

The text that follows is a PREPRINT.

Please cite as:

Nogueira, E.M., B.W. Nelson and P.M. Fearnside. 2005. Wood density in dense forest in central Amazonia, Brazil. *Forest Ecology and Management* 208(1-3): 261-286.

ISSN: 0378-1127

Copyright: Elsevier

The original publication is available at: <http://www.elsevier.com.nl>

1 **Wood density in dense forest in central Amazonia, Brazil**

2
3 Euler Melo Nogueira^a, Bruce Walker Nelson^b, Philip M. Fearnside^b

4
5 ^aGraduate Program in Tropical Forest Science, National Institute for Research in
6 the Amazon – INPA, C.P. 478, 69.011-970 Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil

7 ^bDepartment of Ecology, National Institute for Research in the Amazon – INPA,
8 C.P. 478, 69.011-970 Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil

9
10
11 13 July 2004, revised 1 Dec. 2004

12
13 Address for proofs:

14 Philip M. Fearnside

15 INPA

16 Av. André Araújo, 2936

17 C.P. 478

18 69.011-970 Manaus, Amazonas

19 Brazil

20 tel: +55-92-643-1822

21 fax: +55-92-642-8909

22 email: pmfearn@inpa.gov.br

23 abstract :400 words, main text : 6108 words

24
25 In press: *Forest Ecology and Management*

Abstract

Measurements of wood density of trees in Amazonian forests are necessary to reduce uncertainties in estimates of carbon stocks and of greenhouse-gas emissions from deforestation. Based on samples from 310 trees in 186 species or morpho-species collected near Manaus, Brazil, the present study finds that commonly used wood density estimates found in published lists by species need to be adjusted downward by 5.3%. Taking the average bole density from this study as a standard, wood density overestimations in three prior studies of the central Amazon were found to be 6%, 4% and 0%. Estimates of primary forest biomass and of gross emissions from biomass loss through deforestation will have to be reduced by similar percentages. Considering full disks with bark dried at 103°C, the mean basic density at breast height in the Central Amazon dense forest was 0.704 ± 0.117 (mean \pm 1 standard deviation; $n=310$; range 0.27-0.96); at the top of the bole it was 0.647 ± 0.093 ($n=307$; range 0.26-0.87). The arithmetic mean of the basic density of the trunk -- average of the density at breast height and at the top of the bole -- was 0.675 ± 0.101 ($n=307$; range 0.27-0.91). The mean basic density of the bole, adjusted for tapering, and using four samples along the bole, was 0.670 ± 0.099 ($n=71$; range 0.38-0.86). The arithmetic mean of the basic density for the same trees was 0.675 ± 0.098 (range 0.39-0.87). The basic density of central heartwood was 0.766 ± 0.158 ($n=149$; range 0.34-1.06). Significant differences exist between the various published estimates for Amazonian forest biomass and emissions, but we emphasize that revision of density values based on the present study will not reduce these discrepancies; instead, all estimates will shift in parallel to lower levels. Adjustments to biomass and emissions are sufficiently large to be significant for the global carbon balance. For example, an estimate of net committed emissions of 249×10^6 Mg CO₂-equivalent C/year for Brazilian Amazonia in the 1990, of which 237×10^6 Mg CO₂-equivalent C/year was from net removal of biomass, would be reduced by 14×10^6 Mg CO₂-equivalent C/year (5.7%: larger than the 5.3% adjustment to gross emissions because regrowth estimates remain unchanged). Decreases of similar proportions would apply throughout the tropics. For the 1980s these downward adjustments total 113×10^6 Mg C/year for CO₂ effects alone, or approximately 132 Mg CO₂-equivalent C/year including trace gases.

Keywords: Amazon forest, Basic density, Wood density, Basic specific gravity.

1. Introduction

Greenhouse gas emissions from tropical deforestation represent one of the largest uncertainties concerning global climate change (Houghton, 2003). Emissions when forests are cleared are almost directly proportional to the biomass (including both live and dead material) of the forest, which, in turn, depends on the volume of wood and its density. Because such large amounts of biomass are cleared each year, even small

1 alterations in estimates of wood density translate into quantities for forest biomass and
2 greenhouse gas emissions that are significant for global change.

3
4 Density is an important physical characteristic of wood in defining technological
5 and commercial use because it is an excellent indicator of the amount of wood present in
6 a sample and of the workability of the material (Silva, 1984; Trugilho et al., 1990;
7 Chimelo, 1992; ASTM, 2002). The density is related to other properties of the wood,
8 such as resistance, porosity, organization of the anatomical components and the number,
9 size, and chemical composition of the cells (Kollmann and Côté, 1968; Trugilho et al.,
10 1990; Simpson and TenWolde, 1999; Ilic et al., 2000; Hacke et al., 2001; ASTM, 2002).
11 In tropical forests wood density is related to a tree's resistance to impacts caused by
12 wind, to relative growth rate and to mortality (Putz et al., 1983; Muller-Landau, 2004).
13 Wood density is also a strong indicator of the stage of ecological succession, with pioneer
14 species being less dense and having greater variation than climax species (Denslow,
15 1980; Wiemann and Williamson, 1989; Muller-Landau, 2004). There is great variation in
16 density along the bole, among species, and among individuals in any given species due to
17 differences in the age of the tree and in the climatic life zone (Chudnoff, 1976; Wiemann
18 and Williamson, 1989, 2002; Rueda and Williamson, 1992; de Castro et al., 1993; Rocha,
19 1994; Higuchi et al., 1998; Woodcock, 2000; Baker et al., 2004; Muller-Landau, 2004).
20 Variation has been observed from the heartwood to the bark, along the length of the bole
21 (the trunk below the first large branch), among different compartments in a given tree and
22 between individuals of the same species. This variation reflects the interaction of the
23 plant with environmental factors such as climatic and edaphic conditions, natural impacts
24 and competition for light (Chudnoff, 1976; Wiemann and Williamson, 1989; Trugilho et
25 al., 1990; Ilic et al., 2000; França, 2002; Muller-Landau, 2004).

26
27 Different methodologies have been used for determining the weight and volume
28 measures, the ratio of which represents density, resulting in different concepts (Trugilho
29 et al., 1990; Fearnside, 1997a). Weight has been determined with different moisture
30 contents, with volume either with or without bark, and using volume either of the fresh
31 wood, of dry wood, or of wood that has been dried and later re-hydrated. Among the
32 different ways of calculating density are apparent density (the ratio between weight and
33 volume at a given moisture content), green density (green weight/green volume), simple
34 specific gravity (dry weight/dry volume), true density (excluding naturally occurring
35 pores in the wood by compression of the sample), and basic density or basic specific
36 gravity, which is obtained as the ratio between the dry weight and the volume of the
37 green wood (Fearnside, 1997a; Souza et al., 2002). Basic density was used in the present
38 study and is considered to be the most appropriate density measure for biomass
39 estimation (Brown, 1997; Fearnside, 1997a).

40
41 Based on 470 samples from tropical American forests, Reyes et al. (1992) found a
42 mean density of $0.60 \pm 0.008 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (mean ± 1 standard error). Brown and Lugo (1992)
43 report a mean of 0.69 for Amazonia, based on a relationship between biomass and bole
44 volume from data (diameter, species and the volume of all trees) reported by Heinsdijk
45 (1958) and Prance et al. (1976) for two areas of Amazonian forest. Muller-Landau (2004)
46 examined 112 trees from dense forest of the Central Amazon. These represented 89

1 species and their density was either determined directly from thin wood cores of the full
2 xylem radius or was based on published data at the species level. The 89 species
3 constituted 19% of the trees in a nearby large inventory. When weighted for abundance in
4 that inventory, the 89 species had a mean density of $0.71 \pm 0.15 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (mean \pm 1
5 standard deviation).

6
7 Using mainly the inventories of RADAMBRASIL (Brazil, Projeto
8 RADAMBRASIL, 1976-1986) and published lists of density by species (Fearnside,
9 1997a) the mean basic density for Brazilian Amazonia was estimated at 0.69, considering
10 the different vegetation types and their respective areas. For dense lowland forest in the
11 state of Amazonas, the mean density reported is 0.70 g.cm^{-3} . This value contains
12 uncertainty due to doubts concerning the taxonomy of the species (names are usually only
13 reliable to the genus level) and use of density values determined by different methods
14 (Fearnside, 1997a).

