1	Fermentability of whole oat flour, PeriTec flour and bran by
2	Lactobacillus plantarum
3	
4	Gopal Kedia <sup>1</sup> , José Antonio Vázquez <sup>1,2</sup> and Severino S. Pandiella <sup>1</sup> *
5	
6	<sup>1</sup> School of Chemical Engineering and Analytical Science
7	The University of Manchester
8	Sackville Street, PO Box 88, Manchester M60 1QD, UK
9	
10	<sup>2</sup> Grupo de Reciclado y Valorización de Materiales Residuales
11	Instituto de Investigacións Mariñas (CSIC)
12	r/ Eduardo Cabello, 6. Vigo-36208. Galicia – Spain
13	
14	* Corresponding author E-mail: s.pandiella@manchester.ac.uk
15	
16	
17	

18 ABSTRACT

19

20 Whole oat flour obtained by hammer milling was fermented with L. plantarum along 21 with white flour and bran in order to compare the suitability of these substrates for the 22 production of a probiotic beverage. The three substrates show a viable cell concentration 23 at the end of fermentation above the minimum required in a probiotic product. The 24 highest cell concentration was observed in white flour (9.16 Log<sub>10</sub> CFU/mL) and the 25 lowest in the bran sample (8.17  $Log_{10}$  CFU/mL). 26 27 Keywords: Lactobacillus plantarum, probiotic, fermentation, oat flour, unstructured 28 mathematical model. 29 30 **INTRODUCTION** 31 32 There has been a recent increase in the use of dietary components that help to maintain, 33 or even improve, the gut micro flora balance. Previous studies have shown that cereals 34 are good substrate for the proliferation of probiotic lactic acid bacteria and could also be 35 used as prebiotics and symbiotic (Charalampopoulos, Pandiella, Wang, & Webb, 2002). 36 Oat grains are packed with nutrients and impart valuable health benefits. They contain 37 biologically active ingredients like dietary and functional fibres that are part of the bran 38 and germ of the grain. Some of these parts of the grain are removed in conventional flour 39 milling to produce white oat flour. Whole grains would have added health benefits by 40 maximising the intake of fibre (Nyman, Siljestroem, Pedersen, Bach Knudsen, Asp,

41 Johansson, & Eggum, 1984).

43 Due to their perceived health benefits, probiotic bacteria have been incorporated into 44 yoghurts and fermented milks for a number of decades (Saarela, Mogensen, Fonden, 45 Matto, & Mattilda-Sandholm, 2000). Lactobacilli and bifidobacteria are the most 46 commonly used microorganisms and are generally associated with habitats rich in nutrients, such as various food commodities (vegetable, milk, meat). However, some are 47 48 also habitants of the normal flora of the oral cavity and the gastrointestinal and 49 genitourinary tract of animals and humans (Axelsson, 1998).

50

51 The objective of this work is to study the fermentability by probiotic lactic acid bacteria 52 of three different oat samples: whole oat flour produced by hammer milling, PeriTec 53 white flour and bran obtained by debranning technology (Mousia & Pandiella, 2004). 54 Cell growth, metabolic product formation and substrate uptake will be monitored and the 55 results will be fitted to an unstructured mathematical model.

- 56
- 57

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

58

#### 59 Dry milling of oat to obtain flour and bran

60 The whole oat flour was obtained by milling the oat in a hammer mill (Falling Number 61 AB, England) fitted with a sieve of 850 µm aperture size, whereas bran and white flour 62 were obtained by combined debranning and dry milling of oat using the Satake STR-100 63 mill. This process consisting of two break grindings, both utilising a pair of 14 flutes per 64 inch corrugated rolls operated under a dull to dull roll disposition, along with four reduction grindings by a pair of smooth rolls, separated the groats pearled for 20 s into six flour fractions (white flour) and four bran fractions (bran) (Wang, Koutinas, & Campbell, 2007). The overall flour extraction rate reached 51% of the original groat weight. The weight ratio of the bran fractions together with the pearlings, 49%, satisfied one of the four criteria in the definition for oat bran by the AACC (not more than 50% of the starting material; Fulcher & Miller, 1993).

71

#### 72 Fermentation monitoring

73 Microorganism and inocula

*L. plantarum* (NCIMB 8826) originally isolated from human intestine was used for the
 fermentation of the oat sample and the strain was stored on slopes of MRS at 4°C.

