

<u>APROBACIÓN UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE VALÈNCIA</u>	<u>III</u>
<u>APROBACIÓN UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPÚBLICA.....</u>	<u>IV</u>
<u>DEDICATORIA</u>	<u>V</u>
<u>AGRADECIMIENTOS</u>	<u>VI</u>
<u>TABLA DE CONTENIDO.....</u>	<u>VIII</u>
<u>FIGURAS.....</u>	<u>XIV</u>
<u>TABLAS.....</u>	<u>XVII</u>
<u>RESUMEN.....</u>	<u>XXI</u>
<u>SUMMARY</u>	<u>XXII</u>
<u>RESUM</u>	<u>XXIII</u>
<u>ESTRUCTURA DE LA TESIS</u>	<u>XXV</u>

Parte I. Introducción y marco teórico

<u>1. INTRODUCCIÓN</u>	<u>7</u>
1.1. <u>IMPORTANCIA DE LA SOSTENIBILIDAD AMBIENTAL EN LA AGRICULTURA</u>	<u>8</u>
1.1.1. <u>Principales problemas ambientales que genera la agricultura .</u>	<u>9</u>
1.1.2. <u>Políticas de sostenibilidad ambiental agroalimentaria</u>	<u>11</u>
1.1.3. <u>Medición de la sostenibilidad ambiental</u>	<u>18</u>
1.2. <u>IMPORTANCIA DE LA CITRICULTURA.....</u>	<u>21</u>
1.2.1. <u>Producción cítrica en el mundo</u>	<u>22</u>
1.2.2. <u>El hemisferio sur y su rol en la citricultura mundial.....</u>	<u>23</u>
1.3. <u>MOTIVACIÓN DE LA TESIS.....</u>	<u>26</u>
1.4. <u>OBJETIVOS DE LA TESIS</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>2. MATERIALES Y MÉTODOS.....</u>	<u>31</u>
2.1. <u>ANÁLISIS DE CICLO DE VIDA.....</u>	<u>32</u>
2.1.1. <u>Metodología</u>	<u>32</u>
2.2. <u>SISTEMAS DE ESTUDIO</u>	<u>43</u>
2.2.1. <u>Campo en el sur para el cultivo de limón.....</u>	<u>45</u>
2.2.2. <u>Campo en el norte para el cultivo de mandarina y naranja ...</u>	<u>46</u>

2.2.3. Vivero para limones y mandarinas.....	47
--	----

Parte II. Resultados

3. <u>TOWARDS HARMONISED AND REGIONALISED LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT OF FRUITS: A REVIEW ON CITRUS FRUIT.....</u>	55
3.1. INTRODUCTION	57
3.2. STATE-OF-THE-ART LCA APPLIED TO CITRUS FRUIT PRODUCTION	61
<u>3.2.1. Literature review method.....</u>	61
3.3. RESULTS OF SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW ON LCA OF CITRUS FRUITS.....	63
<u>3.3.1. General aspects of the LCA studies selected.....</u>	63
<u>3.3.2. Review of the main methodological choices</u>	73
3.3.2.1. Goal and scope	73
3.3.2.2. Inventory analysis.....	76
3.3.2.2.1. Data representativeness	77
3.3.2.2.2. On-field emissions from fertilisers and soil management	85
3.3.2.2.3. Primary distribution of pesticides	89
3.3.2.2.4. Water inventory.....	90
3.3.2.2.5. Background data	91
3.3.2.3. Impact assessment methods and impact categories	92
3.3.2.4. Interpretation of results.....	100
3.3.2.4.1. Methods for comparative analysis.....	100
3.3.2.4.2. Uncertainty and variability assessment.....	101
<u>3.3.3. Most impacting stages per category</u>	103

