

## NUMERICAL DATA

### Removal of particulate matter and trace elements from ambient air by urban greenery in the winter season (2018)

Total amount and division into categories (sPM and wPM) of large (10–100  $\mu\text{m}$ ), coarse (2.5–10  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and fine (0.2–2.5  $\mu\text{m}$ ) PM accumulated on foliage of examined plant species. Data are means  $\pm$  SD,  $n = 4$

Species	PM ( $\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$ ) Size fraction ( $\mu\text{m}$ )			10–100 $\mu\text{m}$ ( $\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$ ) PM category (surface/in waxes)		2.5–10 $\mu\text{m}$ ( $\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$ ) PM category (surface/in waxes)		0.2–2.5 $\mu\text{m}$ ( $\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$ ) PM category (surface/in waxes)	
	10-100	2.5–10	0.2–2.5	sPM	wPM	sPM	wPM	sPM	wPM
<b>Pinus nigra</b>	114.6 $\pm$ 15.7	8.99 $\pm$ 2.59	4.13 $\pm$ 0.74	70.2 $\pm$ 17.0	44.3 $\pm$ 4.74	3.63 $\pm$ 3.15	5.36 $\pm$ 1.03	1.84 $\pm$ 0.71	2.30 $\pm$ 1.41
	A <sup>1</sup> (a <sup>2</sup> )	B(a)	B(a)	A(a)	B(a)	A(a)	A(a)	A(a)	A(a)
<b>Taxus baccata</b>	48.4 $\pm$ 3.26	3.77 $\pm$ 0.58	1.45 $\pm$ 0.53	25. 9 $\pm$ 3.9 1	22.5 $\pm$ 5.10	1.47 $\pm$ 0.45	2.67 $\pm$ 0.98	0.81 $\pm$ 0.23	0.64 $\pm$ 0.33
	A (b)	B(b)	B(b)	A(b)	A(b)	A(a)	A(b)	A(b)	A(a)
<b>Carpinus betulus</b>	3.97 $\pm$ 0.54	2.79 $\pm$ 0.20	1.33 $\pm$ 0.70	2.3 4 $\pm$ 0.6 9	1.62 $\pm$ 0.58	1.66 $\pm$ 0.73	1.13 $\pm$ 0.59	0.82 $\pm$ 0.23	0.50 $\pm$ 0.62
	A (c)	B(b)	C(b)	A(c)	A(c)	A(a)	A(b)	A(b)	A(a)

1. Comparisons between different PM size fraction (10–100, 2.5–10, 0.2–2.5  $\mu\text{m}$ ) or category (sPM and wPM) within the same plant species (capital letters)
2. Comparisons between different plant species within the same PM size fraction (10–100, 2.5–10, 0.2–2.5  $\mu\text{m}$ ) or category (sPM and wPM) (lowercase letters)

The black pine plants accumulated significantly the greatest mass of PM in all size fractions. On all species, the largest size fraction (10–100  $\mu\text{m}$ ) made up significantly the greatest proportion of accumulated PM mass and the fine fraction made up the smallest proportion. Expressed as percentage, the large PM fraction amounted to 90% in *P. nigra* and *T. baccata*, and 49% in *C. betulus*, while fine PM accounted for only 3% in *P. nigra* and *T. baccata* or 16% in *C. betulus*. Regardless of the species, the amount of large PM was higher on the foliage surface (sPM) than in waxes (wPM).

## Removal of particulate matter and trace elements from ambient air by urban greenery in the winter season (2018)

Leaf and PM concentrations ( $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$  DW) of selected trace elements. Data are means  $\pm$  SD, n = 4 (plant material) or n = 2 (PM)

