

Assessing the differences of two vineyards soils' by NIR spectroscopy and chemometrics

Sandia Machado¹, Luisa Barreiros^{1,2}, António R. Graça³, Manuel Madeira⁴, <u>Ricardo N.M.J.</u> <u>Páscoa^{1*}, Marcela Segundo¹, João A. Lopes⁵</u>

¹ LAQV/REQUIMTE, Department of Chemical Sciences, Laboratory of Applied Chemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Porto, Rua de Jorge Viterbo Ferreira n º 228, 4050-313, Porto, Portugal

- ² Escola Superior de Saúde, Instituto Politécnico do Porto, Rua Dr. António Bernardino de Almeida 400, 4200-072 Porto, Portugal
- ³ Departamento de Investigação e Desenvolvimento, SOGRAPE Vinhos S.A., Aldeia Nova, 4430-852, Avintes, Portugal
- ⁴ Forest Research Centre (CEF), School of Agriculture (ISA), University of Lisbon (ULisboa), Tapada da Ajuda, 1399-017 Lisboa, Portugal
- ⁵ Research Institute for Medicines (iMed-ULisboa), Faculty of Pharmarcy, University of Lisbon, Av. Prof. Gama Pinto, 1649-003, Lisboa, Portugal



✓ Discrimination of soil types;



Sampling spots





Pedology soil map for QL



Legend: 1,2,3,4,8- Limons sableux et cailloux de schistes; 5-Limons et argiles cullouteuses; 6- Limons sableux saturès et éléments détrifiques; 7- Limons sableux et éléments détrifiques;

Pedology soil map for QC



Legend: 1,2- Sol organique sur arènes grises remaniées; 3,4- Arènes três sableuses; 5,6,7-Arènes sablo-argileuses; 8- Sol organique sur arènes grises remaniées;



Soil's collection







Spectral acquisition



NIR instrument



FTLA 2000, ABB (diffuse reflectance mode)

Assessing the differences of two vineyards soils' by NIR spectroscopy and chemometrics rnpascoa@ff.up.pt



Data analysis

NIR soil's spectra

Chemometric analysis:

Qualitative approach





PCA: Scores plot



Score plot of the first two principal components using NIR soils ' spectra (spectra were pre- processed with Savitzky-Golay (using 15 points filter width, second polynomial order and first derivative) followed by SNV and then mean centered).



PLSDA: Confusion matrices



Class predictions for the 2 LV PLS-DA model calibrated from the soils NIR spectra for QC (a) and QL (b).

100% of correct predictions



PLS: calibration models

PLS calibration models results for the different soils parameters using the entire NIR spectra pre-processed with Savitzky-Golay (using 15 points filter widt, second polynomial order and first derivative by SNV and then mean centered

Parameters	LV	RMSEC	RMSECV	RMSEP	R _C ²	R_P^2	RER
рН -Н 2 О	8	0.19	0.44	0.27	0.94	0.85	11
pH - KCl	6	0.30	0.50	0.25	0.73	0.78	7
Corg	6	1.50	2.20	1.70	0.86	0.84	9
CnH	6	0.79	1.30	1.50	0.85	0.27	4
N	6	0.09	0.14	0.10	0.91	0.90	13
C/N	3	3.70	4.50	2.80	0.42	0.55	6
Ca ²⁺	8	1.40	3.50	1.70	0.98	0.98	17
Mg ²⁺	5	0.42	0.64	0.52	0.97	0.97	19
Na ⁺	2	0.12	0.13	0.09	0.37	0.46	5
K ⁺	6	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.75	0.56	5
SB	5	2.20	4.40	3.00	0.97	0.95	16
Al ³⁺	6	0.20	0.34	0.21	0.55	0.69	7
CEC	5	0.65	1.00	0.77	0.94	0.89	11
ECEC	7	1.80	4.50	2.40	0.98	0.97	19
GSB	7	19.00	52.00	27.00	0.97	0.93	13
GSA	6	8.70	13.00	11.00	0.68	0.49	5
Р	4	13.00	18.00	14.00	0.19	0.07	4
К	5	27.00	38.00	31.00	0.61	0.36	5



PLS: calibration models



Experimental values versus the cross-validation (●) and prediction (■) model estimated for Ca²⁺ (a), pH(H2O) (b), N (c), CEC (d), Mg²⁺ (e), SB (f), ECEC (g) and GSB (h).



Conclusions:

- ✓ The developed methodology demonstrated its suitability for the qualitative analysis of soil.
- ✓ Although not accurate for several soil parameters, it was accurate for 6 soil parameters (Ca²⁺, pH(H2O) (b), N (c), CEC (d), Mg²⁺ (e), SB (f), ECEC (g) and GSB (h).)
- ✓ The developed methodology is much more rapid, cost-effective, lesslaborious and environmentally friendly that the reference procedures.



Thanks for your attention!

Sandia Machado



Luisa Barreiros



Ricardo N. M. J. Páscoa





António R. Graça

Marcela Segundo



Manuel Madeira



João A. Lopes



Assessing the differences of two vineyards soils' by NIR spectroscopy and chemometrics rnpas

rnpascoa@ff.up.pt