








SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

A comparison of the methods used to assess the nutritional status of selected crop species

Bogdan Kulig¹⁾ , Agnieszka Klimek-Kopyra*¹⁾ , Anna Ślizowska¹⁾ ,
Andrzej Oleksy¹⁾ , Barbara Skowera²⁾ , Andrzej Lepiarczyk¹⁾ ,
Wiesław Grygierzec³⁾ 

¹⁾ University of Agriculture in Krakow, Faculty of Agriculture and Economics, Department of Agriculture and Plant Production, 21 Mickiewicza Ave, 31-120 Kraków, Poland

²⁾ University of Agriculture in Krakow, Faculty of Environmental Engineering and Land Surveying, Department of Ecology, Climatology and Air Protection, 21 Mickiewicza Ave, 31-120 Kraków, Poland

³⁾ University of Agriculture in Krakow, Faculty of Agriculture and Economics, Department of Statistics and Social Policy, 21 Mickiewicza Ave, 31-120 Kraków, Poland

* Corresponding author

Table S1. Comparative readings of *SPAD* and *HNT* readings

<i>SPAD</i>	<i>HNT</i>	<i>SPAD</i>	<i>HNT</i>	<i>SPAD</i>	<i>HNT</i>
30.0	375	40.0	534	50.0	701
30.5	383	40.5	542	51.0	709
31.0	391	41.0	550	51.5	717
31.5	399	41.5	558	52.0	725
32.0	407	42.0	566	52.5	733
32.5	415	42.5	574	53.0	741
33.0	423	43.0	582	53.5	749
33.5	431	43.5	590	54.0	757
34.0	439	44.0	598	54.5	765
34.5	447	44.5	606	55.0	773
35.0	455	45.0	614	55.5	781
35.5	462	45.5	622	56.0	789
36.0	470	46.0	629	56.5	796
36.5	478	46.5	637	57.0	804
37.0	486	47.0	645	57.5	812
37.5	494	47.5	653	58.0	820
38.0	502	48.0	661	58.5	828
38.5	510	48.5	669	59.0	836
39.0	518	49.0	677	59.5	844
39.5	526	49.5	685	60.0	852

Source: own study.