Species	$\text{mg kg}^{-1}$ DW In plant	In accumulated PM					
		Total PM	10–100 $\mu\text{m}$	2.5–10 $\mu\text{m}$	0.2–2.5 $\mu\text{m}$	Total sPM	Total wPM
	Zn						
<b>Pinus nigra</b>	29.0 $\pm$ 5.55 B	36.5 $\pm$ 17.3	37.1 $\pm$ 19.6	22.5 $\pm$ 4.11	54.2 $\pm$ 8.63	42.0 $\pm$ 28.5	25.2 $\pm$ 2.27
<b>Taxus baccata</b>	52.9 $\pm$ 5.71 A	19.4 $\pm$ 5.15	19.7 $\pm$ 5.25	18.8 $\pm$ 3.42	8.93 $\pm$ 4.13	24.3 $\pm$ 2.73	14.1 $\pm$ 7.07
<b>Carpinus betulus</b>	56.5 $\pm$ 12.5 A	26.0 $\pm$ 1.79	23.5 $\pm$ 0.93	18.5 $\pm$ 7.43	51.6 $\pm$ 12.9	29.4 $\pm$ 1.70	21.2 $\pm$ 1.59
<b>Average</b>	46.1 $\pm$ 4.30	24.1 $\pm$ 3.06	26.8 $\pm$ 5.00	19.9 $\pm$ 1.86	38.2 $\pm$ 9.74	31.9 $\pm$ 6.20	20.2 $\pm$ 2.48
	Mg						
<b>Pinus nigra</b>	923.0 $\pm$ 318.1 B	268.5 $\pm$ 13.5	286.0 $\pm$ 12.5	103.0 $\pm$ 2.61	142.6 $\pm$ 22.9	256.3 $\pm$ 36.0	274.1 $\pm$ 81.2
<b>Taxus baccata</b>	985.4 $\pm$ 243.2 AB	107.3 $\pm$ 0.25	110.9 $\pm$ 1.98	86.2 $\pm$ 0.32	51.0 $\pm$ 41.7	118.2 $\pm$ 8.84	94.9 $\pm$ 10.6
<b>Carpinus betulus</b>	1632.8 $\pm$ 466.1 A	145.6 $\pm$ 2.35	116.3 $\pm$ 17.9	115.9 $\pm$ 4.03	296.5 $\pm$ 43.6	126.4 $\pm$ 3.74	173.7 $\pm$ 13.0
<b>Average</b>	1180.4 $\pm$ 134.0	173.8 $\pm$ 30.9	171.1 $\pm$ 36.6	101.7 $\pm$ 5.52	163.4 $\pm$ 46.8	166.9 $\pm$ 29.1	180.8 $\pm$ 36.1
	Ni						
<b>Pinus nigra</b>	0.98 $\pm$ 0.28 B	3.67 $\pm$ 0.00	3.63 $\pm$ 0.00	3.17 $\pm$ 0.18	5.79 $\pm$ 0.27	3.67 $\pm$ 0.00	3.66 $\pm$ 0.01
<b>Taxus baccata</b>	1.01 $\pm$ 0.49 B	3.24 $\pm$ 0.23	3.33 $\pm$ 0.21	2.42 $\pm$ 0.13	2.55 $\pm$ 0.60	3.06 $\pm$ 0.14	3.46 $\pm$ 0.64
<b>Carpinus betulus</b>	2.24 $\pm$ 0.58 A	3.76 $\pm$ 0.40	3.49 $\pm$ 0.40	3.05 $\pm$ 0.01	6.31 $\pm$ 1.82	3.73 $\pm$ 0.38	3.81 $\pm$ 0.42
<b>Average</b>	1.41 $\pm$ 0.21	3.55 $\pm$ 0.13	3.48 $\pm$ 0.10	2.88 $\pm$ 0.15	4.88 $\pm$ 0.82	3.48 $\pm$ 0.15	3.64 $\pm$ 0.15
	Pb						
<b>Pinus nigra</b>	1.31 $\pm$ 0.59 B	425.7 $\pm$ 20.5	390.8 $\pm$ 21.0	544.2 $\pm$ 32.7	1121.1 $\pm$ 103.2	406.8 $\pm$ 30.6	456.8 $\pm$ 4.47