76

To obtain sufficient cells for parallel experiments each inoculum was proliferated from
the slopes twice in universal bottles containing 20 mL MRS suspension. After 48 h, 0.5
mL of the broth from the first incubation were transferred into freshly sterilized MRS
suspension to propagate for another 24 h.

81

82 *Fermentation procedures* 

Shake-flask fermentations were performed in duplicate using 500 mL screw-capped glass
bottles. In all fermentations, 5% w/v suspensions of the different fractions were prepared
and autoclaved at 121°C for 15 min. Bottles were inoculated with a 2% v/v of lactic acid
bacteria and incubated at 150 rpm and 37°C for 30 h. Samples were regularly taken for

total cell counting and centrifuged fermented media (10 min, 4500 rpm) were stored at 20°C for later analysis.

89

#### 90 *Cell enumeration*

Viable cells were enumerated using the method of Miles and Misra (Collins, 1984).
Decimal dilutions of fermentation broths were prepared using sterile Ringer's solution.
12 µL were dropped onto 3-4 day old MRS agar plates and then incubated at 37°C for 2-3
days. Viable cell counts were calculated as log<sub>10</sub> colony forming units per mL. Dilutions
with less than 10 or more than 130 colonies were discarded.

96

#### 97 Chemical analyses

Total dietary fibre, soluble fibre and insoluble fibre were determined according to the 98 99 method of Prosky & al. (1992). β-glucan was measured by the McCleary & Codd method 100 (McCleary & Codd, 1991) using an assay kit from Megazyme. The concentration of 101 soluble free amino nitrogen (FAN) during fermentation was assayed by the EBC-102 ninhydrine colorimetric method (European-Brewery-Convention, 1973). The protein 103 content was calculated by multiplying the total Kjeldahl nitrogen by a factor of 6.25. 104 Total reducing sugar (TRS) was assayed by the dinitrosalicylic acid method (Miller, 105 1959), and the concentration of lactic acid was obtained using an analytical kit from 106 Megazyme.

107

#### 108 Mathematical models

In order to describe and compared the kinetics of the lactic acid bacteria on the oat flour media, an unstructured mathematical model was used (Vázquez & Murado, 2008; Vázquez & Murado, 2008). The variables fitted by this approach were the biomass concentration (*X*: as  $log_{10}C$ , being *C* the colony forming units per mL), the lactic acid concentration (*L*), the total the reducing sugars (*S*) and the free amino nitrogen (*N*). The definition and units of the model parameters and variables are shown in table 1.

115 
$$X = \frac{X_m}{1 + \exp\left[2 + \frac{4 \cdot v_{mx}}{X_m} \cdot \left(\lambda_x - t\right)\right]}$$
(1)

116 
$$L = \frac{L_m}{1 + \exp\left[2 + \frac{4 \cdot v_{ml}}{L_m} \cdot \left(\lambda_l - t\right)\right]}$$
(2)

117 
$$S = S_0 + \frac{X_0}{Y_{x/s}} - \frac{1}{Y_{x/s}} \cdot \frac{X_m}{1 + \left(\frac{X_m}{X_0} - 1\right) \cdot e^{-\frac{4\cdot v_{mx}}{X_m}}} - \frac{m_s \cdot X_m^2}{4 \cdot v_{mx}} \cdot \ln\left[\frac{X_0 \cdot \left(e^{\frac{4\cdot v_{mx}}{X_m}} - 1\right) + X_m}{X_m}\right]$$
(3)

118 
$$N = N_0 + \frac{X_0}{Y_{x/n}} - \frac{1}{Y_{x/n}} \cdot \frac{X_m}{1 + \left(\frac{X_m}{X_0} - 1\right) \cdot e^{-\frac{4 \cdot v_{mx}}{X_m}}} - \frac{m_n \cdot X_m^2}{4 \cdot v_{mx}} \cdot \ln\left[\frac{X_0 \cdot \left(e^{\frac{4 \cdot v_{mx}}{X_m}} - 1\right) + X_m}{X_m}\right] (4)$$

119

#### 120 Numerical and statistical methods

Fitting procedures and parametric estimations calculated from the results were carried out by minimisation of the sum of quadratic differences between observed and modelpredicted values, using the non linear least-squares (quasi-Newton) method provided by the macro 'Solver' of the Microsoft Excel XP spreadsheet. Statistica 6.0 software (StatSoft, Inc. 2001) was used to evaluate the significance of the estimated parameters by
fitting the experimental values to the proposed mathematical models, and the consistency
of these equations.

