Reprinted from AGRONOMY JOURNAL Vol. 60, March-April 1968, p. 149-151

Purchased by Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, for official use.

# Differences in Chemical. Composition of Plant Sample Fractions Resulting from Grinding and Screening<sup>1</sup>

# **J. H. Smith, D. L. Carter, M. J. Brown, and C. L. Douglas <sup>2</sup>**

#### **ABSTRACT**

Alfalfa, barley straw, corn leaves, peas, red clover, and<br>wheat straw samples were ground in a Wiley mill and<br>screened to separate particle sizes. Particle size samples<br>were analyzed for N, P, K, Ca, Mg, Zn, Se, and SiO<sub>3</sub> **alyses and** biological experiments.

*Additional index words: nitrogen,* **phosphorus, potassium,** *calcium,* **magnesium, silica, selenium, zinc, particle size.**

THE accuracy of plant material chemical analyses<br>depends in part upon how well a subsample depends in part upon how *well a* subsample represents the entire plant sample. A degree of inaccuracy is probably introduced into many plant material analyses because of unrepresentative subsamples. This inaccuracy could account for much of the variability encountered in analyses such as total nitrogen by *a* Kjeldahl method. Plant material composition problems may also be found in biological experiments m which plant materials are added to soil, such as in decomposition or nitrification rate studies. The senior author became aware of these problems through previous research (9) involving alfalfa decomposition and nitrification in soil. A high degree of reproducibility was obtained in biological experiments using the alfalfa after characterizing the alfalfa by particle size and consequently by N concentration.

Many reports have dealt incidently with sample preparation and the precautions that are necessary. Piper (8) recommends that where 1- to 2-g samples are taken for analysis, sieves with round holes 0.5 mm diameter should be used. He also gives a short discussion on plant sample handling and prevention of contamination. Johnson (4) reported that dust must be removed by washing plant samples before accurate microelement analyses can be obtained. No reports were found that dealt with chemical composition of plant samples as influenced by grinding and particle size separations.

Differences in N content of alfalfa samples by particle size have been observed to range from 100 to several hundred percent. These observations led to investigations to determine the elemental composition of several plant species and the influence of plant material particle sizes on elemental composition.

#### **METHODS AND MATERIALS**

Alfalfa *(Mericago sativa),* barley straw *(Hordeum vulgare),* `Lemhi. wheat straw *(Triticum aestivum),* University of Idaho Experimental wheat straw 59-10320 *(Triticum aestivum),* and peas *(Pisum sativum),* were all sampled by hand-cutting from fields near Kimberly, Idaho. The alfalfa was cut very young and the peas were cut at early bloom. Another barley straw and an alfalfa sample were obtained from baled straw and hay stacks in the same area. 'Gaines' wheat straw (Triticum aestivum) was obtained from plots at Aberdeen, Idaho. Sweet corn leaf<br>samples (Zea mays) and red clover (Trifolium pratense) samples<br>were cut by hand near Kimberly, I

The alfalfa, barley straw, and Gaines wheat straw samples analyzed and reported in Table 1 were ground in a Wiley mill through a 2-mm stainless steel screen and sieved through stain-<br>less steel screens to give particle sizes of greater than 841  $\mu$  (20-<br>mesh), 841 to 500  $\mu$  (20 to 32-mesh), 500 to 250  $\mu$  (32 to 60-<br>mesh), 250 to 149

spectrometer (7)<sup>3</sup>. Selenium was determined by fluorimetry using a method described by Allaway and Cary (1).<br>Silica was determined colorimetrically by a method described<br>by Jones and Handreck (5) and modified to use oxali

eliminating interference from phosphorus (10). The limits of variability for the various methods employed are about as follows: nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium  $\pm 2\%$ ; calcium, magnesium, and zinc  $\pm 5\%$ ; selenium  $\pm 10$  ppb<br>in the range 20 to 300 ppb; and silica  $\pm 10\%$ .

