



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DIFFERENT YIELD STIMULATION
SYSTEMS ON YOUNG TREES OF HEVEA CLONE RRIM 901 PANEL
BO-1**

MOHD AKBAR BIN MD SAID

FP 2003 28

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DIFFERENT YIELD STIMULATION SYSTEMS
ON YOUNG TREES OF *HEVEA* CLONE RRIM 901 PANEL BO-1**

By

MOHD AKBAR BIN MD SAID

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies,
Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctoral of Philosophy**

December 2003

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in
Fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DIFFERENT YIELD STIMULATION SYSTEMS
ON YOUNG TREES OF *HEVEA* CLONE RRIM 901 PANEL BO-1**

By

MOHD AKBAR BIN MD SAID

December 2003

Chairman : Associate Professor Mohd. Fauzi bin Ramlan, Ph.D.

Faculty : Agriculture

The emphasis of the study is to evaluate the response of young *Hevea* trees to a new method of stimulation, REACTORRIM technique, developed by the Rubber Research Institute of Malaysia (RRIM) in 1990. The main objective of the development of REACTORRIM method of stimulation is to address the problem of shortage of skilled tappers to tap trees according to the conventional tapping system. REACTORRIM technique, which employs a concept of direct supply of ethylene into the laticiferous tissue at a slow but continuous rate, is effective for increasing the yield response of premium and old rubber trees.

Young *Hevea* trees clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1 responded negatively to the method of stimulation irrespective of methods of latex extraction, age of tree and history of tapping. The results showed that the negative effects were seen earlier on the cut systems than on the puncture tapping system. The bole growth quantified during the

study period was shown not to be solely the manifestation of cambial activity but also the continuous formation of layers of unproductive dry tissue.

Despite severe bark reaction, the puncture tapping system responded more favorably to the REACTORRIM technique. All the experiments showed a consistent trend, where a higher dosage of ethylene was required for the puncture tapping system. The results confirmed the inverse relationship between dosage of ethylene and number of latex vessels severed during tapping.

The effect of methods of stimulation on the status of elements and selected physiological parameters was markedly observed. Removal of nutrients was higher in the REACTORRIM stimulated trees. The high removal of nutrients and low content of sucrose can be associated with the downward trend of yield of the *Hevea* trees used. There was no significant difference between the status of nutrients during the moderate and high yielding periods of the year.

Sucrose appeared as the most suitable parameter to be used as stress indicator for young *Hevea* trees, clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1 used in this study. The content of sucrose was influenced by the interaction effect between the methods of stimulation and latex extraction. The content of sucrose of the REACTORRIM stimulated treatments was consistently lower than the non-REACTORRIM stimulated treatments, except for the puncture tapping system.

Young *Hevea* trees clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1 used in the study responded negatively to REACTORRIM method of stimulation with drastic reduction in latex production, low content of sugar, high incidence of tapping panel dryness and considerably high loss of nutrient from latex and after-shaved bark. The yield profile obtained from the study showed that there was no sign of yield recovery indicating collapse of lactiferous system and impaired biosynthetic processes. Findings established from the study confirmed that REACTORRIM technique is not suitable as yet, for commercial uptake on young *Hevea* trees. For young *Hevea* trees, the most suitable exploitation system is the conventional 1/2S d/3 system with or without mild ethephon stimulation.

Abstrak tesis dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
Sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**KAJIAN PERBANDINGAN PELBAGAI SISTEM PERANGSANGAN HASIL
KE ATAS POKOK *HEVEA* MUDA KLON RRIM 901 PANEL BO-1**

Oleh

MOHD AKBAR B MD SAID

Disember 2003

Pengerusi : Professor Madya Mohd. Fauzi bin Ramlan, Ph.D.

Fakulti : Pertanian

Penumpuan kajian ialah untuk menilai respon pokok-pokok *Hevea* muda kepada kaedah perangsangan teknik REACTORRIM yang dicipta oleh Institut Penyelidikan Getah Malaysia (RRIM) pada tahun 1990. Tujuan utama menghasilkan teknik perangsangan REACTORRIM ialah untuk menangani masalah kekurangan penoreh mahir untuk menoreh sistem torehan konvensional. Teknik perangsangan REACTORRIM menggunakan konsep membekal gas etilina secara berterusan ke tisu 'laticiferous' dengan kadar pelepasan yang perlahan adalah berkesan untuk meningkatkan respon hasil pokok-pokok getah premium dan pokok getah tua. Sungguhpun demikian, kaedah perangsangan REACTORRIM belum lagi disyorkan kepada pokok-pokok *Hevea* muda.