3.4.	METHODOLOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO HARMONIZE CITRUS FRUIT LCAS AND INCREASE REPRESENTATIVENESS	104
3.4.1.	<u>Goal and scope: framing the assessment</u>	<u>104</u>
3.4.2.	<u>Inventory analysis and data representativeness.....</u>	<u>107</u>
3.4.3.	<u>Impact Assessment.....</u>	<u>112</u>
3.4.4.	<u>Results interpretation and policy implications</u>	<u>115</u>
3.5.	CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	117
<u>4.</u>	<u>MULTI-SEASON ENVIRONMENTAL LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT OF LEMONS: A CASE STUDY IN SOUTH URUGUAY.....</u>	<u>147</u>
4.1.	INTRODUCTION	149
4.2.	MATERIALS AND METHODS	153
4.2.1.	<u>System description</u>	<u>154</u>
4.2.2.	<u>Life cycle assessment.....</u>	<u>155</u>
4.2.2.1.	Functional unit and system boundaries	155
4.2.2.2.	Life cycle inventory (LCI)	157
4.2.2.2.1.	Input production and transportation.....	160
4.2.2.2.2.	Emissions from fertiliser and pesticide application...	161
4.2.2.2.3.	Water use, energy, and blue water consumption for irrigation	163
4.2.2.3.	Impact categories and impact assessment methods ...	166
4.3.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	167
4.3.1.	<u>Environmental impacts and contribution analysis.....</u>	<u>167</u>
4.3.2.	<u>Inter-seasonal variability of impacts.....</u>	<u>173</u>
4.3.3.	<u>Sensitivity analysis</u>	<u>178</u>
4.3.4.	<u>Comparison with other studies</u>	<u>179</u>
4.3.5.	<u>Gap for improvement</u>	<u>183</u>
4.4.	CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES.....	186

4.5.	MATERIAL COMPLEMENTARIO DEL CAPÍTULO 4	205
5.	<u>ON THE RELEVANCE OF SITE SPECIFICITY AND TEMPORAL VARIABILITY IN AGRICULTURAL LCA: A CASE STUDY ON MANDARIN IN NORTH URUGUAY</u>	<u>225</u>
5.1.	INTRODUCTION	226
5.2.	METHODS	230
5.2.1.	<u>System description</u>	<u>231</u>
5.2.2.	<u>Life cycle assessment.....</u>	<u>233</u>
5.2.2.1.	Functional unit and system boundaries	233
5.2.2.2.	Life cycle inventory (LCI)	235
5.2.2.3.	Impact categories and impact assessment methods ...	243
5.3.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	245
5.3.1.	<u>Environmental impacts and contribution analysis.....</u>	<u>245</u>
5.3.2.	<u>Inter-seasonal variability of the impact scores.....</u>	<u>250</u>
5.3.3.	<u>Regionalised environmental impacts</u>	<u>253</u>
5.3.4.	<u>Influence of N emission modelling on the environmental impact scores.....</u>	<u>254</u>
5.3.5.	<u>Comparison with other studies</u>	<u>261</u>
5.4.	CONCLUSIONS	265
5.5.	MATERIAL COMPLEMENTARIO DEL CAPÍTULO 5	279
6.	<u>ADDRESSING WATER FOOTPRINT, ECOSYSTEM SERVICES AND BIODIVERSITY IN CITRUS LCAS: A CASE STUDY IN URUGUAY.....</u>	<u>317</u>
6.1.	INTRODUCTION	318
6.2.	METHODS	323
6.2.1.	<u>System description</u>	<u>323</u>
6.2.2.	<u>Life cycle assessment.....</u>	<u>325</u>
6.2.2.1.	Functional unit and system boundaries	325
6.2.2.2.	Life cycle inventory (LCI)	326
6.2.2.3.	Impact categories and impact assessment methods ...	332

6.3.	RESULTS	337
6.3.1.	<u>Comprehensive water footprint</u>	<u>340</u>
6.3.2.	<u>Ecosystem services</u>	<u>345</u>
6.3.3.	<u>Biodiversity loss.....</u>	<u>348</u>
6.4.	DISCUSSION	351
6.4.1.	<u>Comparison with other Uruguayan studies and alternatives for improvement.....</u>	<u>351</u>
6.4.2.	<u>Limitations and future research needs.....</u>	<u>353</u>
6.5.	CONCLUSIONS	357
6.6.	MATERIAL COMPLEMENTARIO DEL CAPÍTULO 6	376
7.	<u>LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT OF CITRUS NURSERY: ARE ITS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELEVANT?</u>	<u>405</u>
7.1.	INTRODUCTION	406
7.2.	MATERIALS AND METHODS	409
7.2.1.	<u>System description</u>	<u>409</u>
7.2.2.	<u>Life cycle assessment.....</u>	<u>412</u>
7.2.2.1.	Functional unit and system boundaries	412
7.2.2.2.	Life cycle inventory (LCI)	413
7.2.2.3.	Impact categories and impact assessment methods ...	422
7.3.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	423
7.3.1.	<u>Environmental impacts and alternatives for improvement ..</u>	<u>423</u>
7.3.2.	<u>Relative contribution of the nursery process to the whole crop cycle</u>	<u>428</u>
7.3.3.	<u>Comparison with processes in databases</u>	<u>432</u>
7.4.	CONCLUSIONS	435
7.5.	MATERIAL COMPLEMENTARIO DEL CAPÍTULO 7	446

