

NUMERICAL DATA

Green wall technology for the phytoremediation of indoor air: a system for the reduction of high CO₂ concentrations (2018)

Light compensation points for the tested plant species in 150-mm pots and 15.0-L chambers. The compensation point is the light level at which the potted plant neither produces nor consumes net CO₂

Species	Common name	Compensation point light level (μmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹ (lx))
Neomarica sp.	Walking iris	15 (700)
Philodendron xanadu	Xanadu	14 (650)
Peperomia sp.	Large Leaf Peperomia	13 (600)
Peperomia sp.	Small Leaf Peperomia	13 (600)
Gibasis sp.	Tahitian Bridal Veil	10 (460)
Epipremnum aureum	Golden pothos	10 (460)
Chlorophytum comosum	Spider plant	10 (460)

Green wall technology for the phytoremediation of indoor air: a system for the reduction of high CO₂ concentrations (2018)

Net effective CO₂ removal from a sealed room by four modules containing two different plant species, at two different light intensities and with module impellers off and running at full output (3.5 m s⁻¹)

Plant cultivar	Light level (μmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)	Fan speed (m s ⁻¹)	Volume of CO ₂ removed (mL h ⁻¹)	Mass CO ₂ removed (g h ⁻¹)	CADR (m ³ m ⁻² green wall h ⁻²)	ACH (m ⁻² green wall)
Chlorophytum	50	0	2418	4.43	0.21	0.014
	50	3.5	2221	4.07	0.26	0.017
	250	0	2688	4.92	0.31	0.020
	250	3.5	2999	5.49	0.33	0.021
Epipremnum	50	0	194	0.35	0.19	0.012
	50	3.5	351	0.64	0.16	0.011
	250	0	232	0.43	0.23	0.015
	250	3.5	745	1.36	0.31	0.020

Source: Air Qual Atmos Health (2017) 10:575–585 DOI 10.1007/s11869-016-0452-x

Assessment of filtration efficiency and physiological responses of selected plant species to indoor air pollutants (toluene and 2-ethylhexanol) under chamber conditions(2018)

Removal rate constant for 2-ethylhexanol and toluene in experiments with *Dieffenbachia maculata*, *Spathiphyllum wallisii*, and *Asparagus densiflorus* under different light conditions (light/ dark). Values are means \pm SD ($n = 4$) after 48 h of VOC exposure

	Plant species	Removal rate constant [$\text{L h}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2}$ leaf area]		
		Light	Dark	
2-Ethylhexanol	D. maculata	1.8 ± 0.2	1.4	$\pm 0.1^*$
	S. wallisii	2.4 ± 0.2	1.9	$\pm 0.2^*$
	A. densiflorus	2.0 ± 1.1	1.7	± 1.0
	Significance among species	n.s.	n.s.	
Toluene	D. maculata	5.6 ± 1.8	5.5	± 1.2
	S. wallisii	5.7 ± 1.5	4.0	± 0.8
	A. densiflorus	4.0 ± 2.1	3.4	± 2.0
	Significance among species	n.s.	n.s.	

Asterisks indicate significant differences between light conditions within plant species and VOC identity ($p \leq 0.05$, one-way ANOVA, followed Tukey's HSD test)

n.s. not significant

Source: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-017-0453-9>

Phytoremediation of VOCs from indoor air by ornamental potted plants: A pilot study using a palm species under the controlled environment (2018)

Average reduction of formaldehyde vapors achieved by air and root part of *Chamaedorea elegans* with and without combined chamber losses

	Inlet	With combined chamber losses			Without combined chamber			Leaf surface area
			los ses					
Type of test	concentrati on	C out	Whole RE	Whole EC	C out	Ne t	Net EC	