Teknik perangsangan REACTORRIM tidak sesuai untuk pokok *Hevea* muda, klon RRIM 901, panel BO-1, yang menunjukkan respon negatif ke atasnya tidak mengira

kaedah pengeluaran lateks, umur pokok dan sejarah penorehan. Pertumbuhan batang pokok yang dirangsang dengan teknik REACTORRIM yang direkodkan disepanjang kajian ini bukan merupakan manifestasi aktiviti kambium tetapi juga disebabkan oleh kesan pembentukan lapisan kulit kering yang tidak produktif secara berterusan.

Walaupun reaksi kulit keterlaluan, sistem torehan cucuk menunjukkan respon yang lebih menggalakkan kepada keadah perangsangan REACTORRIM. Kesemua percubaan menunjukkan corak yang seragam di mana dos etelina yang tinggi diperlukan untuk sistem torehan cucuk. Keputusan ini adalah selaras dengan perhubungan yang bertentangan di antara dos etilina dengan bilangan saluran lateks yang tercedera apabila ditoreh.

Kesan kaedah perangsangan ke atas status unsur pemakanan mineral dan bukan mineral dan ke atas status parameter fisiologi lateks terpilih adalah sangat ketara. Pengaliran keluar unsur pemakanan terutamanya unsur pemakanan makro dari kulit yang ditoreh dan dari lateks adalah tinggi pada pokok-pokok yang dirangsang dengan teknik REACTORRIM. Pengaliran unsur pemakanan yang tinggi adalah berkait rapat dengan corak penurunan hasil torehan pokok *Hevea* muda yang digunakan dalam kajian ini. Keputusan yang didapati menunjukkan tiada perbezaan ketara di antara status unsur pemakanan ketika musim berpenghasilan sederhana dan tinggi dalam tahun yang sama.

Sukrosa merupakan parameter yang paling sesuai untuk digunakan sebagai petanda 'stress' bagi pokok *Hevea* muda, klon RRIM 901, panel BO-1, yang digunakan

di dalam kajian ini. Kandungan sukrosa dipengaruhi oleh kesan interaksi di antara kaedah perangsangan dengan kaedah pengeluaran lateks.

Kandungan sukrosa rawatan yang dirangsang dengan teknik REACTORRIM adalah sentiasa rendah dari kandungan gula rawatan yang tidak dirangsang dengan teknik REACTORRIM, kecuali sistem torehan cucuk. Pokok getah muda klon RRIM 901, panel BO-1 yang digunakan dalam kajian ini menunjukkan respon negatif kepada teknik REACTORRIM dengan kejatuhan pengeluaran lateks yang amat ketara, kejadian kekeringan kulit dan kehilangan kandungan unsur pemakanan yang agak tinggi dari lateks dan kulit yang ditoreh berbanding torehan konvensional.

Profil hasil yang ditunjukkan dari percubaan ini menunjukkan tiada tanda-tanda pemulihan ke atas pengeluaran hasil di masa hadapan dan ini berkemungkinan tinggi disebabkan oleh sistem 'laticiferous' pokok-pokok yang terlibat tidak berfungsi serta gangguan ke atas sistem biosintesis. Keputusan kajian menjurus kepada kesimpulan iaitu teknik REACTORRIM masih belum sesuai untuk diamalkan secara komersil tidak mengira kaedah pengeluaran hasil, umur pokok dan sejarah penorehan. Untuk pokok *Hevea* muda, sistem eksploitasi yang paling sesuai ialah sistem torehan konvensional 1/2S d/3 dengan atau tanpa penggunaan etefon dengan kekuatan yang rendah.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this thesis is made possible due to the blessing of the Almighty Allah.

The author wish to express sincere appreciation and gratitude to the followings who have supported and assisted in the graduate study leading to a PhD degree at Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang, Selangor:

Y Bhg Dato' Hamid Sawal, Director General of MRB and Y Bhg Dato' Dr Abdul Aziz Sheikh Abdul Kadir, former Director General of the Malaysian Rubber Board (MRB) for their encouragement, advice and support.

The MRB Board for allowing the author to pursue the graduate study on part-time basis.

