

Biomassestimation models of three fast-growing tree species at Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract

A field experiment was conducted for develop the regression models of biomass of three fast-growing trees, viz., *Populus deltoides* (Poplar), *Eucalyptus spp.* (Eucalyptus) and *Casuarina equisetifolia* (Casuarina) in high-density plantation after two years at three different spacings, viz., 1m×1m, 1.2m×1.2m and 1.5m×1.5m in village Padilla, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh. The trial was established in year 2021 and data was collected after two years. The result indicates themaximum height range was found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 7.5m followed by T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 5.3m whereas the maximum girth range was found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 12.5cm followed by T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5m) 11.7cm. Thebolelinear function showed for height and grith in 2nd year maximum R² was found in T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 0.969 followed by T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m) 0.958 whereas the branch's linear function showed for height and grith was maximum R² in 2nd year maximum in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.947 followed by T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 0.838. The leaves' linear function showed for height and grith was maximum R² in 2nd year maximum found in T₉: Casuarina (1.5m×1.5m) 0.903 followed by T₅: Eucalyptus (1.2m×1.2m) 0.861 whereas the AGB linear function showed for height and grith was maximum R² in 2nd year maximum found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.976 followed by T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m) 0.965. The bole biomass maximum found after 2nd year T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 2.801kgtree⁻¹ followed by T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 2.801kgtree⁻¹ whereas in 2nd year branch biomass maximum found in T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 1.130 kgtree⁻¹ followed by T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 0.982 kgtree⁻¹. The leaves biomass maximum found in 2nd year maximum found in T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 1.950 kgtree⁻¹ followed by T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 1.617kgtree⁻¹ whereas in 2nd year AGB maximum in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 5.285 kgtree⁻¹ followed by T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 4.803 kgtree⁻¹.

Key words: Regression model, Biomass, Fast-growing tree species, Height, Girth

Introduction

Fast-growing wood species have been frequently used in plantation forests and community forests to improve the woods' long-term viability. They can be used to bridge the gap between supply and demand for wood [1]. Planting density has a major impact on each individual tree's available growing resources and crown features[2], affecting wood volume

growth, biomass increment, and wood quality [3,4]. Trees have a critical role in the environment [5] and also trees are visible and quantifiable indicators of ecological health. Trees transform and alter the environment in which they grow, making them important ecosystem engineers [6]. Trees also provide a variety of ecosystem services such as water purification, erosion prevention, flood defence, carbon sequestration, air temperature regulation and air quality regulation [7].

Based on diameter at breast height (DBH) and height data, biomass estimation equations, also known as allometric equations or regression models, are used to estimate the biomass or volume of aboveground tree components. These equations are generated from sample trees' measured tree weights in relation to their DBH and height. Estimating the biomass of tree species present in a forest or plantation using biomass equations is a standard and cost-effective method [8]. Direct and indirect methods, as well as remote sensing methods, can be used to estimate biomass. Destructive sampling is the most accurate method for estimating tree biomass [9,10,11,12]. This direct method permits allometric equations to be developed, which may be utilised to translate ground-based observations into biomass [9,10].

Material and methods

The experiment was established at Padilla, Prayagrajin year July, 2021 and the data was collected after two year (June, 2023). The GPS location of site longitude (25.54° N) and latitude (81.89° E). The experiment was conducted for evaluation of growth performance and develop the regression equation of biomass of three fast-growing tree species under high-density plantation. In this experiment three fast growing species *viz.*, Poplar (*Populus deltoides*), Eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus spp.*) and Casuarina (*Casuarina equisetifolia*) was established in randomized block design (RBD) with 9 treatments and 3 replication with following treatments *viz.*, T₁: Poplar (1×1m), T₂: Eucalyptus (1×1m), T₃: Casuarina (1×1m), T₄: Poplar (1.2×1.2 m), T₅: Eucalyptus (1.2×1.2 m), T₆: Casuarina (1.2×1.2 m), T₇: Poplar (1.5×1.5 m), T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5×1.5 m) and T₉: Casuarina (1.5×1.5 m).

Height (m) of the tree was documented with help of clinometer and pole method whereas girth (cm) was documented above 1.37 m ground level with help of measuring tape.