	(mg/m ³)					R E		
	(mg/m ³)	(%)	(mg/m ^{2.h})	(mg/m ³)	(%)	(mg/m ^{2.h})		(m ²)
Chamber								
loss at 40%	6.37 ±0.13	5.92 ±0.22	7.06 ±1.72	-	5.92	7.06	-	-
RH								
Chamber								
loss at 80%	6.71 ±0.02	5.69 ±0.09	15.20 ±0.97	-	5.69	15.20	-	-
RH								
	0.66 ±0.04	0.00±00	100.00 ±00	0.11 ±04	0.10	84.80	0.10	2.43
	0.97 ±0.04	0.12± 0.02	87.63 ±1.17	0.15 ±0.03	0.27	72.43	0.12	2.43
	1.63 ±0.05	0.26± 0.03	84.05 ±1.57	0.24 ±0.04	0.51	68.85	0.19	2.43
Average	2.68 ±0.02	0.46± 0.03	82.84 ±1.06	0.38 ±0.01	0.87	67.63	0.31	2.43
	4.97 ±0.03	0.81± 0.05	83.70 ±0.88	0.72 ±0.02	1.57	68.50	0.59	2.43
entire plant	7.13 ±0.03	1.32± 0.06	81.49 ±0.72	1.00 ±0.04	2.40	66.29	0.82	2.43
	11.72 ±0.06	2.61± 0.09	77.73 ±0.66	1.57 ±0.03	4.39	62.53	1.27	2.43
	14.58 ±0.05	3.88± 0.06	73.39 ±0.30	1.85 ±0.03	6.10	58.19	1.47	2.43
	16.37 ±0.07	5.77± 0.05	64.75 ±0.14	1.83 ±0.03	8.26	49.55	1.40	2.43
Effect of darkness	7.13 ±0.03	1.86 ±0.11	73.91 ±1.48	0.91 ±0.01	2.94	58.71	0.72	2.43
Root zone, pot & soil	8.72 ±0.10	4.84 ±0.07	44.50 ±0.13	12.16 ±0.10	6.17	29.29	8.02	0.134*

Source: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.01.078>

Correlation Between Plant Physiology and CO₂ Removable (2017)

All the results of CO₂ reduction by plants species at four conditions

		Percentage of CO ₂ Reduction (%)			
	300 lux & 450±5 ppm of CO ₂	700 lux & CO ₂	300 lux & CO ₂	700 lux & CO ₂	700 lux & CO ₂
Type of Plants					
Anthurium	0.62	8.26	2.2	10.8	
Dumb Cane	6.38	12.72	5.5	11.10	
Golden Pothos	6.67	11.81	6.10	10.3	
Kadaka Fern	5.86	12.67	6.50	12.48	
Prayer Plant	7.68	14.88	7.0	14.80	
Spider Plant	-1.44	-1.13	-0.2	0.1	
Syngonium	4.08	10.56	6.72	10.08	

Physiology parameter for each type of plants

Type of Plants	Physiology Parameter		
	Leaf Area (m ²)	Fresh Weight (g)	Dry Weight (g)
Anthurium	0.1072±0.008	104.089±9.543	22.488±1.306
Dumb Cane	0.1441±0.007	123.594±11.981	16.991±2.298
Golden Pothos	0.1273±0.009	248.435±13.987	68.078±1.817
Kadaka Fern	0.1469±0.008	132.708±10.192	20.927±3.471
Prayer Plant	0.1817±0.004	106.545±7.871	13.478±1.025
Spider Plant	0.0771±0.005	56.221±8.086	7.353±1.615
Syngonium	0.0601±0.003	65.119±6.580	15.044±2.639

Correlation between physiology parameter of plants and condition of light intensity and CO₂ concentration

	CO ₂ removable at four conditions (Pearson Correlation)			
Physiology Parameter	300 lux & CO ₂	700 lux & CO ₂	300 lux & CO ₂	700 lux & CO ₂
	450±10 ppm of CO ₂	450±10 ppm of CO ₂	1000±10 ppm of CO ₂	1000±10 ppm of CO ₂
Leaf Area	0.763	0.687	0.526	0.686
Fresh Weight	0.487	0.411	0.422	0.325
Dry Weight	0.284	0.235	0.294	0.164

Source: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5002203>