15
16 A reliable value for mean density for forests in Amazonia is necessary so that
17 volumetric estimates available from extensive inventories can be converted to estimates
18 of biomass stock (Brown et al., 1989; Brown and Lugo, 1992; Fearnside, 1997a;
19 Houghton et al., 2001). Mean density has also been used in adapting allometric models
20 developed for dense forest to make them applicable to other types of forest, correcting for
21 the effect of density differences (França, 2002; Baker et al., 2004). Studies of wood
22 density in Amazonia can contribute to reducing uncertainties in estimates of the stock and
23 emission of carbon, in addition to contributing to studies of nutrient dynamics in
24 Amazonian ecosystems and to quantification of forest resources.

25
26 The objective of this study was to determine the basic density of species in dense
27 forest on plateaus with latosol (Oxisol) soils in central Amazonia, and to evaluate the
28 radial variation and variation along the length of the bole. The study also determined the
29 difference between the densities calculated using the volume of re-hydrated samples and
30 using the fresh volume. A second objective was to evaluate possible bias toward high or
31 low wood density in previous studies.

32 33 **2. Material and Methods**

34 35 2.1. Collection site

36
37 The collection area is located about 50 km northwest of Manaus, Amazonas,
38 Brazil, in the Tarumã-Mirim Rural Settlement Project. Plateau locations were selected in
39 six different lots of small rural farmers. The area has annual average precipitation of 2075
40 mm, rainfall below 100 mm per month from July to September, mean altitude of 100 m,
41 minimum mean monthly temperature of 26°C and maximum of 27.6°C (Brazil, INMET,
42 2003). The vegetation is dense rain forest of terra firme (land that is not seasonally
43 flooded), on yellow latosols (Oxisols) that are poor in nutrients (Magnago et al., 1978;
44 Yamazaki et al., 1978). Random felling of trees was allowed, this being a new
45 colonization front (< 5 years) with deforestation for agricultural use already planned and
46 authorized by the Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural

1 Resources (IBAMA). The plots selected were under primary forest, without invasion of
2 pioneer trees or mortality associated with edges.

3 4 2.2. Collection of wood samples

5
6 Samples of wood of 310 trees were collected (DBH = 5 to 122 cm) at six different
7 sites distributed over an area of 45 km², sampling approximately 50 trees/site. The
8 collection locations were at least 100 m from the edge of the forest. Trees were chosen to
9 fill quotas for each size class but otherwise at random. The chain saw operator was not
10 allowed to choose trees since he might exclude species with very hard wood or with high
11 silica content, both of which shorten chain life. For all trees disks of constant thickness
12 were collected at breast height and at the top of the bole using a chainsaw. For 73 trees,
13 two additional disks were collected at intermediate points such that all four disks were
14 equally spaced along the bole. From each of the disks a wedge-shaped sample was
15 removed that was representative of the radial variations (bark, sapwood and heartwood).
16 Each wedge was immediately sealed in a plastic bag kept in the shade to avoid loss of
17 water. Samples of heartwood of 149 trees were also collected at breast height (~1.36 m).
18 Botanical specimens were collected from every tree for identification.

19 20 2.3. Determination of basic density

21
22 On the day each sample was collected, its volume was determined based on the
23 Archimedes principle by displacement of water (ASTM, 2002). Impaled with a thin
24 needle, each sample was forcibly immersed in water in a container resting on a digital
25 balance. The balance had 2000-g capacity and 1-g precision, and was calibrated daily
26 using a volumetric flask containing water. The dry weight of each sample was determined
27 in an oven at 80 and 103°C (ASTM, 2002). A vented electric oven was used in an air-
28 conditioned room kept at 25°C. Samples, which were kept in double paper bags, were
29 considered completely dry after three consecutive stable weight readings, checked every
30 24 hours. A single tare weight was used for paper bags from each factory bundle, based
31 on weighing a sheaf of 50 bags heated to the drying temperature for 24 hours.

32 33 2.4. Determination of mean basic density of the bole

34
35 Arithmetic mean density of two or of four measurements along the bole was
36 determined for all 307 trees. A taper-adjusted mean density was determined for 71 of
37 these trees, which were sampled at four locations along the bole, using the model of Vital
38 (1984, eq. 1):

$$39$$

$$40 D_{mb} = \{ \sum (D_{ms1} * V_{seg 1}), (D_{ms2} * V_{seg 2}), (D_{ms3} * V_{seg 3}) \} * (\sum V_{seg 1, 2 \text{ and } 3})^{-1} \text{ (eq. 1)}$$

41
42 Where:

43 D_{mb} = Mean density of the bole,

44 D_{ms1} = Mean of the density at breast height, and at 33% of the length between breast
45 height and the top of the bole,

- 1 D_{ms2} = Mean of the density at 33% and at 66% of the length between breast height and
 2 the top of the bole,
 3 D_{ms3} = Mean of the density at 66% of the length between breast height and the top of the
 4 bole, and the density at the top of the bole.
 5 $V_{seg 1, 2 \text{ and } 3}$ = Volume of the bole segments at the heights 1.36m - 33%, 33% - 66% and
 6 66% - top, respectively.

7
 8 The volume of each segment (the frustum of a paraboloid) was obtained using the
 9 Smalian formula:

$$10 \quad V = \{(As_i + As_f) * 0.5\} * h \quad (\text{eq. 2})$$

11
 12
 13 Where:

- 14 As_i = Cross sectional area at base of segment,
 15 As_f = Cross sectional area at top of the segment,
 16 h = Length of the segment.

17
 18 For correct determination of the area of each cross section of the bole, a drawing
 19 was traced of the external edge of the entire disk, and of the internal edge if the log was
 20 hollow. The drawings were photographed using a digital camera with an 80 mm lens at a
 21 distance of 4 m. The area of each section was determined by counting pixels later
 22 transformed to cm^2 . Scale varied only 0.6% between the center and edge of the tracing
 23 paper and this was averaged out by using registration marks at the four corners. When
 24 present, the hollow areas were subtracted in determining the total area of each section.
 25 This procedure was adopted in order to eliminate errors implicit in the common
 26 assumption that the bole is a solid of revolution and that diameter and volume can be
 27 inferred from circumference obtained with a measuring tape. The procedure eliminated
 28 volume overestimates that are caused by the occurrence of trunks with oval cross-
 29 sections, external irregularities above buttresses, or hollow cores; these conditions are
 30 common in Amazonian species.

31 32 2.5. Density obtained using re-hydrated volume of heartwood

33
 34 Heartwood samples were always obtained near the center of the disk at breast
 35 height, but varied in size and thus in their surface-to-volume ratios. This will affect re-
 36 hydration rate so three sub-samples were taken, each measuring approximately $2 \times 2 \times 3$
 37 cm (volume 12 cm^3). To reduce bias in density in the radial direction, the sub-samples
 38 were obtained along the radial axis and a mean density calculated. The sub-samples were
 39 weighed on a digital balance with 0.01 g precision immediately after drying at 103°C .
 40 They were then immersed in water for 14 days under refrigeration to avoid
 41 decomposition, and the re-hydrated volumes determined by the Archimedes principle
 42 using the same balance.

43 44 2.6. Botanical identification

45

1 All botanical samples were identified by experts (parabotanists), who are
2 employees of the herbarium of the National Institute for Research in the Amazon (INPA).

3 4 **3. Results**

5 6 3.1. Wood density: vertical and radial variation

7
8 The 310 trees were identified as 186 different species or morpho-species, with
9 four trees unidentified (Appendices 1 and 2). The values for basic density at breast height
10 and at the upper end of the bole for each species are presented in Appendix 1. All density
11 values are based on dry weight obtained at 103°C, except where noted. Following the
12 classification proposed by Melo et al. (1990), only 5% of the trees in this study have light
13 wood (density $\leq 0.50 \text{ g.cm}^{-3}$), 64% have wood of medium weight (density 0.50 to 0.72)
14 and 31% have heavy wood (density > 0.72).