Stem biomass (kg tree⁻¹)

The twenty trees that were chosen were weighed at the stem. Selected trees were carefully cut, minimising root damage. The stem was chopped into logs for ease of biomass

estimate and separated 20 cm above the ground level. The fresh weight of the logs was then instantly determined by weighing them on an electronic scale in the field. To achieve the appropriate weight, a representative sample was taken from the stem of each tree and placed in an oven set at 100 ± 2 °C. Dry matter content was calculated by using the formula [13]:

$$\text{Stem Dry matter content (\%)} = \frac{DS_1 + DS_2 + DS_3}{FS_1 + FS_2 + FS_3} \times 100$$

Where:

DS_1, DS_2, DS_3 = Dry weight of sample one, two and three, respectively.

FS_1, FS_2, FS_3 = Fresh weight of sample one, two and three, respectively.

Total stem dry weight (kg)

Using the following formula, the total dry weight of the stem portion was calculated by multiplying its total fresh weight by its dry matter content:

$$\text{Total stem dry weight} = \text{Total stem fresh weight} \times \text{Stem dry matter content (\%)}$$

Branches biomass (kg tree⁻¹)

Twenty randomly chosen trees were used to compute the branch biomass without leaves. The branches were then immediately detached from the shoots and weighed in the field with an electronic scale to obtain the current weight. To obtain the oven dry weight of the branch biomass, three randomly chosen branch samples from various portions of were taken, dried in an oven (100 ± 2 °C), and the weight attained remained constant. Dry matter content was calculated by using the formula [13]:

$$\text{Dry matter content (\%)} = \frac{DB_1 + DB_2 + DB_3}{FB_1 + FB_2 + FB_3} \times 100$$

Where:

DB_1, DB_2, DB_3 = Dry weight of branch one, two and three, respectively.

FB_1, FB_2, FB_3 = Fresh weight of branch one, two and three, respectively.

Total branch dry weight (kg)

The following formula was used to get the total branch dry weight for each tree branch: total fresh weight multiplied by dry matter content:

$$\text{Total branch dry weight} = \text{Total branch fresh weight} \times \text{Branch dry matter content (\%)}$$

Leaf biomass (kg tree⁻¹)

Leaves of selected trees were detached from the branches in the field and weighed instantly with the help of electronic balance in the field to get the fresh weight. In an oven set at 70 ± 2 °C, four representative leaf samples were dried until the leaf biomass reached a

consistent weight. Leaves dry matter content was calculated by using the following formula [13]:

$$\text{Leaves Dry matter content (\%)} = \frac{DL_1 + DL_2 + DL_3 + DL_4}{FL_1 + FL_2 + FL_3 + FL_4} \times 100$$

Where:

DL₁, DL₂, DL₃, DL₄ = Dry weight of leaves one, two, three and four respectively.

FL₁, FL₂, FL₃, FL₄ = Fresh weight of leaves one, two, three and four respectively.

Total leaves dry weight (kg)

The total dry weight of the leaves on each tree was calculated by multiplying their fresh weight by the dry matter content of each tree:

$$\text{Total leaves dry weight} = \text{Total leaves fresh weight} \times \text{Leaves dry matter content (\%)}$$

Above ground biomass (kg tree⁻¹)

For the calculation of above ground biomass (AGB) addition of dry biomass of bole. Branches and leaves.

$$\text{AGB} = \text{Bole biomass} + \text{Branches biomass} + \text{Leaves Biomass}$$

Statistical analysis

With the assistance of MS-Excel and the web programme WASP, the regression equation for the stem, branches, leaves, and aboveground biomass was created. OPSTAT statistical software was utilised to compute descriptive statistics and determine which linear and non-linear models were appropriate. Twenty-seven different equations (Table 2) were used to assess the biomass models of fast-growing tree species in an attempt to calculate the estimation accuracy of each model using the coefficient of determination, or R²[14,15,16].