128

129 **RESULTS** 

130

131 The characterisation of the different oat samples is shown in table 2. Figure 1 shows the 132 growth of L. plantarum and the chemical changes during fermentation in the three media 133 with time. The numerical values of the kinetic parameters obtained from fitting the 134 experimental data to the unstructured mathematical models, as well as the statistical 135 analysis of the equations and parameters validation are summarised in the table 3. 136 According to these results, the medium prepared from white flour led to the highest maximum biomass production and the maximum growth rate  $(v_{mx})$ . 137 Whole flour 138 produced a slightly lower cell concentration, and in bran a maximum cell concentration 139 one  $Log_{10}$  CFU/mL below white flour was achieved. The numerical values of the parameter  $-\lambda_x$  are not shown in table 3 because they were negatives (not realistic) and 140 141 therefore not useful for comparative purposes.

142

The highest concentration (p < 0.05) and maximum production rate of lactic acid ( $v_{ml}$ ) was also obtained in white flour (1.2 g/L and 0.09 g L<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> respectively). The evolution of pH decreased accordingly to this organic acid formation. The final TRS concentrations after 30 h decreased to 1.7 g/L, 2.5 g/L and 2.8 g/L for bran, whole flour and white flour, respectively. The sugar consumption was adequately described by the proposed model (3) 148 (see statistical analysis in table 3). The maximum value of  $Y_{x/s}$  was obtained in whole 149 flour followed white flour and bran. In all three fermentation FAN decreases after a small 150 initial rise in the first 4 h of fermentation. For the whole flour broth, FAN increases from 151 74.86 mg/L to 80.44 mg/L and then decreases to 36.42 mg/L after 30 hours. Similar 152 trends were observed for the white flour and bran media.

153

#### 154 **DISCUSSION**

155

156 Due to the complexity of the cereal substrates used, the main compositional changes that 157 were monitored to justify their fermentability were FAN and sugars. Research studies 158 using semi-defined synthetic media have identified these compounds as the most crucial 159 factors for LAB growth (Bethin & Villadsen, 1996; Taillandier, Gilis, Portugal, Laforce, 160 & Strehaiano, 1996; Loubiere, Cocaign-Bousquet, Matos, Goma, & Lindley, 1997). The 161 fractions used had a maximum particle size of 850  $\mu$ m (the aperture size of the sieve in 162 the hammer mill was 850  $\mu$ m). The broths prepared from them are homogeneous liquid 163 media with some non-fermentable insoluble bran particles in suspension. It is then 164 possible to compare the different cultures and to fit the numerical data to the 165 mathematical models defined in the materials and methods section.

166

167 The growth of LAB in the whole flour was comparable with the results obtained from 168 previous workers in oat and other cereals. *L. plantarum* has also been reported to grow 169 well in wheat and barley without the need for additional nutrients, where along with other 170 LAB it is used for the industrial production of lactic acid (Hofendahl & Hahn-Hagerdal,

171 1997). Patel & al. (2004) reported a maximum growth of *L*.*plantarum* in malt, barley and
172 wheat of 9.15 Log<sub>10</sub> CFU/mL, 8.46 Log<sub>10</sub> CFU/mL and 8.39 Log<sub>10</sub> CFU/mL respectively.
173 The maximum cell concentrations in whole and white flours were 8.97 Log<sub>10</sub> CFU/mL
174 and 9.16 Log<sub>10</sub> CFU/mL respectively, comparable with these results.

175

176 LAB are able to assimilate nitrogen in both inorganic and organic forms, although the 177 availability of amino acids is critical for the growth of fastidious bacteria such as 178 lactobacilli (Plessis, Dicks, Vescovo, Torriani, & Dellaglio, 1996; Vescovo, Torriani, 179 Dellaglio, & Bottazi, 1993). The nitrogen uptake in the fermentations was monitored by 180 measuring FAN. Though the FAN concentration decreased over the course of the 181 fermentations, small increments were observed in the stationary phase of growth.