Dr Wan Abdul Rahaman bin Wan Yaacob, former Assistant Director (Biology) of MRB for his support.

Associate Professor Dr Mohd Fauzi Ramlan, Chairman of the committee of the author's graduate study, for his invaluable suggestions and advice, encouragement, patience and understanding that enable the author to complete the study despite long duration mainly because of official workload that the author has to attend.

Dr Jamal b Talib, Dr Yeang Hoong Yeet and Dr S. Sivakumaran for serving as members of committee of the author's graduate study and for their advice, suggestions and encouragement.

Staff of Crop Management Unit notably En. K. Jeyakumar, En. Mohd Noh Hj Yunus, En. Muthugaruppan, En. Rajan, En. Mazlan, En. K. Arumugam and En. Ramamoorthy for their technical support both in the field and in the laboratory. Their assistance is deeply appreciated. Appreciation is also extended to En. Shah of the Agriculture Faculty, UPM for his technical assistance.

Dr Hj Abdul Ghani Ibrahim and En. Ishak Said for allowing the use young *Hevea* trees clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1 in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor, Field 112 and Field 103-108 in Pelepah Division of RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore respectively.

Statisticians from the Information Technology Unit of MRB specifically Tn Hj Mohd Napi Daud and Siti Hawa Sulong and their staff Doyah and Hamzah for advice and assistance in analysis of data generated from the study.

Finally to my mother, Parsah bte Omar, my wife Hasnah Abdul Manaf, my son, Mohd Hatta and my daughter, Elisya Farha for their encouragement and patience throughout the study period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
APPROVAL SHEETS	x
DECLARATION FORM	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xix
LIST OF FIGURES	xxv
LIST OF PLATES	xxix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxx
TAPPING NOTATION	xxxii
 CHAPTER	
 1 INTRODUCTION	 1.1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	2.1
2.1 Introduction of rubber in Malaysia	2.1
2.2 Establishment of rubber industry in the Peninsula	2.2
2.3 The structural changes and contribution of rubber industry	2.5
2.4 Objective of tapping	2.6
2.5 Factors influencing crop exploitation	2.8
2.5.1 Horticultural and agronomic practices	2.8
2.5.2 Tapping parameters	2.9
2.5.3 Anatomy and cytology of latex	2.10
2.5.4 Latex Physiology	2.13
2.5.5 Latex total solid content and dry rubber content	2.15
2.5.6 Plugging index and flow of latex	2.16
2.5.7 Turgor pressure diurnal and seasonal changes in latex flow	2.19
2.5.8 Sucrose and latex invertase activity	2.21
2.6 Exploitation system	2.24
2.6.1 Concept and methods of latex extraction	2.24
2.6.2 Excision method of latex extraction	2.25
2.6.3 Incision method of latex extraction	2.28
2.7 Tapping systems for young rubber	2.31
2.7.1 Conventional tapping system	2.31
2.7.2 Puncture tapping system	2.33
2.7.3 Short cut system	2.36
2.8 Stimulating latex production	2.36

2.8.1	Physical injuring for stimulating latex flow	2.36
2.8.2	Use of chemical for stimulating latex flow	2.37
2.8.3	Use of ethylene gas for stimulating latex flow	2.40
2.8.4	Development of gaseous method of stimulation in Malaysia	2.42
2.8.5	Role of ethylene in relation to production of rubber	2.43
2.9	Methods of ethephon application for the conventional tapping system commonly practiced by the NR industry of Malaysia	2.45
2.9.1	Bark application method	2.46
2.9.2	Panel application method	2.47
2.9.3	Groove application method	2.48
2.9.4	Lace application method	2.48
2.10	Method of ethephon application for puncture tapping system	2.49
2.11	Yield response of young <i>Hevea</i> trees to ethephon stimulation	2.50
2.11.1	Yield response of cut system to exploitation system without stimulation	2.50
2.11.2	Yield response of cut system to the conventional ethephon stimulation	2.51
2.11.3	Yield response of incision method of latex extraction to the conventional ethephon stimulation	2.53
2.12	Status of nutrient drainage in relation to exploitation of <i>Hevea</i> trees	2.55
2.12.1	Nutrient drainage in leaf	2.55
2.12.2	Nutrient drainage in latex	2.57
2.12.3	Nutrient drainage in bark	2.58
3	GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS	3.1
3.1	Site description	3.1
3.2	Experimental design	3.1
3.3	Treatment combinations	3.2
3.4	Stimulation practices	3.3
3.5	Recording of parameters of tapping, stimulation and bole growth	3.4
3.5.1	Tapping yields	3.4
3.5.2	Dry rubber content	3.6
3.5.3	Moisture content of bark	3.8
3.5.4	Bark consumption	3.8
3.5.5	Girth measurement	3.9
3.5.6	Incidence of tapping panel dryness	3.9
3.6	Analysis of data	3.10