Result and discussion

Range of height and girth was shown in table 1. The maximum height range was found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 7.5 m followed by T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 5.3 m and minimum in T₁: Poplar (1m×1m) 2.1 m whereas the maximum girth range was found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 12.5 cm followed by T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5 m) 11.7 cm and minimum in T₃: Casuarina (1m×1m) 3.5 cm. Similarly, result reported in Poplar clone maximum height in Udai clone (11.57 ± 0.23 m) followed by L - 87 (10.22 ± 0.42 m) and minimum in Bahar (6.74 ± 0.19 m) at age of four years [17]. In first year the maximum height was reported in T₂ (3.76 m; *Casuarina* 1m×1 m) followed by T₆ (3.66 m; *Casuarina* 1.2m×1.2m) whereas maximum girth was found in T₆ (7.34 cm; *Casuarina* 1.2m×1.2m) followed by T₁ (7.18 cm; *Eucalyptus* 1m×1m) [18]. The *E. tereticornis* height and DBH range varied from 11.20-18.70 m and 8.59-18.13 cm, respectively [19]. The maximum height was documented in 3018

(12.55 m), followed by P-32 (12.29 m), P-23 (11.89 m) and P-13 (11.77 m) and lowest in clone 413 (9.99 m), 288 (9.95 m) and 2136 (9.28 m) [20]. The maximum height was recorded in Poplar clone L-200-84 (9.98 m) followed by Udai (9.57 m) at Prayagraj [21].

Table 1: Range of height (m) and girth (cm) of fast-growing species under HDP

Treatment	Range of height (m)	Range of girth (cm)
T ₁ : Poplar (1m×1m)	5.1-7.2	9.8-13.8
T ₂ : Eucalyptus (1m×1m)	5.0-12.5	8.5-21.0
T ₃ : Casuarina (1m×1m)	3.5-5.9	5.0-8.5
T ₄ : Poplar (1.2m×1.2 m)	5.3-8.0	10.0-19.5
T ₅ : Eucalyptus (1.2m×1.2 m)	4.5-9.0	8.0-19.1
T ₆ : Casuarina (1.2×1.2 m)	2.8-6.1	5.0-10.5
T ₇ : Poplar (1.5m×1.5 m)	3.8-9.0	6.8-18.5
T ₈ : Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5 m)	4.0-9.3	6.5-14.9
T ₉ : Casuarina (1.5m×1.5 m)	2.5-5.8	3.8-9.8

Linear regression model of bole, branches, leaves and above ground biomass of tree was shown in table 2. The bole linear function showed for height and girth in 2nd year maximum R^2 was found in T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 0.969 followed by T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m) 0.958 and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5m) 0.755 whereas height was maximum R^2 found in 2nd year T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m) 0.842 followed by T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 0.808 and minimum in T₃: Casuarina (1m×1m) 0.485. The bole linear function showed for girth was maximum R^2 found in 2nd year in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.956 followed by T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m) 0.950 and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5m) 0.597. Similarly, result reported in allometric equations for *E. camaldulensis* for biomass height calculated R^2 values were for bole (0.94) [22]. The bole biomass of *C. equisetifolia* regression equation displayed maximum correlation with dbh $R^2 = 0.97$ [23]. The *E. tereticornis* adjusted R^2 for fitted functions varied from 0.911 to 0.995 for different components [24]. The logarithmic Black willow and eastern cottonwood model that used square of dbh then multiplied by height was the best fitting model (Adj. $R^2 = 0.982$) for the single tree AGB. Whereas a model that used dbh and total stem height as separate predictors was the best fitting model (Adj. $R^2 = 0.954$) for eastern cottonwood [25].

Table 2: Regression model of Bole, branches, leaves and above ground biomass of fast-growing species under HDP