<b>Taxus baccata</b>	1.64 $\pm$ 0.55 B	499.2 $\pm$ 8.30	519.0 $\pm$ 6.48	363.1 $\pm$ 35.8	211.1 $\pm$ 0.74	538.4 $\pm$ 36.7	459.9 $\pm$ 51.5
<b>Carpinus betulus</b>	3.60 $\pm$ 2.35 A	598.2 $\pm$ 72.6	439.7 $\pm$ 24.1	528.2 $\pm$ 12.3	1310.5 $\pm$ 556.2	638.3 $\pm$ 129.2	542.7 $\pm$ 5.53
<b>Average</b>	2.18 $\pm$ 0.48	507.7 $\pm$ 34.5	449.8 $\pm$ 24.3	478.5 $\pm$ 37.7	880.9 $\pm$ 238.2	527.8 $\pm$ 49.3	486.5 $\pm$ 20.2
	Cr						
<b>Pinus nigra</b>	19.3 $\pm$ 4.09 A	12.5 $\pm$ 1.20	13.1 $\pm$ 1.41	5.67 $\pm$ 0.56	9.88 $\pm$ 0.85	11.18 $\pm$ 2.08	14.2 $\pm$ 0.55
<b>Taxus baccata</b>	16.6 $\pm$ 2.47 A	6.29 $\pm$ 0.01	6.54 $\pm$ 0.05	4.22 $\pm$ 0.21	3.97 $\pm$ 0.12	6.32 $\pm$ 0.11	6.27 $\pm$ 0.14
<b>Carpinus betulus</b>	22.5 $\pm$ 11.4 A	6.37 $\pm$ 0.20	5.32 $\pm$ 0.69	5.98 $\pm$ 0.67	11.1 $\pm$ 3.28	6.67 $\pm$ 0.08	5.93 $\pm$ 0.62
<b>Average</b>	19.5 $\pm$ 2.00	8.38 $\pm$ 1.31	8.32 $\pm$ 1.55	5.2 $\pm$ 0.38	8.32 $\pm$ 1.52	8.06 $\pm$ 1.06	8.80 $\pm$ 1.71
	Cd						
<b>Pinus nigra</b>	0.06 $\pm$ 0.02 B	80.6 $\pm$ 0.40	74.7 $\pm$ 0.36	98.3 $\pm$ 7.62	205.7 $\pm$ 14.4	76.4 $\pm$ 1.30	86.5 $\pm$ 0.77
<b>Taxus baccata</b>	0.04 $\pm$ 0.01 B	91.6 $\pm$ 1.76	95.8 $\pm$ 1.32	63.0 $\pm$ 6.52	28.9 $\pm$ 1.45	96.0 $\pm$ 3.47	87.2 $\pm$ 6.80
<b>Carpinus betulus</b>	0.11 $\pm$ 0.01 A	108.9 $\pm$ 6.04	79.0 $\pm$ 8.43	100.0 $\pm$ 7.96	234.5 $\pm$ 83.7	110.2 $\pm$ 13.01	107.3 $\pm$ 3.93
<b>Average</b>	0.07 $\pm$ 0.01	93.7 $\pm$ 5.32	83.1 $\pm$ 4.36	87.1 $\pm$ 7.97	156.4 $\pm$ 43.5	94.2 $\pm$ 6.67	93.7 $\pm$ 4.55
	Sb						
<b>Pinus nigra</b>	0.34 $\pm$ 0.15 A	6.37 $\pm$ 0.56	6.95 $\pm$ 0.59	1.53 $\pm$ 0.92	0.72 $\pm$ 0.21	6.42 $\pm$ 0.69	6.26 $\pm$ 0.34
<b>Taxus baccata</b>	0.15 $\pm$ 0.06 A	0.87 $\pm$ 0.02	0.94 $\pm$ 0.04	0.27 $\pm$ 0.09	0.37 $\pm$ 0.05	0.73 $\pm$ 0.04	1.03 $\pm$ 0.02
<b>Carpinus betulus</b>	0.15 $\pm$ 0.05 A	0.64 $\pm$ 0.16	0.77 $\pm$ 0.30	0.48 $\pm$ 0.10	0.54 $\pm$ 0.18	0.78 $\pm$ 0.06	0.43 $\pm$ 0.31
<b>Average</b>	0.21 $\pm$ 0.04	2.63 $\pm$ 1.19	2.89 $\pm$ 1.29	0.76 $\pm$ 0.30	0.54 $\pm$ 0.08	2.64 $\pm$ 1.20	2.57 $\pm$ 1.17