15
16 [Figure 1 here]

17
18 [Table 1 here]

19
20 The mean density generally decreases from breast height to the top of the bole
21 (Figure 1, Table 1). For 87% of the trees, the density decreased with height on the bole,
22 the most extreme case being a 57% decrease. Only 13% of the trees increased in density
23 with height, the most extreme case being a 24% increase. Density at the top of the bole is
24 8% lower than at breast height, on average.

25
26 Using density of the disk at breast height as an indication of average density of the
27 entire bole will result in a 4.3% overestimate of a stand's average bole wood density. The
28 mean basic density with bark at breast height for all species was 0.704 ± 0.117 (mean ± 1
29 standard deviation; $n=310$; range 0.27-0.96). The mean basic density with bark at the top
30 of the bole was 0.647 ± 0.093 ($n=307$; range 0.26-0.87). The arithmetic mean basic
31 density of the entire bole, based on disks from just two positions, was 0.675 ± 0.101
32 ($n=307$; range 0.27-0.91, Appendix 1), significantly lower than the density at breast
33 height (paired t-test, $p < 0.001$, $n = 307$). For the 73 trees sampled at four positions along
34 the length of the bole a similar arithmetic mean was obtained: 0.675 ± 0.098 ($n=73$; range
35 0.39-0.87). Mean basic density of these trees, adjusted for tapering of the bole, was
36 similar to the arithmetic mean: 0.670 ± 0.099 ($n=71$; range 0.38-0.86).

37
38 Using heartwood density at breast height will lead to 5.3% overestimate of density
39 of the entire disk at that height (paired t-test, $p < 0.001$, $n=149$). For the trees from which
40 heartwood was collected separately, the whole-disk basic density at breast height was
41 0.728 on average, while the average density of just the heartwood at breast height was
42 0.785 (Figure 2). Not all trees showed this pattern: for 18% the heartwood density was
43 lower than the full disk by 0-26%. For 80% of the trees the heartwood was 0-20% denser
44 and in 2% of the trees heartwood was 40-56% denser than the whole disk.

45
46 [Figure 2 here]

3.2. Effect of re-hydration and of drying temperature (80°C and 103°C) on density

Using oven-dried samples that were later re-hydrated to estimate basic density of heartwood led to a 2.5% overestimate (Table 1; paired t-test, $p < 0.001$; $n=145$). The basic density from green volume of the heartwood, for the trees from which heartwood was collected, was 0.766 ± 0.158 (range 0.34-1.06). But when obtained using re-hydrated volume, the density of the heartwood was 0.785 ± 0.167 (range 0.17-1.05). Fourteen days were insufficient for the complete recovery of the green volume of small wood blocks of approximately 12 cm^3 . The difference was larger with denser wood ($p < 0.001$; $n=144$), probably because denser wood is more resistant to the penetration of water during immersion. The error in estimating basic density using re-hydrated samples will therefore probably be less than 2.5% in forest types or in parts of a tree with basic density lower than 0.766. The error will also be less if re-hydrating air-dried samples to determine volume prior to oven drying, as is standard procedure. The widespread practice of re-hydration is undoubtedly due to the greater convenience of not being obliged to determine volumes immediately after sample collection.

Density from dry weight at 80°C was, on average, 1.1% higher than at 103°C (Table 1; paired t-test, $p < 0.001$, $n= 310$), despite the dry weight at each temperature being based on three consecutive stable readings. Although 103°C is recommended in official protocols for density determination (ASTM, 2002), tests at 80°C were conducted as well due to the existence of density data for Amazonia that were determined at this temperature.

3.3. Relationship of density to morphometric variables

The arithmetic mean density of the bole showed no significant correlation with bole height, corrected bole volume or DBH (Figure 3b). But density showed a nearly significant relationship with total tree height (Figure 3a) ($p = 0.07$, Pearson correlation).

[Figure 3 here]

3.4. Density corrections

In Table 2 simple regressions are presented that allow estimation of the mean basic density of the entire bole in dense Amazon forest based on commonly available attributes such as re-hydrated heartwood density, basic density of heartwood or basic density of the entire disk at breast height. Basic density of the full disk at breast height is also estimated from two types of heartwood density at the same height. All models are highly significant. Residuals are symmetric and non-heteroscedastic.

[Table 2 here]

4. Discussion

4.1. Causes of density variation within the bole and between species and locations.

1
2 In general, studies that have determined radial and longitudinal variation in
3 density for species in Amazonia (Wiemann and Williamson, 1989; Amorim, 1991; de
4 Macedo, 1991; de Castro et al., 1993; Higuchi and Carvalho, 1994), either present results
5 for few species restricted to certain functional groups, or measure either only radial or
6 only longitudinal variation. For 145 trees in central Amazonia the present study finds
7 patterns of radial variation in the dense terra firme forest, with the density usually
8 decreasing from the center to the outside, at breast height. Therefore, the portions of the
9 trunk that are more recent have lower density. This result is in agreement with Fearnside
10 (1997a, Table 1) and Amorim (1991). However, it is not certain if the same pattern is
11 observed at higher positions of the bole.

12
13 Unlike the pattern found here for most of the trees in dense primary forest, in the
14 case of pioneer tropical species, de Castro et al. (1993) affirm that density increases
15 linearly from the center to the outside, a difference that can reach 200-300% in some
16 species. Wiemann and Williamson (1989) demonstrated for 16 species of tropical trees
17 that density increases away from the center, the increase being more accentuated (90-
18 270%) in pioneer species in lowland forest. The same pattern is expected for other
19 colonizing species. Pioneer species probably allocate resources to growth in stature to the
20 detriment of the strength of the trunk, resulting in a bole with lower density and rapid
21 apical growth. In the present study, the density of heartwood was compared with the
22 density of the whole disk including bark, unlike the studies of Wiemann and Williamson
23 (1989) and de Castro et al. (1993), which examined density in 1-2 cm increments along
24 the radius of the disk at breast height, considering the center of the bole and not the
25 heartwood. Among the species in the present study, Amapá (Brosimum parinarioides
26 Ducke (Moraceae)), a canopy tree, had the largest decrease in density in the center-bark
27 direction, with the heartwood density being 55% greater than the whole disk with bark.
28 Among the few species that presented the inverse pattern, the greatest difference (18%
29 density increase in the center-bark direction) was detected in Sclerolobium
30 melanocarpum Ducke (Caesalpinioideae), a pioneer emergent tree (Ribeiro et al., 1999).

31
32 In the present study, density increased with the vertical position of the sample in
33 only 14% of the trees. De Macedo (1991) found that in just one of 12 trees collected near
34 Manaus, the density at the base of the bole was smaller than in the upper part. These few
35 cases of lower density at the lower part of the bole may be a consequence of incipient
36 degradation of the wood, which precedes the formation of a hollow core. This process
37 would be more advanced close to the base of the tree, where hollow cores are most
38 common. This could also be responsible for some cases of lower density of the heartwood
39 found in 18% of the trees when compared with the density of whole the disk. Cupania
40 scrobiculata L.C. Rich. (Sapindaceae) had a hollow area occupying 7.6% of the cross
41 section at breast height and also had lower density of the intact wood at the same height
42 when compared to the density at the top of the bole. However, no other hollow tree had
43 lower density at breast height when compared to the top of the bole.

44
45 Several authors have pointed to different ecophysiological aspects as responsible
46 for variation in the density of the bole, such as structural demands, climatic zone,

1 humidity, age, illumination and rapid growth (DeZeeuw, 1965; Chudnoff, 1976;
2 Denslow, 1980; Wiemann and Williamson, 1988; Rueda and Williamson, 1992; de
3 Castro et al., 1993; Favrichon, 1994; Suzuki, 1999; Ter Steege and Hammond, 2001).
4 Using 56 inventory plots grouped by region, Baker et al. (2004) reported mean stand-
5 level wood density to be 12% higher in the eastern and central Amazon, compared with
6 the northwest Amazon. Muller-Landau (2004), analyzing variation between four widely
7 spread neotropical forest sites, observed that the wood density varies inversely with the
8 fertility of the soil but is independent of rainfall, seasonality and temperature. Woodcock
9 (2000) found different mean wood densities in plots of different successional stages, with
10 lower density in young successional stages, but did not test for differences among soil
11 types. Ter Steege and Hammond (2001), in forests in Guyana, failed to find a relationship
12 between wood density and soil fertility, but did find a relationship between density and
13 the diversity of species and seed size. Several more diverse communities exhibited
14 characteristics of colonizing species, such as lower wood density and smaller seeds. On
15 Barro Colorado Island, Panama, Muller-Landau (2004) also found a weak negative
16 correlation between the wood density and rate of adult mortality and the rate of relative
17 growth of trees and saplings. In other words, short-lived species with higher rates of
18 growth have lower wood density. Similar results are reported by Favrichon (1994) and
19 Suzuki (1999).