Parte III. Discusión general y conclusiones finales

8.	<u>DISCUSIÓN GENERAL</u>	461
8.1.	PUNTOS CRÍTICOS DETECTADOS EN EL CULTIVO CITRÍCOLA DEL URUGUAY Y PROPUESTAS DE MEJORA.....	462
8.2.	CONTRIBUCIONES METODOLÓGICAS A LOS ACV CITRÍCOLAS.....	465
8.3.	INVESTIGACIÓN FUTURA	481
9.	<u>CONCLUSIONES FINALES</u>	485

Parte IV. Contribuciones científicas y bibliografía

10.	<u>CONTRIBUCIONES CIENTÍFICAS</u>	491
11.	<u>BIBLIOGRAFÍA</u>	493

Figuras

<u>Fig. 1.1.</u>	<u>Objetivos de desarrollo sostenible propuestos por las Naciones Unidas, destacando con color aquellos relacionados con la agricultura.</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Fig. 1.2.</u>	<u>Los cuatro pilares de la «Estrategia de la Granja a la Mesa»...</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Fig. 1.3.</u>	<u>Principales políticas de sostenibilidad ambiental del Uruguay</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Fig. 1.4.</u>	<u>Informes nacionales voluntarios de los ODS de Uruguay en el período 2017-2022.....</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Fig. 1.5.</u>	<u>Ejemplos de ecoetiquetas tipo I, tipo II y tipo III</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>Fig. 2.1.</u>	<u>Etapas del análisis de ciclo de vida.</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>Fig. 2.2.</u>	<u>Límites del sistema y etapas del ciclo de vida incluidas en los ACV presentados en los capítulos 4, 5 y 6.....</u>	<u>44</u>
<u>Fig. 2.3.</u>	<u>Ubicación del campo de estudio productor de limones</u>	<u>46</u>
<u>Fig. 2.4.</u>	<u>Ubicación del campo de estudio productor de mandarinas y naranjas</u>	<u>47</u>
<u>Fig. 3.1.</u>	<u>Review strategy followed to select the LCA studies of citrus fruits based on Denyer and Tranfield (2009).....</u>	<u>63</u>
<u>Fig. 3.2.</u>	<u>(a) Number of LCA studies according to the producing country and the product analysed. (b) Percentage of worldwide citrus fruit production corresponding to each producing country identified in the review. ‘Others’ are countries with negligible contribution (USA, Australia, and Chile)</u>	<u>65</u>
<u>Fig. 3.3.</u>	<u>Main methodological aspects of the LCA revised to answer the research questions</u>	<u>73</u>
<u>Fig. 3.4.</u>	<u>Recommendations to improve the temporal and geographical representativeness of LCAs of fruits.</u>	<u>108</u>
<u>Fig. 4.1.</u>	<u>System boundaries showing the life cycle stages included in the LCA of Uruguayan lemons.....</u>	<u>156</u>
<u>Fig. 4.2.</u>	<u>Average percent contribution of the life cycle stages to the environmental footprint of Uruguayan lemons, per tonne of lemon and per ha</u>	<u>173</u>
<u>Fig. 4.3.</u>	<u>Relative variability of the impact values of Uruguayan lemons with respect to the mean for the studied seasons.....</u>	<u>178</u>
<u>Fig. 5.1.</u>	<u>System boundaries showing the life cycle stages included in the LCA of Uruguayan mandarins</u>	<u>235</u>