### RESULTS

The fractional percentages and the N, P, K, Ca, Mg, Zn, Se, and  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  contents for each particle size of barley straw, Gaines wheat straw, and alfalfa are given in Table 1. The greater than  $841\mu$  particles for the

Contribution from the Northwest Branch, Soil and Water Conservation Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, USDA; Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station cooperating. Received July 26, 1967.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Research Soil Scientists and Soil Scientists, respectively, Snake River Conservation Research Center, Kimberly, Idaho.

<sup>3</sup>The authors express their appreciation to John W. Brown for the analyses on the atomic absorption spectrometer.

**Table 1. Particle size distribution and elemental composition of barley straw, Gaines wheat straw, and alfalfa.**



two straw samples represented a fairly small fraction of the entire sample, with the major part of the straw samples being found in the 841 to  $500\mu$  range. As particle sizes decreased below  $500\mu$ , the percentage of the total sample in each fraction also decreased, but the actual amount of material found in the very small particle sizes is rather surprising, with 6 to 11% in the smaller than  $149\mu$  size. The same particle size distribution was found for alfalfa except the 500 to  $250\mu$ fraction contained the largest percentage (40%) of the total.

The N, P, Ca, Mg, and  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  percentages of the three plant materials increased with decreasing particle Some of these increases were comparatively small. For instance, the P content of alfalfa increased about 1.4 fold, and was almost constant for the three larger particle sizes. Other increases were rather large. For instance, the Ca content of barley straw increased from 0.092 to 0.512% or about 5.6 fold, and the  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$ in the alfalfa increased from 0.3 to 4.50% for a 35 fold increase. Most of this latter increase came between the 250 to  $149<sub>\mu</sub>$  and the  $\lt 149<sub>\mu</sub>$  particle sizes. Other increases in component composition percentages with decreasing particle size were intermediate between those indicated.

The K concentration was variable and unpredictable in all the plant materials. This may be understandable because K does not combine chemically in the plant. In the barley straw there was a dramatic decline in Zn percentage composition with decrease in particle size. The other two plant materials showed a slight decrease, or decrease and then an increase in the smaller particles, but differences were relatively small. Barley straw contained more Zn in the larger sizes than did the other two plant materials. In the barley and wheat straw samples the smallest particle sizes contained a greater Se concentration than the larger particle sizes. The concentrations of Se were so low that the precision of about  $\pm 10$  ppb left some question as to actual differences between fraction sizes in some cases.

Weighted means were determined for the elemental percentages of the three plant materials reported in Table 1. These values are thought to be the most representative chemical composition yalues that are available for the entire plant sample. Comparison of the particle size fraction composition with that of the





weighted mean should give some indication of the possible deviation from true values that can be obtained when separation of the sample takes place during handling.

Table 2 shows the percentage composition of N, P, K, Ca, Mg, Se, and  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  in two wheat straw varieties, samples of hand-cut barley straw, sweet corn leaves, red clover, peas, and very young alfalfa, by particle sizes. As before, there was an increase in percentage composition of N, P, Ca, Mg, and  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  with decreasing particle size for all plant materials. There was no predictable trend for K concentration. The Se concentrations in the experimental wheat straw and the peas remained almost constant with particle size of the plant material. Selenium concentration increased with decreasing particle sizes of alfalfa, red clover, barley straw, and Lemhi wheat straw, but the reverse was true with corn leaves.

#### **DISCUSSION**

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

经经济

The percentage composition of N, P, Ca, Mg, and  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  generally increased with decreasing particle sizes of three wheat straw varieties, one baled and one handcut barley straw and alfalfa samples, corn leaves, red clover, and peas. Differences in elemental composition as particle size decreased ranged from about a 1.4-fold increase in P percentage to about a 35-fold increase for **SiO**<sup>2</sup> percentage of one alfalfa sample. Both of these extremes were in the baled alfalfa sample. The elements that increase in percentage composition in the smaller particle sizes are concentrated in the more active plant parts. For example, N and P are constituents of amino acids, proteins, enzymes, coenzymes, and nucleic materials which are concentrated in the leaves and other succulent plant tissues. Surprising as it may seem, Si is also concentrated in much higher amounts in leaves around cell perimeters than in nodes or internodes of barley plants. Jones and Handreck (6) reported that the leaf of barley contained 3 times as much Si as the internode and roots, 14 times as much as the node, and 40 times as much as the seed.