4	RESPONSE OF 5-YEAR-OLD CLONE RRIM 901, PANEL BO-1 TO DIFFERENT EXPLOITATION SYSTEMS	4.1
4.1	Introduction	4.1
4.2	Materials and methods	4.2
4.3	Results	4.5
4.3.1	Seasonal change	4.5
4.3.2	Bole growth	4.6
4.3.3	Total tree productivity	4.12
4.3.4	Proportion of latex and late drip	4.19
4.3.5	Land productivity	4.26
4.3.6	Dry rubber content	4.31
4.3.7	Bark reaction to REACTORRIM method of stimulation	4.34
4.3.8	Bark consumption	4.39
4.3.9	Moisture content in the bark	4.40
4.3.10	Incidence of tapping panel dryness	4.42
4.4	Discussion	4.43
4.4.1	Tree productivity	4.43
4.4.2	Dry rubber content	4.45
4.4.3	Bark moisture content	4.47
4.4.4	Incidence of tapping panel dryness	4.48
4.4.5	Proportion of latex and late drip	4.50
4.4.6	Effect of wintering period	4.52
4.5	Conclusion	4.53
5	STUDY ON THE STATUS OF MACRO AND MICRO ELEMENTS IN LATEX, BARK AND LEAF OF CLONE RRIM 901, PANEL BO-1 TAPPED WITH DIFFERENT EXPLOITATION SYSTEMS	5.1
5.1	Introduction	5.1
5.2	Materials and methods	5.3
5.2.1	Determination of Nitrogen	5.6
5.2.2	Determination of Phosphorus	5.6
5.2.3	Determination of Potassium (K), Magnesium (mg), Manganese (Mn), Copper (Cu), Iron (Fe), Zinc (Zn) and Calcium (Ca)	5.7
5.3	Results	5.8
5.3.1	Nitrogen	5.8
5.3.1	Phosphate	5.12
5.3.3	Potassium	5.16
5.3.4	Magnesium	5.20
5.3.5	Calcium	5.24
5.3.6	Copper	5.27
5.3.7	Manganese	5.30
5.3.8	Iron	5.34

5.3.9	Zinc	5.36
5.3.10	Correlation between yield, DRC and mineral elements status in leaf, bark and latex	5.40
5.4	Discussion	5.44
5.4.1	Leaf nutrient status of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in relation to methods of latex extraction and stimulation	5.44
5.4.2	Drainage of nutrients from latex of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in relation to methods of latex extraction and stimulation	5.45
5.4.3	Loss of nutrients from bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in relation to methods of latex extraction and stimulation	5.49
5.4.4	Annual loss of elements	5.53
5.4.5	Annual bark shaved in relation to yield and nutrient drainage	5.54
5.5	Conclusion	5.57
6	STUDY ON THE STATUS OF SELECTED PHYSIOLOGICAL LATEX PARAMETERS OF HEVEA TREES CLONE RRIM 901, PANEL BO-1, TAPPED WITH DIFFERENT EXPLOITATION SYSTEMS	6.1
6.1	Introduction	6.1
6.2	Materials and methods	6.3
6.2.1	Study site and sampling procedures	6.3
6.2.2	Field sampling	6.4
6.2.3	Determination of pH	6.5
6.2.4	Protocols for determination of sucrose, inorganic phosphate, thiols and proline	6.5
6.3	Results	6.10
6.3.1	pH of latex	6.10
6.3.2	Thiols	6.13
6.3.3	Proline	6.18
6.3.4	Inorganic phosphate	6.24
6.3.5	Sucrose	6.29
6.3.6	Correlations among parameters of latex physiology	6.34
6.4	Discussion	6.38
6.4.1	Sucrose	6.38
6.4.2	pH	6.44
6.4.3	Thiols	6.46
6.4.4	Inorganic phosphate	6.48
6.4.5	Proline	6.50
6.5	Conclusion	6.52