20
21 In open forests in the state of Acre, in southwestern Amazonia, low wood density
22 is believed to result from both phytogeographical and ecological factors (França, 2002).
23 For example, trees in the family Bombacaceae, which are typically light weight, are more
24 abundant in all forest types of this region. A larger number of pioneer tree species and of
25 fast-growing species may also be responsible for the low mean density of disks taken at
26 breast height from trees in a bamboo-dominated forest of this region: only 0.51 g.cm^{-3}
27 determined at 80°C . Common pioneer taxa here include *Acacia polyphylla*, *Apeiba* sp.,
28 *Jacaratia* sp., *Cavanillesia hylogeiton*, *Ceiba* sp. and *Cecropia sciadophylla* (Oliveira,
29 2000). In these environments, fast-growing species are favored by the occurrence of
30 fertile soils (Cambisols or Inceptisols), by extensive temporary gaps resulting from
31 natural disturbance by bamboo (*Guadua* sp.) and from the periodic and synchronized
32 death of this bamboo. Schnitzer et al. (2000), in a study of 428 treefall gaps in tropical
33 forest on Barro Colorado Island, Panama, found a similar correlation between liana
34 abundance and the abundance of pioneer trees.

35 36 4.2. Methodological uncertainties in density determination

37

38 An important source of uncertainty in the available density data for Amazonia is
39 species identification in forest inventories. Fearnside (1997a) found that many published
40 inventories are based on common names. When the scientific names are reported, they
41 are not based on formal botanical identification, but rather use tables equating common
42 and scientific designations. According to Pires (1978), more than 90% of the
43 identifications used in the inventories conducted by the Food and Agriculture
44 Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Amazonia could be in error at the species
45 level because they have been based on common names. The data in the FAO inventory
46 (Heinsdijk, 1958) have been used for calculations of biomass and emissions of carbon in

1 Amazonia because they are representative of several vegetation types (Brown et al.,
2 1989). These uncertainties demonstrate the importance of studies to determine density
3 with correct identification of the species.

4
5 In the present study, a test was conducted on the reliability of the common names
6 supplied by a local woodsman (mateiro). These were transformed to scientific names
7 using three guides: Catalog of Trees of Brazil (Camargos et al., 2001), Flora of the
8 Reserva Ducke (Ribeiro et al., 1999) and Common Names of Amazonian Plants (Silva et
9 al., 1977), Appendix 2. All of the trees also had botanical specimens identified in the
10 herbarium, so the correct scientific names were also known. Only 53% of the scientific
11 names inferred from the common names supplied by the mateiro proved to be correct.
12 The common names and scientific names were considered to be equivalent when the
13 common name mentioned by the mateiro was similar to one of the common names
14 mentioned in the literature, or to one of the names listed when the common name is a
15 compound word. Mistakes sometimes occurred when the mateiro attributed different
16 names for a given species, or when common names were identified in different places.
17 The mateiro was sometimes unable to identify the same species that he had identified
18 previously.

19
20 Another source of uncertainty is the use of different methods for obtaining
21 density. The following types have been reported (1) apparent densities, with a moisture
22 content of 12% (g water/100 g oven-dry weight), based on the methodology of COPANT
23 (1973); (2) green density, such as the data on 50 species published by IBAMA (Souza et
24 al., 2002), or for 40 species occurring in the Tapajós National Forest (Fedalto, 1989), and
25 (3) density based on the volume re-hydrated from green wood samples, such as 75
26 species collected in the Curuá-Una forest management research area in Pará (Brazil,
27 IBDF, 1988; Vol. 2), 23 species sampled in forests in the state of Amapá (Brazil,
28 INPA/CPPF, 1993) and 40 species in the area of the Balbina hydroelectric dam (Brazil,
29 INPA/CPPF, 1991). This has hindered the obtaining of consistent values for basic density
30 using the ratio of dry weight to true green volume in the living tree. In some references,
31 the green volume refers to wood that has been allowed to air dry and is later re-hydrated
32 until saturation, or that has been sampled green and later saturated (Brazil, IBDF, 1988;
33 Vol. 2, p. 29).

34
35 Time for complete drying of the samples was highly variable; some required more
36 than 20 days at a temperature of 103 ± 2 °C to achieve a stable weight. Thus basic density
37 will be overestimated if drying times are limited to a few days and standardized for
38 different species and sample sizes. The density obtained from drying at 80°C was
39 significantly higher than the density obtained at 103°C (Table 1). Since the weight
40 obtained at 80°C was considered dry after stabilization (constant weight for three
41 consecutive measurements), the loss of additional weight when dried at 103°C could
42 represent water that is chemically bound to the cell wall, as well as organic compounds
43 that are volatilized at the higher temperature.

44
45 Presence of hollows means that central heartwood is lost from the disk, causing a
46 bias toward more external wood, which was usually less dense in this study. Hollows

1 were found in 10% of the trees, including 7% at breast height. But hollows accounted for
 2 just 0.7% of the total stand bole volume after adjusting for size-class frequencies typical
 3 of a large inventory. Our method, in which density is based on a cross-sectional disc
 4 instead of small solid wood samples, avoids bias of the density results from the presence
 5 of hollows.

6 7 4.3. Wood density and biomass estimates

8
9 Studies of wood density for species in Amazonia are important for biomass
 10 estimates because this information is necessary for conversion of volume data from forest
 11 inventories to biomass (Houghton et al., 2001; Brown, 1997; Brown and Lugo, 1992):

$$12 \quad \text{TAGB} = \text{Inventoried volume} * \text{VEF} * \text{WD} * \text{BEF} \quad (\text{eq. 3})$$

13
14
15 Where:

16 TAGB = Total above-ground biomass of standing trees (≥ 10 cm DBH; Mg ha^{-1})

17 Inventoried volume = commercial volume of the boles above the minimum DBH
 18 inventoried ($\text{m}^3 \text{ ha}^{-1}$). Usually, minimum inventoried DBH is between 25 and 30
 19 cm,

20 VEF = Volume Expansion factor, to represent the volume of boles between 10 cm and
 21 the minimum DBH inventoried,

22 WD = Wood density, stand average of all boles,

23 BEF = Biomass Expansion Factor (expands bole biomass to all above-ground biomass,
 24 for all trees ≥ 10 cm DBH).

25
26 The following values are assumed for Amazonia, in accord with Houghton et al. (2001,
 27 citing Brown and Lugo, 1992):

28
29 VEF = 1.25 for dense forests, or 1.5 for other Amazonian forests;

30 WD = 0.69,

31 BEF = $\exp \{3.213 - 0.506 \ln \text{SB}\}$, for $\text{SB} < 190 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$;

32 BEF = 1.74, for $\text{SB} > 190 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$;

33 SB = Stand biomass (biomass of the boles) ≥ 10 cm DBH = inventoried volume * VEF *
 34 WD

35
36 For estimates based on volumetric data, wood density of 0.69 g.cm^{-3} has been
 37 used as mean value for Brazilian Amazonia (Houghton et al., 2001; Fearnside, 1997a;
 38 Brown, 1997; Brown and Lugo, 1992; Brown et al., 1989). This value may be subject to
 39 the overestimation biases reported in this paper.