182

The white flour showed the maximum cell concentration, which is probably due to the fact that does not contain bran and non-fermentable outer layers. The bran fraction obtained by this method will contain most of the outer non-fermentable layers of the grain but also fermentable fractions, which justifies the considerably high value or cell concentrations obtained. All values exceed the level suggested by Sanders & Huis in 't Veld (1999) for a probiotic product formulation (10<sup>6</sup> CFU/g or CFU/mL).

189

190 In summary, the three substrates studied demonstrate their capability to support a 191 probiotic fermentation by human L. plantarum. The highest cell populations were 192 obtaind for white oat flour. According to our results the bran fraction, usually discarded

by the flour milling industry, could be feremented with a probiotic microorganism. Thiscould lead to the development of novel probiotic beverages.

195

#### 196 **REFERENCES**

197

Axelsson, L. (1998). Lactic acid bacteria: classification and physiology. Lactic Acid Bacteria:
Microbiological and Functional Aspects. Ed., Salminen, S., Von Wright, A., New York, Marcel
Dekker 1-72.

201

202 Bethin, S., & Villadsen, J. (1996). Amino acids utilization by Lactococcus lactis subsp. cremoris

FD1 during growth on yeast extract or casein peptone. *Journal of Applied Biotechnology*, 80, 6572.

205

206 Charalampopoulos, D., Pandiella, S.S., Wang, R., & Webb, C. (2002). Application of cereals and

207 cereal components in functional foods: A review. International Journal of Food Microbiology,

208 79, 131-141.

209

210 Collins, C.H. (1984). Microbiological methods, Ed: Butterworths, London.

211

European-Brewery-Convention. (1973). Ninhydrin method for determination of free a-amino
nitrogen. *Journal of Institute Brewing*, 79, 37-41.

214

215 Fulcher, G.R., & Miller, S.S. (1993). Structure of oat bran and distribution of dietary fiber

216 components. In: Oat Bran. St. Paul, MN, USA, American Association of Cereal Chemists.

217

218	Hofendahl, K., & Hahn-Hagerdal, B. (1997). L-lactic acid production from whole wheat flour
219	hydrolysates using strains of lactobacilli and lactococci. Enzyme and Microbial Technology, 20,
220	301-307.
221	
222	Loubiere, P.M., Cocaign-Bousquet, M.M., Matos, J., Goma, G., & Lindley, N.D. (1997).
223	Influence of end-products inhibition and nutrient limitations on the growth of Lactococcus lactis.
224	Journal of Applied Microbiology, 82, 95-100.
225	
226	McCleary, B.V., & Codd, R. (1991). Measurement of (1-3) (1-4) beta glucan in barley and oats:
227	A streamlined enzymatic procedure. Journal of Science Food and Agriculture, 55, 303-312.
228	
229	Miller, G.L. (1959). Use of dinitrosalicylic acid reagent for determination of reducing sugar.
230	Analytical Chemistry, 31, 426-428.
231	
232	Mousia, Z., & Pandiella, S.S. (2004). Debranning advantage. World Grain, March (www.World-
233	Grain.com).
234	
235	Nyman, M., Siljestroem, M., Pedersen, B., Bach Knudsen, K.E., Asp, N.G., Johansson, C.G, &
236	Eggum, O. (1984). Dietary fiber content and composition in six cereals at different extraction
237	rates. Cereal Chemistry, 61, 14-19.
238	

- 239 Patel, H.M., Pandiella, S.S., Wang, R.H., & Webb, C. (2004). Influence of malt, wheat and barley
- extracts on the bile tolerance of selected strains of lactobacilli. *Food Microbiology*, 21, 83-89.
- 241
- 242 Plesis, E., Dicks, L., Vescovo, M., Torriani, S., & Dellaglio, F. (1996). Lactobacillus acidophilus
- and related species: a review. Annali di Microbiologie ed Enzimologia, 46, 319-340.