Treatment	Variable	Parameters	Dry bole biomass	R ²	Dry branches biomass	R ²	Dry leaves biomass	R ²	Above ground biomass	R ²
T ₁ : Poplar (1m×1m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-4.20, -0.026, 0.483	0.905	-0.443, 0.150, 0.012	0.740	-0.338, -0.007, 0.067	0.607	-4.981, 0.117, 0.562	0.912
	W=a + bH	a, b	-3.847, 1.034	0.641	-0.434, 0.176	0.733	-0.289, 0.140	0.424	-4.570, 1.350	0.687
	W=a + cG	a, c	-4.232, 0.475	0.905	-0.262, 0.061	0.590	-0.346, 0.065	0.607	-4.840, 0.600	0.910
T ₂ : Eucalyptus (1m×1m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-4.081, -0.137, 0.60	0.951	-0.249, 0.078, 0.038	0.947	0.014, 0.149, 0.007	0.854	-4.316, 0.090, 0.645	0.976
	W=a + bH	a, b	-7.858, 1.807	0.708	-0.487, 0.200	0.850	-0.030, 0.172	0.849	-8.376, 2.180	0.763
	W=a + cG	a, c	-4.466, 0.568	0.956	-0.03, 0.056	0.918	0.434, 0.042	0.704	-4.062, 0.667	0.976
T ₃ : Casuarina (1m×1m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-1.213, 0.037, 0.239	0.774	-0.086, 0.074, 0.009	0.700	0.091, 0.075, 0.004	0.644	-1.208, 0.186, 0.252	0.835
	W=a + bH	a, b	-0.714, 0.387	0.485	-0.067, 0.088	0.688	0.099, 0.081	0.642	-0.682, 0.555	0.632
	W=a + cG	a, c	-1.185, 0.253	0.772	-0.030, 0.039	0.494	0.149, 0.033	0.409	-1.066, 0.325	0.805
T ₄ : Poplar (1.2m×1.2m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-3.02, 0.591, 0.148	0.885	-0.450, 0.139, 0.27	0.838	-0.155, 0.084, 0.009	0.772	-3.624, 0.814, 0.184	0.927
	W=a + bH	a, b	-2.388, 0.901	0.808	-0.335, 0.196	0.786	-0.116, 0.103	0.752	-2.838, 1.200	0.857
	W=a + cG	a, c	-2.44, 0.304	0.731	-0.313, 0.064	0.662	-0.072, 0.031	0.550	-2.822, 0.399	0.753
T ₅ : Eucalyptus (1.2m×1.2m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-3.037, 0.174, 0.314	0.914	-0.027, 0.027, 0.042	0.805	0.067, 0.045, 0.049	0.861	-3.00, 0.246, 0.406	0.925
	W=a + bH	a, b	-2.610, 0.790	0.741	0.030, 0.109	0.661	0.134, 0.142	0.731	-2.446, 1.041	0.756
	W=a + cG	a, c	-2.851, 0.378	0.905	0.002, 0.052	0.793	0.116, 0.066	0.840	-2.733, 0.496	0.914
T ₆ : Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-1.295, 0.127, 0.196	0.958	-0.080, 0.111, -0.004	0.826	-0.050, 0.093, 0.026	0.816	-1.425, 0.331, 0.218	0.965
	W=a + bH	a, b	-1.389, 0.559	0.842	-0.078, 0.101	0.825	-0.062, 0.151	0.789	-1.529, 0.811	0.892
	W=a + cG	a, c	-1.179, 0.243	0.950	0.021, 0.037	0.641	0.035, 0.061	0.759	-1.123, 0.340	0.937
T ₇ : Poplar (1.5m×1.5m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-0.570, 0.138, 0.076	0.755	-0.256, 0.091, 0.019	0.712	-0.29, 0.018, 0.036	0.688	-1.114, 0.248, 0.131	0.834
	W=a + bH	a, b	-0.025, 0.219	0.507	-0.117, 0.112	0.634	-0.029, 0.057	0.260	-0.171, 0.387	0.568
	W=a + cG	a, c	-0.294, 0.104	0.597	-0.074, 0.038	0.382	-0.252, 0.040	0.667	-0.619, 0.181	0.652
T ₈ : Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-2.913, 0.292, 0.271	0.969	-0.072, 0.080, 0.020	0.772	-0.428, 0.231, 0.005	0.837	-3.413, 0.603, 0.296	0.962
	W=a + bH	a, b	-2.364, 0.746	0.668	-0.031, 0.114	0.696	-0.418, 0.240	0.836	-2.813, 1.100	0.771
	W=a + cG	a, c	-2.181, 0.350	0.913	0.128, 0.042	0.584	0.152, 0.067	0.409	-1.901, 0.458	0.835
T ₉ : Casuarina (1.5m×1.5m)	W=a + bH + cG	a, b, c	-0.519, -0.033, 0.185	0.912	-0.115, 0.047, 0.032	0.709	-0.064, 0.048, 0.046	0.903	-0.698, 0.061, 0.262	0.921
	W=a + bH	a, b	-0.428, 0.315	0.683	-0.10, 0.106	0.652	-0.041, 0.134	0.811	-0.569, 0.556	0.757
	W=a + cG	a, c	-0.537, 0.171	0.910	-0.09, 0.051	0.681	-0.038, 0.066	0.882	-0.665, 0.287	0.919