40
41 For dense forest of Central Amazonia, the density difference between heartwood
 42 and whole disk will lead to an overestimate of 5.3%, the difference between the whole
 43 disk at breast height and the average total bole density is 4.3%, while the effect of re-
 44 hydrating oven-dried heartwood is an overestimate of 2.5%. So if average bole density of
 45 a stand is based on re-hydrating oven-dried samples of heartwood taken near the center of
 46 a disk at breast height, there will be a ~12.1% overestimate of both density and biomass

1 (eq. 3). A fourth tendency for overestimation is the exclusion of bark from most samples
2 used in prior studies. A fifth tendency in the same direction will result from using
3 standard drying times. Re-hydration times of 14 days or less are a sixth source of
4 overestimate, as shown in this study. Re-hydration of samples larger than the small (12
5 cm^3) blocks used in this study will mean even greater overestimates than those reported
6 here, but re-hydration of wood more porous than the heartwood used here or re-hydrating
7 air-dried samples, will reduce or eliminate the bias.

8
9 To what extent do previously published lists of wood density by species include
10 all these biases toward overestimate? In the case of data on wood density of Amazonian
11 trees published by the Coordination of Research on Forest Products of the National
12 Institute for Research in Amazonia (INPA), the Laboratory of Forestry Research of the
13 Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA) and
14 the Center for Wood Technology of the Superintendency for Development of Amazonia
15 (SUDAM), samples were taken at random from different sections of the bole, based on
16 the norms of COPANT (Brazil, IBDF, 1981, 1988; Brazil, INPA/CPFF, 1991, pp. 5 and 7;
17 Brazil, INPA/CPFF, 1993, p. 8; Brazil, IBAMA, 1997). Sampling protocols for basic
18 density followed by the Brazilian Institute for Forest Development (IBDF, 1981, 1988)
19 are random with respect to height along the bole, but the center of each specimen was, on
20 average, just 5.3 cm from center of the disk. Re-hydration protocols used by IBDF (1981,
21 1988) called for immersing green wood “for a long period” then drying at 103°C , and so
22 will be more efficient at regaining fresh volume than re-hydration that begins from dried
23 samples.

24
25 The net effect of biases in the estimate of stand density and biomass using
26 published wood density data can be better examined by comparing the results of this
27 study with three previous estimates for the Central Amazon, which matched forest
28 inventories to published lists of wood density by taxon. In those studies, overestimates of
29 average density of the entire bole -- here presumed to be 0.67 g.cm^{-3} -- were 6%, 4% and
30 0% (Fearnside, 1997a; Baker et al., 2004; Muller-Landau, 2004). Based on samples
31 collected without bark and at breast height, plus published data at the species level,
32 Muller-Landau (2004) found an inventory-adjusted average basic density of 0.71 for 112
33 trees from Central Amazon dense forest. Fearnside (1997a) reported an average density
34 of 0.70 g.cm^{-3} for this same region, using published density data and inventories. His
35 number is identical to the value found in the present study at breast height, but is higher
36 than the 0.67 g.cm^{-3} mean basic density of the entire bole with bark. Baker et al. (2004)
37 found 0.67 g.cm^{-3} to be the stand level average for wood density in the Central Amazon
38 based on 11 ha of dense forest inventory and lists of wood density covering 584 species
39 of Amazonian trees. Their matches were made mostly at the genus or family level, i.e.
40 were matched to related species or related genera. This may introduce a bias toward the
41 more workable (less dense) commercial timbers and toward trees harvested on more
42 fertile soil than the Central Amazon. In the case of Baker et al. (2004), these two biases
43 toward lower wood density appear to have fully compensated the density overestimation
44 biases reported in this paper.

45 46 **5. Significance for global change estimates**

1
2 The adjustments to wood density values used for calculating the biomass of
3 Amazonian forests and the greenhouse gas emissions that result when these forests are
4 cleared have important implications for global change. For example, an estimate of net
5 committed emissions of 249×10^6 Mg CO₂-equivalent C/year for Brazilian Amazonia in
6 1990 (midpoint of high- and low-trace gas scenarios, including effects of CO₂, CH₄ and
7 N₂O), of which 237×10^6 Mg CO₂-equivalent C/year was from net removal of biomass
8 (updated from Fearnside, 2000a), would be reduced by 14×10^6 Mg CO₂-equivalent
9 C/year, or 5.7%. The percentage reduction in net emissions is greater than the 5.3%
10 reduction in gross emissions because the estimates for biomass accumulation in
11 regenerating secondary forest are unaffected by the wood density adjustments.

12
13 Decreases of similar proportion would apply throughout the tropics. An annual
14 gross emission of 2.0×10^9 Mg of carbon (without considering trace-gas effects) from
15 biomass in the tropics during the 1980s (Fearnside, 2000b, p. 128) would be reduced by
16 113×10^6 Mg C annually, assuming the same adjustment applies to all tropical forests.
17 This adjustment would be increased to approximately 132 Mg CO₂-equivalent C/year if
18 the effect of trace gases is considered ($15.5\% \pm 9.5\%$, based on Fearnside, 1997b).

19 20 **6. Conclusions**

21
22 Wood density estimates that have been widely used as the basis of estimating
23 Amazon forest biomass need to be adjusted downward by 5.3% for density variation in
24 the cross-sectional disk. Some studies will require an additional 4.3% downward
25 adjustment for density variation along the length of the bole.

26
27 The present study's results for wood density imply a 5.3% downward adjustment
28 for estimates of primary forest biomass in Amazonia, and adjustment by the same amount
29 of estimates of gross emissions of greenhouse gases from deforestation. Because
30 regrowth estimates are unaffected by the adjustments, net committed emissions would be
31 lowered by a slightly greater percentage: 5.7% in the case of Amazonian deforestation.
32 However, these adjustments do not resolve differences among the various estimates that
33 exist for biomass and emissions, since all estimates have been based on nearly identical
34 assumptions regarding wood density in tropical forests.

35 36 **Acknowledgements**

37
38 The National Council of Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq AI
39 470765/01-1) and the National Institute for Research in the Amazon (INPA PPI 1-3620)
40 provided financial support. Two anonymous reviewers made valuable comments.

41 42 **References**

43
44 Amorim, L.C., 1991. Variação da densidade básica no sentido radial em madeiras
45 tropicais da Amazônia. Relatório Final, Período abril-90/março-91. (Iniciação
46 Científica/Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico).

- 1 Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia (INPA). Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil.
2 24 pp.
3
- 4 ASTM, 2002. Standard Test Methods for Specific Gravity of Wood and Wood-Based
5 Materials. Designation: D 2395-02. ASTM International, West Conshohocken.
6 Pennsylvania, U.S.A. 8 pp.
7
- 8 Baker, T. R., Phillips, O. L., Malhi, Y., Almeida, S., Arroyo, L., Di Fiore, A., Killeen, T.
9 J., Laurance, S. G., Laurance, W. F., Lewis, S. L., Lloyd, J., Monteagudo, A., Neill,
10 D. A., Patiño, S., Pitman, N. C. A., Silva, N., Martínez, R. V., 2004. Variation in
11 wood density determines spatial patterns in Amazonian forest biomass. *Global
12 Change Biology* 10, 545-562.
13
- 14 Brazil, IBDF, 1988. Madeiras da Amazônia. características e utilização; Estação
15 experimental de Curuá-Una / Amazonian Timbers. characteristics and utilization;
16 Curuá-Una Experimental Forest Station, Vol. 2. Instituto Brasileiro de
17 Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF), Brasília, DF, Brazil. 236 pp.
18
- 19 Brazil, INMET, 2003. Instituto Nacional de Meteorologia. www.inmet.gov.br. Accessed
20 12 August 2003.
21
- 22 Brazil, INPA/CPPF, 1991. Catálogo de madeiras da Amazônia. Coordenação de Pesquisa
23 de Produtos Florestais. Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia. Manaus,
24 Amazonas, Brazil. 153 pp.
25
- 26 Brazil, INPA/CPPF, 1993. Catálogo de madeiras do Amapá: características tecnológicas.
27 Coordenação de Pesquisas em Produtos Florestais. Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas
28 da Amazônia, Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. 58 pp.
29
- 30 Brazil, Projeto RADAMBRASIL, 1978. Folha SA.20, Levantamento de Recursos
31 Naturais, Manaus. Departamento Nacional de Produção Mineral, Rio de Janeiro,
32 Brazil. Vol. 18. 747 pp.
33
- 34 Brown, S., 1997. Estimating biomass and biomass change of tropical forest: A Primer.
35 Forestry Paper 134, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
36 (FAO), Rome, Italy. 55 pp.
37
- 38 Brown, S., Lugo, A. E., 1992. Aboveground biomass estimates for tropical moist forests
39 of the Brazilian Amazon. *Interciencia* 17, 8-18.
40
- 41 Brown, S., Gillespie, A. J. R., Lugo, A. E., 1989. Biomass estimation methods for
42 tropical forest with applications to forest inventory data. *For. Sci.* 35, 881-902.
43
- 44 Camargos, J. A. A., Coradin, V. T. R., Czarneski, C. M., Oliveira, D. de.,
45 Meguerditchian, I., 2001. Catálogo de árvores do Brasil. Instituto Brasileiro do Meio

