seasons. Separate analyses were carried out on 1997 data, due to the different amount of N supplied to the crops with respect to 1998 and 1999

Year	Effects	N rates	NO ₃ (g 100 g ⁻¹)
Analysis of variance			
1997	N rate		***
	N rate × week		NS
1998–99	N rate		***
	N rate × week		NS
	Year		NS
	Year × N rate		NS
Comparisons among N rates			
			mean intercept slope
1997		N0	0.8 a 1.10 *** −0.04 *
		N15	1.1 b 1.44 *** −0.04 **
		N30	1.0 b 1.46 *** −0.05 **
		N45	1.3 c 1.90 *** −0.07 ***
		N60	1.3 c 1.91 *** −0.07 ***
		Mean	1.1
1998–99		N0	0.4 a 0.77 *** −0.04 ^{NS}
		N20	0.7 ab 1.12 *** −0.05 **
		N40	0.9 bc 1.26 *** −0.04 *
		N60	1.1 c 1.42 *** −0.04 *
		N80	1.2 c 1.47 *** −0.03 *
		Mean	
1998	Mean		0.5 a
1999	Mean		1.2 a

NS, *, ** and ***, refers to non significant at the 0.05, and significant at the 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001 probability levels, respectively. Means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 0.05 probability level

Fig. 4 Relationship between leaf nitrate and total nitrogen content in tobacco leaves. Data refers to dried leaves sampled throughout the growing season. $\text{NO}_3 = -0.27^{***} + 0.33^{***} \text{ Total N}$; $R^2=0.30$, $n=1055$

Fig. 5 Relationship between leaf nitrate and total nitrogen content in tobacco leaves. Data refers to the harvested and flue-cured product. $\text{NO}_3 = 0.68^{***} + 0.014^{\text{NS}} \text{ Total N}$; $R^2=0.001$, $n=119$