Where, a= Intercept; b and c= slope

The branch's linear function showed for height and grith was maximum R^2 in 2nd year found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.947 followed by T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 0.838 and minimum in T₉: Casuarina (1.5m×1.5m) 0.709 whereas height was shown maximum R^2 found in 2nd year in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.850 followed by T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m) 0.825 and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5 m) 0.634. The branch's linear function showed for grith was maximum R^2 found 2nd year in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.918 followed by T₅: Eucalyptus (1.2m×1.2m) 0.793 and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5m) 0.382. Similarly, result of allometric equations for *E. camaldulensis* for biomass height calculated R^2 values were for branch 0.95 [22]. The *C. equisetifolia* regression equation for branches displayed maximum R^2 value 0.92 [23].

The leaves' linear function showed for height and grith was maximum R^2 in 2nd year maximum found in T₉: Casuarina (1.5m×1.5m) 0.903 followed by T₅: Eucalyptus (1.2m×1.2m) 0.861 and minimum in T₁: Poplar (1m×1m) 0.607 whereas height was shown maximum R^2 found in 2nd year in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.849 followed by T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 0.836 and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5m) 0.260. The leaves' linear function showed for grith was maximum R^2 found in 2nd year T₉: Casuarina (1.5m×1.5m) 0.882 followed by T₅: Eucalyptus (1.2×1.2 m) 0.840 and minimum in T₃: Casuarina (1×1m) and T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 0.409. Similar, result of allometric equations for *E. camaldulensis* for height calculated R^2 values were for leaves biomass 0.97 [22].

The AGB linear function showed for height and grith was maximum R^2 in 2nd year maximum found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.976 followed by T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2 m) 0.965 and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5 m) 0.834 whereas height was shown maximum R^2 found in 2nd year maximum in T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m) 0.892 followed by T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 0.857 and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5m) 0.568. The AGB linear function showed for grith was maximum R^2 found in 2nd year T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.976 followed by T₆: Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m) 0.937 and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5m) 0.652. Similarly, result was reported the maximum R^2 value under Poplar 1.5m×1.5m spacing in both height and girth-based regression model after one year of plantation [13]. The AGB of *E. tereticornis* adjusted R^2 for fitted functions varied from 0.911 to 0.995 [24]. The $R^2 = 0.982$ for equation of AGB of Black willow and $R^2 = 0.954$ for eastern cottonwood are logarithmic model that used square of dbh and height [25].

The bole biomass (kg tree^{-1}) maximum found after 2nd year T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 2.885 kg tree^{-1} followed by T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 2.801 kg tree^{-1} and minimum in T₃: Casuarina (1m×1m) 0.471 kg tree^{-1} whereas branch biomass maximum found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1×1m) 0.868 kg tree^{-1} followed by T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 0.830 kg tree^{-1} and minimum in T₉: Casuarina (1.5m×1.5m) 0.291 kg tree^{-1} . The leaves biomass maximum found in 2nd year maximum found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 1.277 kg tree^{-1} followed by T₈: Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m) 1.072 kg tree^{-1} and minimum in T₇: Poplar (1.5m×1.5m) 0.222 kg tree^{-1} whereas AGB maximum in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 4.946 kg tree^{-1} followed by T₄: Poplar (1.2m×1.2m) 4.233 kg tree^{-1} minimum in T₉: Casuarina (1.5m×1.5m) 1.236 kg tree^{-1} shown in table 3.

Table 3: Bole, branches, leaves and AGB (kg tree^{-1}) of fast-growing species under HDP