Source: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-018-3628-0>

## Impact of particulate matter on basmati rice varieties grown in 1 Indo-Gangetic Plains of India: Growth, biochemical, physiological 2 and yield attributes (2018)

Variation in PM deposition, PM flux, leaf temperature, biochemical parameters and air pollution tolerance index (APTI) of rice varieties at three different growth stages and under three PM treatments.

Variety	Vegetative			Reproductive			Maturity		
	LPM	APM	EPM	LPM	APM	EPM	LPM	APM	EPM
<b>PM deposition (<math>\mu\text{gcm}^{-2}</math>)</b>									
PB-1509	392.4 ± 51.0	702.2 ± 95.6	905.7 ± 7.4	239.4 ± 40.4	780.2 ± 48.7	903.3 ± 9.0	551.5 ± 4.9	829.6 ± 129.6	992.3 ± 3.3
PS-5	632.2 ± 195.7	906.6 ± 52.4	1126.8 ± 3.2	575.2 ± 134.8	07.6 ± 170.7	1153.2 ± 6.0	612.9 ± 156.2	1171.8 ± 81.3	1271.9 ± 7.6
<b>PM Flux (<math>\mu\text{gcm}^{-2}\text{d}^{-1}</math>)</b>									
PB-1509	6.1 ± 2.1	7.4 ± 2.6	10.1 ± 2.6	10.8 ± 3.3	13.8 ± 8.3	15.8 ± 8.4	16.3 ± 3.7	24.2 ± 6.4	29.8 ± 4.6
PS-5	8.9 ± 3.2	12.4 ± 5.9	12.9 ± 5.9	16.8 ± 7.5	18.0 ± 4.9	20.9 ± 4.9	17.2 ± 4.0	25.0 ± 8.9	36.2 ± 6.3
<b>Leaf temperature (°C)</b>									
PB-1509	36.2 ± 0.03	36.3 ± 0.30	36.7 ± 0.06	31.9 ± 0.31	32.7 ± 0.23	34.1 ± 0.29	27.8 ± 0.01	29.2 ± 0.01	30.2 ± 0.11
PS-5	36.2 ± 0.01	36.4 ± 0.01	36.9 ± 0.01	32.0 ± 0.38	33.0 ± 0.15	34.9 ± 0.74	27.8 ± 0.01	29.2 ± 0.01	30.4 ± 0.38
<b>Chlorophyll content (mg/g FW)</b>									
PB-1509	0.23 ± 0.02	0.19 ± 0.01	0.15 ± 0.02	0.245 ± 0.02	0.22 ± 0.05	0.20 ± 0.02	0.077 ± 0.002	0.051 ± 0.003	0.046 ± 0.003
PS-5	0.22 ± 0.05	0.18 ± 0.01	0.14 ± 0.01	0.24 ± 0.02	0.23 ± 0.06	0.22 ± 0.01	0.076 ± 0.001	0.046 ± 0.001	0.040 ± 0.002
<b>Relative leaf water content (%)</b>									
PB-1509	86.7 ± 4.7	75.9 ± 5.4	71.7 ± 2.3	86.1 ± 3.2	83.2 ± 7.1	80.9 ± 4.2	57.3 ± 2.3	47.1 ± 6.4	42.9 ± 5.2
PS-5	78.7 ± 8.3	78.8 ± 5.1	66.5 ± 4.8	72.8 ± 4.9	75.8 ± 5.3	53.9 ± 5.6	63.9 ± 4.1	44.1 ± 3.1	33.8 ± 7.8
<b>pH</b>									
PB-1509	7.9 ± 0.005	7.7 ± 0.03	7.6 ± 0.02	7.8 ± 0.01	7.7 ± 0.02	7.7 ± 0.01	7.6 ± 0.02	7.5 ± 0.04	7.6 ± 0.05
PS-5	7.7 ± 0.002	7.7 ± 0.002	7.7 ± 0.00	7.6 ± 0.07	7.5 ± 0.06	7.6 ± 0.03	7.6 ± 0.01	7.4 ± 0.01	7.5 ± 0.03
<b>Ascorbic acid content (mg/FW)</b>									
PB-1509	1.44 ± 0.02	1.70 ± 0.02	2.32 ± 0.6	3.67 ± 0.3	4.68 ± 0.3	5.24 ± 0.3	2.34 ± 0.01	2.43 ± 0.01	3.24 ± 0.05
PS-5	1.57 ± 0.07	2.4 ± 0.02	3.03 ± 0.5	3.73 ± 0.4	4.83 ± 0.3	5.28 ± 0.4	2.93 ± 0.01	3.05 ± 0.03	3.27 ± 0.03
<b>APTI</b>									
PB-1509	9.8 ± 0.47	8.9 ± 0.54	9.0 ± 0.23	11.6 ± 0.32	12.0 ± 0.48	12.2 ± 0.39	7.5 ± 0.29	6.5 ± 0.34	6.8 ± 0.47
PS-5	9.1 ± 0.83	9.8 ± 0.51	9.0 ± 0.48	10.2 ± 0.05	11.3 ± 0.61	9.5 ± 0.51	8.6 ± 0.37	6.7 ± 0.40	5.8 ± 0.52

Data represent mean value ± standard deviation (n=6)

LPM = Low PM deposition; APM = Ambient PM deposition; EPM = Elevated PM deposition

Source: DOI: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2018.06.015

## Impact of particulate matter on basmati rice varieties grown in 1 Indo-Gangetic Plains of India: Growth, biochemical, physiological 2 and yield attributes (2018)

Effect of PM deposition on gas exchange of rice varieties.