7	EVALUATION OF RESPONSE OF HEVEA TREES CLONE RRIM 901, PANEL BO-1, OPENED FOR TAPPING AT 10-YEAR-OLD TO DIFFERENT EXPLOITATION SYSTEMS	7.1
7.1	Introduction	7.1
7.2	Materials and methods	7.2
7.3	Results	7.4
7.3.1	Total tree productivity	7.4
7.3.2	Effect of wintering period on the tapping yield	7.10
7.3.3	Dry rubber content	7.11
7.3.4	Proportion of latex and late drip	7.12
7.3.5	Land productivity	7.17
7.3.6	Incidence of tapping panel dryness	7.19
7.3.7	Bark reaction to REACTORRIM method of stimulation	7.25
7.4	Discussion	7.25
7.4.1	Influence of delayed opening of tapping on yield	7.26
7.4.2	Bark reaction of <i>Hevea</i> trees opened for tapping at 10-year-old to REACTORRIM method of stimulation	7.32
7.4.3	Influence of stimulation on the proportion of latex and late drip	7.33
7.4.4	Development of tapping panel dryness	7.34
7.5	Conclusion	7.36
8	STUDY OF RESPONSE OF 10-YEAR-OLD <i>HEVEA</i> TREES CLONE RRIM 901, PANEL BO-1, PREVIOUSLY TAPPED FOR FOUR YEARS, TO DIFFERENT EXPLOITATION SYSTEMS	8.1
8.1	Introduction	8.1
8.2	Materials and methods	8.3
8.3	Results	8.4
8.3.1	Total tree productivity	8.4
8.3.2	Influence of surface area on g/t/t	8.6
8.3.3	Dry rubber content	8.8
8.3.4	Proportion of latex and late drip	8.11
8.3.5	Land productivity	8.13
8.3.6	Bark reaction to REACTORRIM method of stimulation	8.14
8.4	Discussion	8.15
8.4.1	Yield response to stimulation in relation to previous tapping	8.15
8.4.2	Influence of previous tapping on dry rubber content	8.18
8.4.3	Bark reaction and tapping panel dryness in relation to response of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, previously tapped for four years to different method of stimulation	8.20
8.5	Conclusion	8.21

9	GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	9.1
9.1	Conventional method of stimulation versus gaseous method of stimulation	9.1
9.2	Tapping parameters as influenced by age, tapping panel and tapping history	9.3
9.3	Growth and bark reaction of young <i>Hevea</i> trees, in response to conventional and gaseous method of stimulation	9.10
9.4	Status of mineral elements of young <i>Hevea</i> trees stimulated with conventional and gaseous method of stimulation	9.12
9.5	Status of selected physiological parameters of young <i>Hevea</i> trees stimulated with conventional and gaseous methods of stimulation	9.18
	REFERENCES	R1
	APPENDIX	
A	REACTORRIM method of stimulation	A1
B	Details of treatment combinations	A2
C	Additional tables	A3
	BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	B1

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Rainfall pattern and average temperature at RRIES Sg. Buloh in 1996 and 1997	4.3
2 Average bole growth of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh	4.8
3 Status of incidence of tapping panel dryness based on the number of trees and length of cut over 24 months	4.43
4 Pearson correlation coefficient of mean g/t/t with leaf, latex and bark mineral content of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	5.41
5 Pearson correlation coefficient of mean DRC with leaf, latex and bark mineral content of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	5.42
6 Pearson correlation coefficients between yield (g/t/t) and latex physiological parameters of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, at different yielding periods of 1996 and 1997	6.35
7 Pearson correlation coefficients between pH and other latex physiological parameters of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, at different yielding periods of 1996 and 1997	6.36
8 Pearson correlation coefficient between thiols and other latex physiological parameters of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, at different yielding periods of 1996 and 1997	6.37
9 Pearson correlation coefficient between praline, Pi and sucrose and between Pi and sucrose of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, at different yielding periods of 1996 and 1997	6.37
10 Monthly rainfall of 1996 and 1997 at Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	7.3
11 Progress of incidence of tapping panel dryness of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, open for tapping at 10-year-old , Field 112 Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	7.20