Treatment	Bole (kg tree^{-1})	Branches (kg tree^{-1})	Leaves (kg tree^{-1})	AGB (kg tree^{-1})
T ₁ : Poplar (1m×1m)	1.039	0.582	0.369	1.990
T ₂ : Eucalyptus (1m×1m)	2.801	0.868	1.277	4.946
T ₃ : Casuarina (1m×1m)	0.471	0.318	0.468	1.256
T ₄ : Poplar (1.2m×1.2m)	2.885	0.830	0.517	4.233
T ₅ : Eucalyptus (1.2m×1.2m)	1.564	0.613	0.904	3.089
T ₆ : Casuarina (1.2m×1.2m)	0.719	0.408	0.572	1.699
T ₇ : Poplar (1.5m×1.5m)	1.085	0.482	0.222	1.797
T ₈ : Eucalyptus (1.5m×1.5m)	1.723	0.637	1.072	3.431
T ₉ : Casuarina (1.5m×1.5m)	0.520	0.291	0.436	1.236
S Em ±	0.08	0.01	0.02	0.11
CD (0.05)	0.25	0.04	0.06	0.33
CV %	10.01	4.46	5.15	7.27

Similarly, result was reported in *E. tereticornis* dry bole, branches, leaves and AGB 67.64, 5.17, 4.33 and 77.15 kg tree^{-1} respectively after four years of plantation [19]. The above-ground biomass production (kg tree^{-1}) was *Eucalyptus tereticornis* 24.1 > *A. excelsa* 21.8 > *M. azedarach* 12.6 > *Populus deltoides* clone G 48 8.3 > *Alstonia scholaris* 6.6 > *Pongamia pinnata* 3.7 [26]. The Poplar biomass was reported higher in agroforestry trees 1,223 kg tree^{-1} than in monoculture plantation trees 1,102 kg tree^{-1} [27]. The AGB was

maximum were found in T₂: Eucalyptus (1m×1m) 0.676 kg tree⁻¹ followed by T₅: Eucalyptus (1.2m×1.2m) 0.598 kg tree⁻¹ and minimum in T₉: Casuarina (1.5×1.5m) 0.214 kg tree⁻¹ after one year [13].

Conclusion

Among the three fast growing tree species Eucalyptus (1m×1m) spacing shows maximum height, girth and biomass. Hence after two years of study Eucalyptus (1m×1m) spacing showed better growth and biomass production, so this spacing is recommended. Among all the species and spacing the regression equation of bole, branches, leaves and AGB height and girth-based model was most suitable equation for estimation and prediction of biomass. Evaluation of biomass prediction equation on the criteria of coefficient of determination (R²) estimated that multi-variable (including both the growth characteristics viz., H and G) linear functions are much more precision and accuracy.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declares that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

References

1. Kojima M, Yamamoto H, Okumura K, Ojio Y, Yoshida M, Okuyama T, Ona T, Matsune K, Nakamura K, Ide Y, Marsoem S N, Sahri M H and Hadi Y S. Effect of The Lateral Growth Rate on Wood Properties in Fast-growing Hardwood Species. *J. Wood Sci.*, 2009; 55: 417–424.
2. Tun TN, Guo J, Fang S and Tian Y, Planting spacing affects canopy structure, biomass production and stem roundness in poplar plantations. *Scand. J. For. Res.* 2018; 33, 464–474.
3. Liziniewicz M, Ekö PM and Agestam E. Effect of spacing on 23-year-old lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta* Dougl. var. *latifolia*) in southern Sweden. *Scand. J. For. Res.*, 2010; 27: 361–371.
4. Nagar B, Rawat S, Rathiesh P and Sekar I. Impact of initial spacing on growth and yield of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* in arid region of India. *World Appl. Sci. J.*, 2015; 33: 1362–1368.