- 1 Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis. Laboratório de Produtos Florestais.
2 Edições IBAMA, Brasília, DF, Brazil. 896 pp.
3
- 4 Chambers, J. Q., Santos, J., Ribeiro, R. J., Higuchi, N., 2001. Tree damage. allometric
5 relationships, and above-ground net primary production in central Amazon Forest.
6 Forest Ecol. and Manage. 152, 73-84.
7
- 8 Chimelo, J. P., 1992. Relacionamento da anatomia da madeira com suas propriedades
9 físicas e mecânicas. Escola Superior de Agricultura "Luis de Queiroz", . Escola
10 Superior de Agricultura "Luis de Queiroz", Universidade de São Paulo
11 (ESALQ/USP), Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil (mimeographed). 25 pp.
12
- 13 Chudnoff, M., 1976. Density of tropical timbers as influenced by climatic life zones.
14 Commonw. For. Rev. 55, 203-217.
15
- 16 COPANT. 1973. Descrição macroscópica. microscópica e geral da madeira; esquema de
17 recomendação, 30, 1-019. Comisión Panamericana de Normas Técnicas (COPANT),
18 Bogotá, Colombia.
19
- 20 De Castro, F., Williamson, G.B., Jesus, R.M., 1993. Radial variation in wood specific
21 gravity of *Joannesia princeps*: the roles of age and diameter. Biotropica 25, 176-182.
22
- 23 De Macedo, C.S.M., 1991. Variação longitudinal da densidade básica e da composição
24 química de madeiras e sua avaliação energética. Relatório Final, abril/1990-
25 março/1991. Iniciação Científica/Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico
26 e Tecnológico). Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia. Manaus, Amazonas,
27 Brazil. 18 pp.
28
- 29 Denslow, J.S., 1980. Gap partitioning among tropical rain forest trees. Biotropica.
30 12(Suppl.), 23-30.
31
- 32 DeZeeuw, C., 1965. Variability in wood. In: Côté, W.A. (Ed.), Cellular ultrastructure of
33 woody plants. Syracuse University Press. Syracuse, New York, U.S.A. pp. 457-471.
34
- 35 Favrichon, V., 1994. Classification des espèces arborées en groupes fonctionnels en vue de
36 la réalisation d'un modèle de dynamique de peuplement en forêt Guyanaise. Revue
37 d'Ecologie Terre et Vie 49, 379-402.
38
- 39 Fearnside, P.M., 1997a. Wood density for estimating forest biomass in Brazilian
40 Amazonia. Forest Ecol. and Manage. 90, 59-87.
41
- 42 Fearnside, P.M., 1997b. Greenhouse gases from deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia:
43 Net committed emissions. Climatic Change 35, 321-360.
44
- 45 Fearnside, P.M., 2000a. Greenhouse gas emissions from land-use change in Brazil's
46 Amazon region. In: Lal, R., Kimble, J.M., Stewart, B.A. (Eds.), Global Climate

- 1 Change and Tropical Ecosystems. Advances in Soil Science. CRC Press, Boca
2 Raton, Florida, U.S.A. pp. 231-249
3
- 4 Fearnside, P.M., 2000b. Global warming and tropical land-use change: Greenhouse gas
5 emissions from biomass burning, decomposition and soils in forest conversion,
6 shifting cultivation and secondary vegetation. *Climatic Change* 46, 115-158.
7
- 8 Fedalto, L. C., Mendes, I. C. A., Coradin, V. T. R., 1989. Madeiras da Amazônia:
9 descrição do lenho de 40 espécies ocorrentes na Floresta Nacional do Tapajós.
10 Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis
11 (IBAMA), Brasília, DF, Brazil. 156 pp.
12
- 13 França, M. B., 2002. Modelagem de Biomassa Através do Padrão Espectral no Sudoeste
14 da Amazônia. Masters thesis in Tropical Forest Science, Instituto Nacional de
15 Pesquisas da Amazônia-Fundação Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Manaus,
16 Amazonas, Brazil 106 pp.
17
- 18 Hacke, U.G., Sperry, J.S., Pockman, W.T., Davis, S.D., McCulloh, K.A., 2001. Trends in
19 wood density and structure are linked to prevention of xylem implosion by negative
20 pressure. *Oecologia* 126, 457-461.
21
- 22 Heinsdijk, D., 1958. Report to the Government of Brazil on a forest inventory in the
23 Amazon Valley, Part 3: Region between Rio Tapajós and Rio Madeira. FAO Report
24 n° 969 and Part 4: Region between Rio Tocantins and Rios Guama and Capim. FAO
25 Report n° 992. Expanded Technical Assistance Program (FAO/58/10/8131), Food
26 and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Rome, Italy.
27
- 28 Higuchi, N., Carvalho Jr., J.A., 1994. Fitomassa e Conteúdo de Carbono de Espécies
29 Arbóreas da Amazônia: Anais do seminário "Emissão x Sequestro de CO₂ - Uma
30 Nova Oportunidade para o Brasil," Companhia Vale do Rio Doce (CVRD), Rio de
31 Janeiro, Brazil. pp. 127-153.
32
- 33 Higuchi, N., Santos, J., Ribeiro, R.J., Minette, L., Biot, Y., 1998. Biomassa da Parte
34 Aérea da Vegetação da Floresta Tropical Úmida de Terra-Firme da Amazônia
35 Brasileira. *Acta Amazonica* 28, 153-166.
36
- 37 Houghton, R.A., 2003. Why are estimates of terrestrial carbon balance so different?
38 *Global Change Biol.* 9, 500-509.
39
- 40 Houghton, R.A., Lawrence, K.T., Hackler, J.L., Brown, S., 2001. The spatial distribution
41 of forest biomass in the Brazilian Amazon: a comparison of estimates. *Global
42 Change Biol.* 7, 731-746.
43
- 44 Ilic, J., Boland, D., McDonald, M., Downes, G., Blakemore, P., 2000. Woody Density
45 Phase 1 - State of Knowledge. National Carbon Accounting System Technical
46 Report 18, Australian Greenhouse Office, Canberra, Australia. 228 pp.