<u>Fig. 5.2.</u>	<u>Average percentual contribution of the life cycle stages to the environmental footprint of Uruguayan mandarins per tonne and ha.....</u>	<u>249</u>
<u>Fig. 5.3.</u>	<u>Relative variability of the impact values of Uruguayan mandarins with respect to the mean for the studied seasons.....</u>	<u>253</u>
<u>Fig. 5.4.</u>	<u>Boxplot representing the probability distribution of N on field emissions modelled with the five methods tested.</u>	<u>304</u>
<u>Fig. 5.5.</u>	<u>Boxplot representing the probability distribution of LCA results for the six seasons of study for the selected impact categories considering the different modelling of N on field emissions.....</u>	<u>305</u>
<u>Fig. 6.1.</u>	<u>System boundaries showing the life cycle stages included in the LCA of Uruguayan oranges.....</u>	<u>326</u>
<u>Fig. 6.2.</u>	<u>Impact categories assessed in the comprehensive water footprint of Uruguayan oranges production.</u>	<u>335</u>
<u>Fig. 6.3.</u>	<u>(a) Average percentual contribution of the life cycle stages to the water footprint of Uruguayan oranges per tonne and ha.....</u>	<u>344</u>
<u>Fig. 6.3.</u>	<u>(b) Relative variability of the values of the water footprint of Uruguayan oranges with respect to the mean for the studied seasons</u>	<u>345</u>
<u>Fig. 6.4.</u>	<u>(a) Average contribution of the life cycle stages to the loss of ecosystem services due to Uruguayan oranges cultivation per tonne and ha.....</u>	<u>347</u>
<u>Fig. 6.4.</u>	<u>(b) Relative variability of the impact values of ecosystem services losses in Uruguayan oranges cultivation with respect to the mean for the studied seasons</u>	<u>348</u>
<u>Fig. 6.5.</u>	<u>(a) Average percentual contribution of the life cycle stages to Biodiversity Loss (BL) of Uruguayan oranges production per tonne and ha.....</u>	<u>350</u>
<u>Fig. 6.5.</u>	<u>(b) Relative variability of the impact values of Biodiversity Loss (BL) due to Uruguayan oranges cultivation with respect to the mean for the studied seasons.....</u>	<u>350</u>
<u>Fig. 7.1.</u>	<u>System boundaries showing the life cycle stages included in the LCA of Uruguayan lemon and mandarin nursery production.....</u>	<u>413</u>
<u>Fig. 7.2.</u>	<u>(a) external greenhouse structure, (b) internal structures for seedbed greenhouses, (c) internal structures for pot greenhouses.....</u>	<u>417</u>
<u>Fig. 7.3.</u>	<u>Average percentual contribution of the life cycle stages to the environmental footprint of Uruguayan citrus nursery production.....</u>	<u>425</u>
<u>Fig. 7.4.</u>	<u>(a) Radial plots representing percentage improvement for the 10-year increase in the life span of structures per impact category. (b) Radial</u>	

plots representing percentage improvement for a reduction in 20% of the transport distance of the substrate per impact category 427

Fig. 7.5. Representation of the citrus crop cycle in Uruguay 429

Fig. 8.1. Reducciones obtenidas en las categorías de impacto evaluadas 479

Tablas

<u>Tabla 2.1. Categorías de impacto evaluadas y métodos de evaluación de impacto utilizados en los distintos capítulos de la tesis.....</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>Tabla 2.2. Meses de cultivo de las variedades de cítricos estudiados.....</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>Tabla 2.3. Etapas en la producción de plántones en vivero</u>	<u>48</u>
<u>Table 3.1. Main methodological choices as refers to the goal and scope of the reviewed LCAs of fresh citrus fruits.....</u>	<u>66</u>
<u>Table 3.2. Main methodological choices as refers to the goal and scope of the reviewed LCAs of citrus-derived products</u>	<u>70</u>
<u>Table 3.3. Main characteristics of the orchards assessed in the reviewed LCAs of fresh citrus fruits.....</u>	<u>80</u>
<u>Table 3.4. Impact categories employed in the reviewed LCAs of fresh citrus fruits. The life cycle stages contributing the most to each impact category are highlighted.....</u>	<u>93</u>
<u>Table 3.5. Impact categories assessed in the reviewed LCAs of citrus-derived products. The life cycle stages contributing the most to each impact category are highlighted</u>	<u>97</u>
<u>Table 3.6. Updated methods to improve the regional representativeness of inventories and impact assessment in LCAs of fruits.....</u>	<u>114</u>
<u>Table 4.1. Main inventory data for the lemon cultivation stage.....</u>	<u>158</u>
<u>Table 4.2. Impact results per cropping season, average impacts, and coefficient of variation (CV) of cradle to farm gate lemon cultivation in Uruguay</u>	<u>168</u>
<u>Table 4.3. Life cycle inventory metadata of lemon production</u>	<u>206</u>
<u>Table 4.4. Transport distances for the inputs used in the case study on Uruguayan lemon cultivation (Searates, 2022).....</u>	<u>207</u>
<u>Table 4.5. Reference evapotranspiration (ET_o), calculated with the Penman-Monteith method (Allen et al., 1998), crop evapotranspiration (ET_c) and blue water consumption (BWC), estimated following Allen et al. (1998), for the four seasons of study</u>	<u>208</u>
<u>Table 4.6. Average impact results per stage and standard deviation of cradle to farm gate cultivation of lemon in Uruguay. FU = 1 ha.....</u>	<u>209</u>