5. FAO and UNEP. State of the World's Forests 2020: forestry, biodiversity and people. FAO and UNEP, Rome, Italy, 2020.
6. Lindenmayer DB and Laurance WF. The ecology, distribution, conservation and management of large old trees. *Biol. Rev.*, 2017; 92: 1434–1458. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12290>
7. Bastin JF, Finegold Y, Garcia C, Mollicone D, Rezende M, Routh D, Zohner CM and Crowther TW. The global tree restoration potential. *Science*, 2019; 365: 76–79.
8. Ravindranath NH and Ostwald M. *Carbon Inventory Methods: Handbook for Greenhouse Gas Inventory*. Carbon Mitigation and Round Wood Production Projects Springer Science. Delft: Advances in Global Change Research, Springer, 2008.
9. Gibbs HK, Brown S, Niles JO, Jonathan A and Foley JA. Monitoring and estimating tropical forest carbon stocks: making REDD a reality. *Environ Res Lett*, 2007; 2:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/2/4/045023>
10. Basuki TM, van Laake PE, Skidmore AK and Hussin YA. Allometric equations for estimating the above-ground biomass in tropical lowland Dipterocarp forests. *For. Ecol. Manag.*, 2009; 257:1684–1694.
11. Vashum KT and Jayakumar S. Methods to estimate above-ground biomass and carbon stock in natural forests—a review. *EcosystEcogr*, 2012; 2 (116): 1–7.
12. Mbow C, Verstraete MM, Sambou B, Diaw AT and Neufeldt H. Allometric models for aboveground biomass in dry savanna trees of the Sudan and Sudan Guinean ecosystems of Southern Senegal. *J. For. Res.*, 2013; 19: 340–347.
13. Singh KB and Tomar A. Growth and biomass Models for three fast-growing tree species under High-density Plantation. *International Journal of Environment and Climate change*, 2024; 14 (2): 562-570.
14. Causton DR. Biometrical, structural and physiological relationship among tree parts. In: *Attributes of Trees as Crops Plants* (eds. M. G. R., Cannell and J. E. Jackson). Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, Huntingdon, 1985; pp 137-159.
15. Feller MC. Generalized versus site-specific biomass regression equations for coastal British Columbia. *Bioresource Technology*, 1992; 39: 9-16.;
16. Antonio N, Tome M, Tome J, Soares P and Fontes L. Effects of tree, stand, and sitevariables on the allometry of Eucalyptus globulus tree biomass. *Canadian Journal of Forest research*, 2007; 37: 895-906.

17. Tomar A, Singh KB, Khan AF, Srivastava A and Singh S. Growth, Biomass and Carbon Sequestration of *Populus deltoides* Clones. *Environment and Ecology*, 2024; 42 (2): 541-546.
18. Singh KB, Tomar A, Khan AF and Beauty K. Growth, biomass and carbon sequestration of fast-growing tree species under high-density plantation in Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India. *Current Science*, 2022; 122, (5): 318-322.
19. Nirmal, Ajit and Handa AK. Biomass and volume models for clonal *Eucalyptus tereticornis* coppice under agroforestry systems in central India. *Indian Journal of Agroforestry*, 2021; 23 (1): 54-60.
20. Srivastav A, Tomar A and Agarwal KY. Performance of *Eucalyptus* clones in Trans-Ganga region of Uttar Pradesh, India. *Indian J. of Agroforestry*, 2020; 22 (1): 43-47.
21. Tomar A and Srivastav A. Early Growth Performance of *Populus Deltoides* Clones in Prayagraj. *Indian Journal of Plant Sciences*, 2020; 9: 31-35.
22. Mandal RA, Kumar B, Yadav V, Yadav KK, Dutta IC and Haque SM. Development of Allometric Equation for Biomass Estimation of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*: A study from Sagarnath Forest, Nepal. *International Journal of Biodiversity and Ecosystems*, 2013; 1 (1): 001-007.
23. Vidyasagaran K and Paramathma M. Biomass Prediction of *Casuarina Equisetifolia*, Forest. Plantations In the West Coastal Plains of Kerala, India. *Ind. J. Sci. Res. and Tech.*, 2014; 2(1): 83-89.
24. Kumar P, Mishra KA, Kumar M, Chaudhari KS, Singh R, Singh K, Rai P and Sharma K D. Biomass production and carbon sequestration of *Eucalyptus tereticornis* plantation in reclaimed sodic soils of north-west India, *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 2019; 89 (7): 1091–1095.
25. Toky OP, Riddell-Black D, Harris PJC, Vasudevan P and Davies PA. Biomass production in short rotation effluent-irrigated plantations in North-West India. *Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research*, 2011; 70 (8), 601-609.
26. Dahal B, Poudel KP, Renninger HJ, Granger JJ, Leininger TD, Gardiner ES, Souter RA and Rousseau RJ. Aboveground biomass equations for black willow (*Salix nigra* Marsh.) and eastern cottonwood (*Populus deltoides* Bartr. ex-Marsh.). *Trees, Forests and People*, 2022; 7: 2-11.
27. Jha KK. Biomass production and carbon balance in two hybrid poplar (*Populus euramericana*) plantations raised with and without agriculture in southern France. *Journal of Forestry Research*, 2018; 29: 1689–1701.

UNDER PEER REVIEW