- 1
2 Kollmann, F. F. P., Côté, W.A. Jr., 1968. Principles of wood science and technology solid
3 wood., v. 1. Spring-Verlag, New York, U.S.A. 592 pp.
4
- 5 Magnago, H., Barreto, R.A.A., Pastore, U., 1978. Projeto RADAMBRASIL. Folha
6 SA.20. Parte IV-Vegetação, Departamento Nacional de Produção Mineral, Rio de
7 Janeiro, Brazil. pp. 413-530.
8
- 9 Melo, J.E., Coradin, V.T.R., Mendes, J.C., 1990. Classes de densidade de madeira para a
10 Amazônia Brasileira. In: Anais do Congresso Florestal Brasileiro, 6. Campos do
11 Jordão, São Paulo, Sociedade Brasileira de Silvicultura, São Paulo, SP, Brazil. Vol.
12 3. pp. 695-699.
13
- 14 Muller-Landau, H.C. (2004) Interspecific and inter-site variation in wood specific gravity
15 of tropical trees. *Biotropica* 36(1): 20-32.
16
- 17 Nelson, B.W., Mesquita, R.C.G., Pereira, J.L.G., Souza, S.G.A., Batista, G.T., Couto,
18 L.B., 1999. Allometric regressions for improved estimate of secondary forest
19 biomass in the central Amazon. *Forest Ecol. and Manage.* 117, 149-167.
20
- 21 Nogueira, E.M., Nelson, B.W., 2003. Ocorrência de árvores ocadas em floresta densa na
22 Amazônia Central. 54º Congresso Nacional de Botânica, Belém - Ananindeua –
23 Pará. Sociedade Brasileira de Botânica, São Paulo, SP, Brazil. (Abstract). CD-ROM.
24
- 25 Oliveira, A.C.A., 2000. Efeitos do Bambu Guadua weberbaueri Pilger sobre a Fisionomia
26 e Estrutura de uma Floresta no Sudoeste da Amazônia. Masters thesis in Ecology,
27 Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia-Fundação Universidade Federal do
28 Amazonas, Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil . 103 pp.
29
- 30 Pinto, A. C. M., Higuchi, N., Iida, S., Santos, J. Dos, Ribeiro, R. J., Rocha, R. M., Silva,
31 R. P. da., 2003. Padrão de distribuição espacial de espécies florestais que ocorrem na
32 região de Manaus-AM. In: Higuchi, N., Santos, J. dos., Sampaio, P.T.B., Marengo,
33 R. A., Ferraz, J., Sales, P. C. de., Saito, M., Matsumoto, S. (Eds.). Projeto Jacarandá,
34 Fase II: Pesquisas florestais na Amazônia Central. CPST/INPA, Manaus Amazonas,
35 Brazil. 252 pp.
36
- 37 Pires, J. M., 1978. The forest ecosystems of the Brazilian Amazon: Description.
38 functioning and research needs. In: United Nations Educational. Scientific and
39 Cultural Organization (UNESCO)/United Nations Environmental Programme
40 (UNEP)/Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Tropical
41 Forest Ecosystems: A State of Knowledge Report, UNESCO, Paris, France. pp.
42 607-627.
43
- 44 Prance, G.T., Rodrigues, W.A., da Silva, M.F., 1976. Inventário florestal de um hectare
45 de mata de terra-firme, Km 30 da Estrada Manaus-Itacoatiara. *Acta Amazonica* 6, 9-
46 35.

- 1
2 Putz, F.E., Coley, P.D., Lu, K., Montalvo, A., Aiello, A., 1983. Uprooting and snapping
3 of trees: structural determinants and ecological consequences. *Canad. J. For. Res.*
4 13, 1011-1020.
5
6 Reyes, G., Brown, S., Chapman, J.C., Lugo, A.E., 1992. Wood densities of tropical tree
7 species. USDA Forest Service. General Technical Report S0-88. Southern Forest
8 Experiment Station, New Orleans, Louisiana, U.S.A. 15 pp.
9
10 Ribeiro, J.E.L. da S., Hopkins, M.J.C., Vicentini, A., Sothers, C.A., Costa, M.A. da S.,
11 Brito, J.M. de., Souza, M.A.D. de., Martins, L.H.P., Lohmann, L.G., Assunção, P.A.
12 C.L., Pereira, E. da C., Silva, C.F. da., Mesquita, M.R., Procópio, L.C., 1999. Flora
13 da Reserva Ducke: guia de identificação das plantas vasculares de uma floresta de
14 terra-firme na Amazônia Central. INPA/DfID, Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. 816 pp.
15
16 Ribeiro, R.J., 1996. Estudos de função de forma para espécies florestais de terra-firme da
17 Amazônia. Masters thesis in forest sciences, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da
18 Amazônia/Fundação Universidade do Amazonas, Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. 76 pp.
19
20 Rocha, J.S., 1994. A segurança de estruturas de madeira determinada a partir da
21 variabilidade da densidade básica e de propriedades mecânicas de madeiras
22 amazônicas. Masters thesis in forest sciences, Escola Superior de Agricultura “Luis
23 de Queiroz”, Universidade de São Paulo (ESALQ/USP), Piracicaba, São Paulo,
24 Brazil. 141 pp.
25
26 Rueda, R., Williamson, G.B., 1992. Radial and vertical wood specific gravity in Ochroma
27 pyramidale (Cav. ex Lam.) Urb. (Bombacaceae). *Biotropica* 24, 512-518.
28
29 Santos, J., 1996. Análise de Modelos de Regressão para Estimar a Fitomassa da Floresta
30 Tropical Úmida de Terra-firme da Amazônia Brasileira. Doctoral dissertation in
31 forest sciences, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil. 121
32 pp.
33
34 Schnitzer, S., Dalling, J., Carson, W.P., 2000. The impact of lianas on tree regeneration in
35 tropical forest canopy gaps: Evidence for an alternative pathway of gap-phase
36 regeneration. *J. Ecol.* 88, 655-666.
37
38 Silva, J.C., 1984. Parâmetros da densidade na qualidade da madeira. . Escola Superior de
39 Agricultura “Luis de Queiroz”, Universidade de São Paulo (ESALQ/USP),
40 Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil. 82 pp.
41
42 Silva, M.F. da., 1977. Nomes vulgares de plantas amazônicas. Instituto Nacional de
43 Pesquisas da Amazônia (INPA), Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. 222 pp.
44
45 Simpson, W., TenWolde, A., 1999. Physical properties and moisture relations of wood.
46 Chapter. 3. In: Forest Products Laboratory. Wood Handbook-wood as an

- 1 engineering material. Gen. Tech. Rep. FPL-GTR-113. U.S. Department of
2 Agriculture, Forest Service. Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wisconsin,
3 U.S.A. 463 pp.
4
- 5 Souza, M.H. de., Magliano, M.M., Camargos, J.A.A., Souza, M.R. de., 2002. Madeiras
6 tropicais brasileiras/Brazilian tropical woods. Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente
7 e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis, 2. ed. edições IBAMA, Brasília, DF, Brazil.
8 152 pp.
9
- 10 Suzuki, E., 1999. Diversity in specific gravity and water content of wood among Bornean
11 tropical rainforest trees. *Ecol. Res.* 14, 211-224.
12
- 13 Ter Steege, H., Hammond, D.S., 1996. Forest management in the Guianas: Ecological
14 and evolutionary constraints on timber production. *BOS NiEuwsletter* 15, 62-69.
15
- 16 Ter Steege, H., Hammond, D.S., 2001. Character convergence, diversity, and disturbance
17 in tropical rain forest in Guyana. *Ecology* 82, 3197-3212.
18
- 19 Trugilho, P.F., Silva, D.A., Frazão, F.J.L., Matos, J.L.M., 1990. Comparação de métodos
20 de determinação de densidade básica em madeira. *Acta Amazonica* 20, 307-319.
21
- 22 Vital, B.R., 1984. Métodos de determinação da densidade da madeira. *Boletim Técnico.*
23 2, Sociedade de Investigações Florestais (SIF), Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil. 21 pp.
24
- 25 Yamazaki, D.R., Costa, A.M.R., Azevedo, W.P., 1978. Projeto RADAMBRASIL, Folha
26 SA.20, Parte III-Pedologia. Departamento Nacional de Produção Mineral, Rio de
27 Janeiro, RJ, Brazil. pp. 247-410.
28
- 29 Wiemann, M.C., Williamson, G.B., 1988. Extreme radial changes in wood specific
30 gravity in some tropical pioneers. *Wood and Fiber Science* 20, 344-349.
31
- 32 Wiemann, M.C., Williamson, G.B., 1989. Radial gradients in the specific gravity of wood
33 in some tropical and temperate trees. *Forest Science* 35, 197-210.
34
- 35 Wiemann, M.C., Williamson, G.B., 2002. Geographic variation in wood specific gravity:
36 Effects of latitude. temperature and precipitation. *Wood and Fiber Science* 34, 96-
37 107.
38
- 39 Woodcock, D.W., 2000. Wood specific gravity of trees and forest types in the southern
40 Peruvian Amazon. *Acta Amazonica* 30, 589-599.