<u>Table 4.7.</u>	<u>Average impact results per stage and standard deviation of cradle to farm gate cultivation of lemon in Uruguay. FU = 1 tonne</u>	<u>210</u>
<u>Table 4.8.</u>	<u>Toxicity impacts of pesticides used in lemon cultivation in Uruguay considering the amount of active principle applied</u>	<u>211</u>
<u>Table 4.9.</u>	<u>Average and standard deviation of resource use indicators, optional indicators, output flows and waste categories per stage corresponding to cradle to farm gate cultivation of lemon in Uruguay, FU = 1 ha</u>	<u>213</u>
<u>Table 4.10.</u>	<u>Average and standard deviation of resource use indicators, optional indicators, output flows and waste categories per stage corresponding to cradle to farm gate cultivation of lemon in Uruguay, FU = 1 tonne</u>	<u>214</u>
<u>Table 4.11.</u>	<u>Information from Life Cycle Assessment studies of lemon production in diverse locations, including yields, N and P₂O₅ fertiliser doses, methods to estimate on-field emissions and selected impact results from cradle to farm gate per FU (kg of lemon)</u>	<u>215</u>
<u>Table 5.1.</u>	<u>Main inventory data for the mandarin cultivation stage.....</u>	<u>236</u>
<u>Table 5.2.</u>	<u>(a) Impact scores per cropping season, average values, and coefficient of variation (CV) of cradle-to-farm gate mandarin cultivation in Uruguay. FU = 1 ha</u>	<u>246</u>
<u>Table 5.2.</u>	<u>(b) Impact scores per cropping season, average values, and coefficient of variation (CV) of cradle-to-farm gate mandarin cultivation in Uruguay. FU = 1 tonne</u>	<u>247</u>
<u>Table 5.3.</u>	<u>Average impact scores of on-field emissions for the regionalised impact categories with and without applying the regionalisation method .</u>	<u>254</u>
<u>Table 5.4.</u>	<u>(a) Average results and standard deviation of the N on-field emissions for 2016-2022 estimated with different modelling approaches....</u>	<u>257</u>
<u>Table 5.4.</u>	<u>(b) Average impact scores and standard deviation for 2016-2022 of the impact categories analysed affected by the modelling approaches to estimate on-field emissions.....</u>	<u>258</u>
<u>Table 5.5.</u>	<u>Results of the post-hoc non-parametric paired comparisons performed using Dunn's test for N emissions and impact categories that present differences detected using the Kruskal-Wallis test</u>	<u>259</u>
<u>Table 5.6.</u>	<u>Detailed inventory of the mandarin cultivation stage</u>	<u>280</u>