244

245	Prosky, L., Asp, N.G., Schweizer, T., DeVries J., & Furda, I. (1992). Determination of insoluble
246	and soluble dietary fibre in foods and food products: Collaborative study. JA. Official Analytical
247	Chemistry 75, 360-367.
248	
249	Saarela, M., Mogensen, G., Fonden, R., Matto, J., & Mattila-Sandholm, T. (2000). Probiotic
250	bacteria: safety, technological and functional properties. Journal of Biotechnology, 84, 197-215.
251	
252	Sanders, M.E., & Huis in 't Veld, J.H.J. (1999). Bringing a probiotic-containing functional food to
253	the market: Microbiological, product, regulatory and labelling issues. Antonie Van Leewenhoek,
254	76, 293-315.
255	
256	Taillandier, P., Gilis, F., Portugal, F.R., Laforce, P., & Strehaiano, P. (1996). Influence of
257	medium composition, pH and temperature on the growth and viability of Lactobacillus
258	acidophilus. Biotechnology Letters, 18, 775-780.
259	
260	Vázquez, J.A., & Murado, M.A. (2008). Mathematical tools for objective comparison of
261	microbial cultures. Application to evaluation of 15 peptones for lactic acid bacteria productions.
262	Biochemical Engineering Journal, 39, 276-287.
263	
264	Vázquez, J.A., & Murado, M.A. (2008). Unstructured mathematical model for biomass, lactic
265	acid and bacteriocin productions by lactic acid bacteria in batch fermentation. Journal of
266	Chemical Technology and Biotechnology, 83, 91-96.

- 268 Vescovo, M., Torriani, S., Dellaglio, F., & Bottazzi, V. (1993). Basic characteristics, ecology and
- 269 application of Lactobacillus plantarum: a review. Annali di Microbiologie ed Enzimologia, 43,
- 270 261-284.
- 271
- 272 Wang, R., Koutinas, A.A., & Campbell, G.M. (2007). Dry processing of oats- Application of dry
- 273 milling. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 82, 559-567.
- 274
- 275

276	FIGURE CAPTIONS
210	

0	7	7
7	1	1

278	Figure 1. Fermentation of Lactobacillus plantarum in the oat samples. Continuous lines
279	represent the mathematical models used to fit experimental data represented by points. $\bigcirc$ ,
280	White Flour; $\bullet$ , Bran; $\blacktriangle$ , Whole Flour. L: Lactic acid; TRS: Total reducing sugars; N:
281	Nitrogen.
282	
283	
284	TABLE CAPTIONS
285	
286	Table 1. Notation used with units.
287	
288	<b>Table 2</b> . Characterisation of the oat samples used (mean $\pm$ standard deviation for n=3).
289	
290	<b>Table 3.</b> Parametric estimations corresponding to the kinetic models (1-4), applied to the
291	cultures of <i>L. plantarum</i> in the oat samples. CI: confidence intervals ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). <i>F</i> : F-
292	Fisher test (df <sub>1</sub> = model degrees freedom and df <sub>2</sub> = error degrees freedom). $r = correlation$
293	coefficient between observed and predicted data. NS = Not Significant.
294	
295	
296	
297	
298	

# FIGURE 1



### TABLE 1

- *X* : Biomass as logaritm of colony forming units per millilitre, log<sub>10</sub> (CFU/mL)
- t: Time, h
- *X<sub>m</sub>* : Maximum biomass, log<sub>10</sub> (CFU/mL)
- $X_0$ : Initial biomass, log<sub>10</sub> (CFU/mL)
- *v<sub>mx</sub>* : Maximum growth rate, [log<sub>10</sub> (CFU/mL)]/h
- $\lambda_x$ : Growth lag phase, h
- *L* : Lactic acid concentration, g/L
- *L<sub>m</sub>* : Maximum lactic acid, g/L
- *v<sub>ml</sub>*: Maximum lactic acid production rate, g L<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>
- $\lambda_l$ : Lactic acid production lag phase, h
- S: Total reducing sugars concentration, g/L
- *S*<sub>0</sub> : Initial total reducing sugars concentration, g/L
- Y<sub>x/s</sub>: Yield coefficient for biomass formation on sugar, log<sub>10</sub> (CFU/mL) g<sup>-1</sup> (sugar) L
- $m_s$ : Maintenance coefficient, g (sugar) L<sup>-1</sup> [log<sub>10</sub> (CFU/mL)]<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>
- N: Free amino nitrogen concentration, mg/L
- No: Initial free amino nitrogen, mg/L
- $Y_{x/n}$ : Yield coefficient for biomass formation on nitrogen, log<sub>10</sub> (CFU/mL) mg<sup>-1</sup> (nitrogen) L
- *m*<sub>n</sub>: Maintenance coefficient, mg (nitrogen) L<sup>-1</sup> [ log<sub>10</sub> (CFU/mL)]<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>