12	Percentage of tapping panel dryness expressed in term of length of dry patch over the total length of cut after 18 month of tapping	7.23
13	Total g/t/t per mm ² of tapped bark of <i>Hevea</i> trees previously tapped for four years, clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1 in Field 103-108, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	8.7
14	ANOVA (Mean square) of bole circumference of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.2
15	ANOVA (Mean square) of total g/t/t of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.3
16	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) of total g/t/t of 5-year-old clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.4
17	ANOVA (Mean square) of g/t/t of latex and late drip of 5-year-old clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.5
18	ANOVA (Mean square) of kg/ha of 5-year-old clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.6
19	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for kg/ha of 5-year-old clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.7
20	ANOVA (Mean square) of DRC of 5-year-old clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.8
21	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for DRC of 5-year-old clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.9
22	ANOVA (Mean square) of bark consumption of 5-year-old clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, over 24 months (cm/24 months) in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.10

23	ANOVA (Mean square) of bark moisture content of 5-year-old clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, during the low, moderate and high yielding periods of 1997 in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.11
24	ANOVA (Mean square) of Nitrogen content (% weight) in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.12
25	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for Nitrogen content in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, Field 19 RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.13
26	ANOVA (Mean square) of Phosphorus content (% weight) in leaf, latex and bark of young <i>Hevea</i> trees clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1 in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.14
27	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for the Phosphorus content in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.15
28	ANOVA (Mean square) of Potassium content (% weight) in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.16
29	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for the content of Potassium in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, Field 19 RRIES Sg. Buloh Selangor DE	A3.17
30	ANOVA (Mean square) of Magnesium content (% weight) in leaf, latex and bark of young <i>Hevea</i> trees clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.18
31	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for the content of Magnesium in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.19
32	ANOVA (Mean square) of Calcium content (ppm) in the leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.20
33	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for the Calcium content in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.21

34	ANOVA (Mean square) of Copper content (ppm) in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.22
35	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for the content of Copper in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.23
36	ANOVA (Mean square) of Manganese content (ppm) in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.24
37	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for the content of Manganese in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19 RRIES Sg. Buloh Selangor DE	A3.25
38	ANOVA (Mean square) of Iron content (ppm) in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.26
39	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for the content of Iron in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19 RRIES Sg. Buloh Selangor DE	A3.27
40	ANOVA (Mean square) of Zinc content (ppm) in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh	A3.28
41	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for the content of Zinc in leaf, latex and bark of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.29
42	ANOVA (Mean square) of pH (1996 and 1997) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh Selangor DE	A3.30
43	ANOVA (Mean square) of thiols (1996 and 1997) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.31
44	ANOVA (Mean square) of proline (1996 and 1997) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh Selangor DE	A3.32

45	ANOVA (Mean square) of inorganic phosphate (1996 and 1997) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.33
46	ANOVA (Mean square) of sucrose (1996 and 1997) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh, Selangor DE	A3.34
47	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) of sucrose content (mM/L) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 19, RRIES Sg. Buloh Selangor DE	A3.35
48	ANOVA (Mean square) of total g/t/t and DRC (18 months) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, opened for tapping at 10-year-old, in Field 112, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	A3.36
49	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) of total g/t/t and DRC (18 months) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 112, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	A3.37
50	ANOVA (Mean square) of total g/t/t (12 months and 13 th to 18 th month) of <i>Hevea</i> trees opened for tapping at 10-year-old, clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 112, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	A3.38
51	ANOVA (Mean square) of average latex and LD g/t/t (18 months) of <i>Hevea</i> trees opened for tapping at 10-year-old, clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 112, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	A3.39
52	ANOVA (Mean square) of kg/ha (12 months and 13 th to 18 th month) of <i>Hevea</i> trees opened for tapping at 10-year-old, clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 103-108, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	A3.40
53	ANOVA (Mean square) of total g/t/t and DRC (12 months) of <i>Hevea</i> trees previously tapped for four years, clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 103-108, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	A3.41
54	Contrast ($p < 0.05$) for total g/t/t and DRC (12 months) of clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 103-108, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT	A3.42

- 55 ANOVA (Mean square) of latex and LD g/t/t (12 months) of *Hevea* trees previously tapped for four years, clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 103-108, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Johore DT A3.43
- 56 ANOVA (Mean square) of kg/ha/year of *Hevea* trees previously tapped for four years, clone RRIM 901, panel BO-1, in Field 103-108, Pelepah Division, RRIES Kota Tinggi, Tinggi, Johore DT A3.44