<u>Table 5.7.</u>	<u>Life cycle inventory metadata for Uruguayan mandarin production</u>	<u>284</u>
<u>Table 5.8.</u>	<u>Sources used and inputs needed for the modelling of each emission for all methodologies analysed</u>	<u>288</u>
<u>Table 5.9.</u>	<u>Transport distances for the inputs used in Uruguayan mandarin cultivation (Searates 2022)</u>	<u>290</u>
<u>Table 5.10.</u>	<u>Average impact results per stage and standard deviation of cradle to farm gate cultivation of mandarin in Uruguay. FU = 1 ha</u>	<u>292</u>
<u>Table 5.11.</u>	<u>Average impact results per stage and standard deviation of cradle to farm gate cultivation of mandarin in Uruguay. FU = 1 tonne</u>	<u>293</u>
<u>Table 5.12.</u>	<u>Toxicity impacts of pesticides used in mandarin cultivation in Uruguay considering the amount of active principle applied</u>	<u>294</u>
<u>Table 5.13.</u>	<u>Evaporation (Evap, mm), absorption (Abs, mm) and blue water consumption (BWC) calculated performing a water balance in the soil using LEACHM model (Hutson and Wagenet, 1992), for the six seasons of study</u>	<u>300</u>
<u>Table 5.14.</u>	<u>Characterisation factors used for regionalisation of emitted flows and the corresponding non-regionalised ones</u>	<u>301</u>
<u>Table 5.15.</u>	<u>Information from Life Cycle Assessment studies of mandarin production in diverse locations, including yields, N and P₂O₅</u>	<u>302</u>
<u>Table 6.1.</u>	<u>Main inventory data for the orange cultivation stage of the assessed orchard in Uruguay</u>	<u>328</u>
<u>Table 6.2.</u>	<u>Impact scores per cropping season, average values, and coefficient of variation (CV) of cradle-to-farm gate orange cultivation in Uruguay</u>	<u>338</u>
<u>Table 6.3.</u>	<u>Detailed inventory of the orange cultivation stage</u>	<u>377</u>
<u>Table 6.4.</u>	<u>Life cycle inventory metadata for Uruguayan orange production</u>	<u>379</u>
<u>Table 6.5.</u>	<u>Reference evapotranspiration (ET_o), crop evapotranspiration (ET_c) and blue water consumption (BWC), estimated following Allen et al. (1998) (see Eq. 6.1 for details) for the six seasons of study</u>	<u>382</u>
<u>Table 6.6.</u>	<u>Transport distances for the inputs used in Uruguayan orange cultivation (Searates, 2023)</u>	<u>384</u>
<u>Table 6.7.</u>	<u>Average impact results per stage and standard deviation of cradle to farm gate cultivation of orange in Uruguay. FU = 1 ha</u>	<u>386</u>

<u>Table 6.8.</u>	<u>Average impact results per stage and standard deviation of cradle to farm gate cultivation of orange in Uruguay. FU = 1 tonne.....</u>	<u>389</u>
<u>Table 7.1.</u>	<u>Average inventory data for citrus seedlings production.....</u>	<u>414</u>
<u>Table 7.2.</u>	<u>Average scores and standard deviation for environmental impacts of citrus nursery stage.....</u>	<u>424</u>
<u>Table 7.3.</u>	<u>Impact scores of producing one seedling in the nursery stage in this study and the commercial databases.....</u>	<u>433</u>
<u>Table 7.4.</u>	<u>Detailed inventory of the nursery stage (inputs and on-field emissions)</u>	<u>447</u>
<u>Table 7.5.</u>	<u>Detailed inventory of the nursery stage (greenhouses structures)</u>	<u>450</u>
<u>Table 7.6.</u>	<u>Life cycle inventory metadata for Uruguayan citrus nursery production</u>	<u>451</u>
<u>Table 7.7.</u>	<u>Transport distances for the inputs used in citrus nursery stage (Searates 2022).....</u>	<u>455</u>
<u>Table 7.8.</u>	<u>Dissipation rate on plant matrix for the pesticides used in the study (PPDB, 2023).....</u>	<u>456</u>
<u>Table 7.9.</u>	<u>Vapor pressures for the pesticides used in the study (PPDB, 2023)</u>	<u>456</u>
<u>Table 7.10.</u>	<u>Average impact results per stage and standard deviation of citrus nursery production in Uruguay.....</u>	<u>457</u>
<u>Tabla 8.1.</u>	<u>Coeficientes de variación de las categorías de impacto, en %, evaluadas para las tres especies cítricas estudiadas, por hectárea y por tonelada</u>	<u>467</u>
<u>Tabla 8.2.</u>	<u>Resultados de las comparaciones pareadas no paramétricas <i>post hoc</i> realizadas mediante la prueba de Dunn para emisiones de N que presentan diferencias detectadas mediante la prueba de Kruskal-Wallis para la producción de mandarinas uruguayas.</u>	<u>470</u>
<u>Tabla 8.3.</u>	<u>Resultados de las comparaciones pareadas no paramétricas <i>post hoc</i> realizadas mediante la prueba de Dunn para categorías de impacto que presentan diferencias detectadas mediante la prueba de Kruskal-Wallis para la producción de mandarinas uruguayas.</u>	<u>472</u>