# TABLE 2

Oat Sampla	Chemical Composition (%)					
Uat Sample	Moisture	Protein	Total dietary Fiber	Soluble Fiber	Insoluble Fiber	β-Glucan
Whole Oat Flour White Oat Flour Oat Bran	$\begin{array}{c} 11.91 \pm 0.86 \\ 12.94 \pm 0.75 \\ 11.31 \pm 0.94 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 15.31 \pm 0.31 \\ 9.31 \pm 0.17 \\ 12.76 \pm 0.22 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 12.82 \pm 0.41 \\ 4.32 \pm 0.12 \\ 17.42 \pm 0.32 \end{array}$	$5.93 \pm 0.08$ $1.61 \pm 0.13$ $7.43 \pm 0.21$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.66 \pm 0.18 \\ 2.66 \pm 0.08 \\ 9.76 \pm 0.12 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 4.05 \pm 0.10 \\ 2.20 \pm 0.14 \\ 5.06 \pm 0.22 \end{array}$

# TABLE 3

		OAT SAMPLES	
VARIABLES	Whole flour	White flour	Bran
GROWTH ( <i>X</i> )	values $\pm$ CI	values $\pm$ CI	values ± CI
$X_m$ $X_0$ $V_{mx}$ $F$ (df <sub>1</sub> =3, df <sub>2</sub> =7; $\alpha$ =0.05) p-value r (obs-pred)	$\begin{array}{c} 8.973 \pm 0.910 \\ 4.800 \pm 0.120 \\ 0.314 \pm 0.173 \\ 793.16 \\ < 0.0001 \\ 0.9604 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 9.161 \pm 0.703 \\ 4.785 \pm 0.121 \\ 0.431 \pm 0.198 \\ 911.60 \\ < 0.0001 \\ 0.9653 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 8.172 \pm 0.469 \\ 4.966 \pm 0.101 \\ 0.324 \pm 0.132 \\ 2063.20 \\ < 0.0001 \\ 0.9756 \end{array}$
LACTIC ACID ( <i>L</i> )	values $\pm$ CI	values $\pm$ CI	values $\pm$ CI
Lm Vmi λi	$\begin{array}{c} 0.974 \pm 0.086 \\ 0.051 \pm 0.012 \\ 4.032 \pm 1.539 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.246 \pm 0.048 \\ 0.088 \pm 0.017 \\ 4.207 \pm 1.088 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.711 \pm 0.038 \\ 0.040 \pm 0.008 \\ 2.950 \pm 1.363 \end{array}$
F (df1=3, df2=8; α=0.05) <i>p</i> -value r (obs-pred)	963.68 <0.0001 0.9965	1777.39 <0.0001 0.9980	1428.59 <0.0001 0.9973
SUGARS ( <i>S</i> )	values $\pm$ CI	values ± CI	values ± CI
$S_0$ $Y_{x/s}$ $m_s$ $F$ (df <sub>1</sub> =3, df <sub>2</sub> =7; $\alpha$ =0.05) p-value r (obs-pred)	$\begin{array}{c} 3.697 \pm 0.079 \\ 11.789 \pm 1.674 \\ 0.002 \pm 0.000 \\ 15626.30 \\ < 0.0001 \\ 0.9895 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 4.143 \pm 0.092 \\ 9.248 \pm 4.489 \\ 0.002 \pm 0.000 \\ 16140.11 \\ < 0.0001 \\ 0.9895 \end{array}$	2.944 ± 0.183 3.393 ± 1.845 0.001 (NS) 1699.37 <0.0001 0.9757
NITROGEN ( <i>N</i> )	values $\pm$ CI	values $\pm$ CI	values ± CI
No Y <sub>x/n</sub> $m_n$ F (df <sub>1</sub> =3, df <sub>2</sub> =7; $\alpha$ =0.05) p-value r (obs-pred)	$\begin{array}{c} 83.715 \pm 8.442 \\ 0.096 \pm 0.079 \\ 0.012 \ (\text{NS}) \\ 511.99 \\ < 0.0001 \\ 0.9625 \end{array}$	65.292 ± 7.993 0.326 (NS) 0.040 (NS) 439.36 <0.0001 0.9080	$\begin{array}{c} 40.495 \pm 6.381 \\ 0.176 \pm 0.172 \\ 0.009 \ (NS) \\ 221.41 \\ < 0.0001 \\ 0.9251 \end{array}$