Parameter	Growth Stage	Treatment	PB-1509	PS-5
Photosynthetic rate ( $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )	Vegetative	LPM	17.4± 2.1	14.9± 3.2
		APM	15.6± 0.1	13.7± 0.1
		EPM	13.2± 0.8	12.3± 0.5
	Reproductive	LPM	18.5± 0.4	17.8± 0.8
		APM	16.3± 0.4	15.2± 0.3
		EPM	11.2± 0.2	13.8± 0.5
	Maturity	LPM	9.8 ± 0.5	14.7 ± 0.9
		APM	4.3 ± 0.5	5.1 ± 0.9
		EPM	1.1 ± 0.07	3.3 ± 0.05
Stomatal conductance ( $\text{mol H}_2\text{O m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )	Vegetative	LPM	0.15± 0.009	0.18 ± 0.005
		APM	0.11± 0.005	0.16± 0.001
		EPM	0.10± 0.008	0.15± 0.006
	Reproductive	LPM	0.25± 0.4	0.19± 0.08
		APM	0.16± 0.04	0.17± 0.03
		EPM	0.16± 0.02	0.13± 0.3
	Maturity	LPM	0.09± 0.003	0.07 ± 0.05
		APM	0.05± 0.006	0.05± 0.004
		EPM	0.04± 0.009	0.03± 0.005

Source: DOI: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2018.06.015

## Particulate Matter pollution capture by leaves of seventeen living wall species with special reference to rail-traffic at a metropolitan station (2017)

Mean PM density ( $\pm$ SE) per 1 mm<sup>2</sup> of a leaf (data for adaxial and abaxial surfaces are combined) of different species of plants on the living wall at New Street Station, Birmingham, UK in 2016.

Species	PM1 $\pm$ SE x 10 <sup>3</sup>	Group	PM2.5 $\pm$ SE x 10 <sup>3</sup>	Group	PM10 $\pm$ SE x 10 <sup>3</sup>	Group
<i>B. sempervirens</i>	45.03 $\pm$ 3.3	a	16.46 $\pm$ 0.9	a	3.04 $\pm$ 0.2	ab
<i>H. albicans</i>	40.41 $\pm$ 6.2	a	13.01 $\pm$ 1.4	ab	2.77 $\pm$ 0.2	abc
<i>T. vulgaris</i>	27.86 $\pm$ 2.6	a	11.41 $\pm$ 0.7	abc	4.04 $\pm$ 0.2	a
<i>H. salicifolia</i>	14.76 $\pm$ 2.4	b	8.32 $\pm$ 1.1	bcd	1.87 $\pm$ 0.2	cd
<i>G. macrorrhizum</i>	12.28 $\pm$ 2.2	bc	2.79 $\pm$ 0.3	efgh	0.90 $\pm$ 0.1	efg
<i>H. youngii</i>	11.65 $\pm$ 0.8	bc	7.26 $\pm$ 0.5	cd	2.53 $\pm$ 0.2	bc
<i>H. helix</i>	9.99 $\pm$ 1.4	bcd	4.90 $\pm$ 0.5	de	1.45 $\pm$ 0.2	de
<i>E. amygdaloides</i>	9.88 $\pm$ 1.5	bcd	4.23 $\pm$ 0.6	ef	1.68 $\pm$ 0.1	efg
<i>A. maritima</i>	9.24 $\pm$ 1.1	bcd	3.51 $\pm$ 0.3	efg	1.28 $\pm$ 0.1	de
<i>P. terminalis</i>	8.37 $\pm$ 1.0	bcd	2.51 $\pm$ 0.2	fghi	0.83 $\pm$ 0.1	efg
<i>G. odoratum</i>	6.87 $\pm$ 1.3	cde	2.79 $\pm$ 0.4	efgh	1.09 $\pm$ 0.1	def
<i>P. veris</i>	6.58 $\pm$ 0.8	cde	2.17 $\pm$ 0.2	ghi	0.72 $\pm$ 0.07	efg
<i>H. officinalis</i>	5.82 $\pm$ 0.8	def	2.69 $\pm$ 0.3	fgh	0.90 $\pm$ 0.09	efg
<i>H. sternii</i>	4.35 $\pm$ 0.7	efg	2.49 $\pm$ 0.4	fghi	0.68 $\pm$ 0.1	fg
<i>B. spicant</i>	3.08 $\pm$ 0.3	efg	0.74 $\pm$ 0.06	j	0.26 $\pm$ 0.02	hi
<i>P. scolopendrium</i>	3.01 $\pm$ 0.5	fg	1.47 $\pm$ 0.1	ij	0.21 $\pm$ 0.03	i
<i>L. nivea</i>	2.78 $\pm$ 0.4	g	1.74 $\pm$ 0.3	hi	0.54 $\pm$ 0.09	gh

Species sharing the same letter/group for a specific PM size range are not significantly different using Tukey's HSD post hoc test with 95% confidence level, P>0.05

**Source:** <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.07.005>