When the succulent leaf parts of plants are ground in a mill, they pulverize into small particles regardless of the screen size. The structural components of the plants, such as stems and ribs, are tough and woody in comparison, and are only reduced in size as the blades cut them small enough to pass through the screen. These tougher parts do no contain the high concentrations of such elements as N, P, Ca, Mg, and  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  found in more active plant parts.

Potassium was unpredictable in the differences in concentration that were observed. There were some increases and some decreases in K concentration with changing particle sizes but **no** patterns were evident. The observed differences were generally small. The lack of trends in K concentration changes with particle sizes was probably because K is not chemically bound in cell constituents and, therefore, does not form *a* permanent part of the plant constituents as is the case with other elements.

The high  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  concentration in the cereals contrasts with the low concentration in leguminous plants, indicating that cereals absorb more  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  than legumes. The very high  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  content of the fine fraction of one alfalfa sample is an interesting exception.

It is not surprising that Se tended to be more concentrated in the smaller plant material particles because most Se in plants is combined in amino acids. As is the case with N, P, Ca, Mg, and  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$ , Se concentration is greatest in the more active or succulent plant parts. Se and Si are not known to be required by these plants for normal growth. Yet these two elements are most concentrated in the active plant parts along with elements that we know are required for plant nutrition. The reason Se concentration decreased with particle size, in the case of corn leaves, is not known.

The wide variability in chemical composition of the different plant materials and their different particle size fractions points out the necessity for careful sample preparation such as fine grinding or very thorough mixing before representative subsamples can be obtained for chemical analyses or biological experiments.

## **LITERATURE CITED**

- 1. ALLAwAr, W. H., and EARLE E. CARY. 1964. Determination of submicrogram amounts of selenium in biological materials. Anal. Chem. 36:1859-1862.
- 2. CARTER, J. N., O. L. BENNETT, and R. W. PEARSON. 1967.<br>Recovery of fertilizer nitorgen under field conditions using<br>N<sup>15</sup>. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. 31(1):50-56.<br>3. CHAPMAN, HOMER D., and PARKER F. PRATT. 1961. Methods
- of analysis for soils, plants and waters. University of Cali-
- fornia, Division of Agricultural Sciences. p. 169-170. 4. JOHNSON, CLARENCE M., and ALBERT ULRICH. 1959. Plant analysis IL Analytical methods for use in plant analysis. California Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 766. p. 58-59.
- 5. JONES, L. H. P., and K. A. **HANDRECK. 1965. Studies of silica in the oat plant.** III. Uptake of silica from soils by the plant. Plant and Soil 23(1):79-96.
- 6. <del>^</del>—————, A. A. MILNE, and S. M. WADHAM. 1963. Studies of silica in the oat plant. 11. Distribution of the silica in the plant. Plant and Soil 18:358-371.
- 7. The Perkin Elmer Corporation. 1965. Analytical methods for atomic absorption spectrometry.
- 8. PIPER, C. S. 1942. Soil and plant analyses; a laboratory manual of methods for examination of soils and the determination of the inorganic constituents of plants. Univ. of
- Adelaide. Adelaide. 368 p. 9. SMITH, J. H. 1964. Relationships between soil cationexchange capacity and the toxicity of ammonia to the nitrification process. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. 28(5):640-644.
- 10. American Public Health Association, Inc., N. Y., Tenth Edition. 1955. Standard methods for the examination of water, sewage, and industrial wastes.