Appendix 1. Basic density (cross-sectional disk of wood with bark) of trees (DBH \geq 5 cm) in Central Amazonia (dense terra firme forest)

Family	Scientific name	N	Basic density at breast height ~1.36 m, mean (standard deviation)	Basic density at the top of the bole, mean (standard deviation)	Arithmetic mean of the bole (breast height and top of the bole)
Anacardiaceae	<u>Anacardium parvifolium</u> Ducke	1	0.508	0.554	0.531
Fabaceae	<u>Andira</u> sp.	1	0.813	0.727	0.770
Fabaceae	<u>Andira unifoliolata</u> Ducke	1	0.760	0.663	0.711
Lauraceae	<u>Aniba cylindriflora</u> kosterm.	1	0.629	0.569	0.599
Lauraceae	<u>Aniba hostmanniana</u> (Nees) Mez.	1	0.766	0.671	0.718
Lauraceae	<u>Aniba panurensis</u> (Meissn.) Mez.	1	0.747	0.713	0.730
Lauraceae	<u>Aniba williamsii</u> O.C.Schmidt	1	0.741	0.678	0.709
Annonaceae	<u>Annona foetida</u> Mart.	1	0.572	0.517	0.544
Apocynaceae	<u>Aspidosperma discolon</u> A.D.C.	2	0.758 (0.016)	0.689 (0.034)	0.724 (0.025)
Anacardiaceae	<u>Astronium le-cointei</u> Ducke	1	0.812	0.614	0.713
Myrtaceae	<u>Blepharocalyx eggersii</u> (Kiaersk.) Landrum	1	0.726	0.693	0.710
Annonaceae	<u>Bocageopsis multiflora</u> (Mart.) R.E.Fr.	1	0.674	0.585	0.629
Annonaceae	<u>Bocageopsis</u> sp.	1	0.696	0.632	0.664
Papilionoideae	<u>Bocoa viridiflora</u> (Ducke) R.S.Cowan	1	0.835	0.745	0.790
Rubiaceae	<u>Botryarrhena pendula</u> Ducke	1	0.734	0.678	0.706
Moraceae	<u>Brosimum guianense</u> (Aubl.) Huber	1	0.780	0.736	0.758
Moraceae	<u>Brosimum lactescens</u> (S.Moore) C.C.Berg.	2	0.703 (0.001)	0.715 (0.006)	0.709 (0.003)
Moraceae	<u>Brosimum parinarioides</u> Ducke	2	0.610 (0.042)	0.522 (0.002)	0.566 (0.022)
Moraceae	<u>Brosimum rubescens</u> Taub.	1	0.776	0.684	0.730
Moraceae	<u>Brosimum utile</u> (H.B.K.) Pittier ssp. ovatifolium (Ducke) C.C.Berg.	1	0.540	0.510	0.525
Malpighiaceae	<u>Byrsonima</u> sp.	1	0.601	0.594	0.598
Lecythidaceae	<u>Cariniana decandra</u> Ducke	1	0.559	0.554	0.557
Lecythidaceae	<u>Cariniana micrantha</u> Ducke	1	0.563	0.536	0.550
Caryocaraceae	<u>Caryocar</u> sp.	1	0.712	0.712	0.712
Olacaceae	<u>Chaunochiton kappleri</u> (Sagot ex Engl.) Ducke	1	0.529	0.519	0.524
Rubiaceae	<u>Chimarrhis turbinata</u> DC.	1	0.650	0.000	0.325

Appendix 1. Continued

Family	Scientific name	N	Basic density at breast height ~1.36 m, mean (standard deviation)	Basic density at the top of the bole, mean (standard deviation)	Arithmetic mean of the bole (breast height and top of the bole)
Sapotaceae	<u>Chrysophyllum amazonicum</u> T.D.Penn.	1	0.826	0.784	0.805
Sapotaceae	<u>Chrysophyllum lucentifolium</u> Cronquist ssp. <u>pachycarpum</u> Pires & T.D.Penn.	1	0.787	0.712	0.749
Sapotaceae	<u>Chrysophyllum sanguinolentum</u> (Pierre) Baehni ssp. <u>sanguinolentum</u>	1	0.624	0.618	0.621
Sapotaceae	<u>Chrysophyllum sanguinolentum</u> (Pierre) Baehni ssp. <u>spurium</u> (Ducke) T. D. Penn.	4	0.660 (0.094)	0.625 (0.075)	0.642 (0.084)
Sapotaceae	<u>Chrysophyllum ucuquirana-branca</u> (Aubrév. & Pellegrin) T. D. Penn.	1	0.733	0.636	0.684
Clusiaceae	<u>Clusia</u> sp.	1	0.821	0.760	0.791
Lecythidaceae	<u>Corythophora alta</u> Kunth	3	0.724 (0.026)	0.680 (0.019)	0.702 (0.019)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Corythophora rimosa</u> W. A. Rodrigues ssp. <u>rimosa</u>	1	0.683	0.630	0.656
Lecythidaceae	<u>Corythophora rimosa</u> W.A. Rodrigues	1	0.712	0.638	0.675
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Couepia</u> sp.	1	0.720	0.632	0.676
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Couepia ulei</u> Pilg.	2	0.816 (0.007)	0.714 (0.038)	0.765 (0.022)
Rubiaceae	<u>Coussarea ampla</u> Mull.Arg.	1	0.476	0.472	0.474
Rubiaceae	<u>Coussarea hirticalix</u> Standl.	1	0.645	0.646	0.646
Sapindaceae	<u>Cupania scrobiculata</u> L.C.Rich.	3	0.506 (0.066)	0.567 (0.083)	0.537 (0.074)
Caesalpiniaceae	<u>Dipterix</u> sp.	1	0.917	0.772	0.845
Annonaceae	<u>Duguetia chysea</u> Maas	1	0.845	0.700	0.773
Annonaceae	<u>Duguetia megalocarpa</u> Maas	1	0.910	0.825	0.867
Annonaceae	<u>Duguetia stelechantha</u> (Diels) R.E.Fr.	1	0.849	0.687	0.768
Annonaceae	<u>Duguetia surinamensis</u> R.E.Fr.	1	0.780	0.654	0.717
Sapotaceae	<u>Ecclinusa guianensis</u> Eyma	1	0.549	0.529	0.539
Humiriaceae	<u>Endopleura uchi</u> (Huber) Cuatrec.	2	0.786 (0.002)	0.706 (0.033)	0.746 (0.018)
Caesalpiniaceae	<u>Eperua duckeana</u> R. S. Cowan	3	0.791 (0.050)	0.737 (0.024)	0.764 (0.037)
Caesalpiniaceae	<u>Eperua glabriflora</u> (Ducke) R. S. Cowan	1	0.759	0.727	0.743
Annonaceae	<u>Ephedrantus amazonicus</u> R.E.Fr.	1	0.816	0.771	0.794
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera amazoniciformis</u> S.A. Mori	3	0.823 (0.018)	0.718 (0.017)	0.770 (0.016)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera atropetiolata</u> S.A.Mori	3	0.753 (0.022)	0.636 (0.010)	0.694 (0.014)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera carinata</u> S.A.Mori	2	0.782 (0.013)	0.705 (0.062)	0.744 (0.038)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera collina</u> Eyma	3	0.735 (0.025)	0.623 (0.026)	0.679 (0.012)

Appendix 1. Continued

Family	Scientific name	N	Basic density at breast height ~1.36 m, mean (standard deviation)	Basic density at the top of the bole, mean (standard deviation)	Arithmetic mean of the bole (breast height and top of the bole)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera coriacea</u> (DC.) Mart. ex Berg.	6	0.699 (0.156)	0.642 (0.126)	0.671 (0.140)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera grandiflora</u> (Aubl.) Sandwith	2	0.752 (0.018)	0.674 (0.016)	0.713 (0.001)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera rodriguesiana</u> Mori	12	0.762 (0.053)	0.688 (0.041)	0.725 (0.041)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera</u> sp.	7	0.734 (0.079)	0.687 (0.027)	0.710 (0.049)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera tessmannii</u> Knuth	3	0.789 (0.023)	0.713 (0.040)	0.751 (0.029)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Eschweilera wachenheimii</u> (Benoist) Sandwith	9	0.750 (0.027)	-	-
Myrtaceae	<u>Eugenia</u> aff. <u>citrifolia</u> Poir.	1	0.664	0.663	0.663
Myrtaceae	<u>Eugenia</u> cf. <u>illepida</u> McVaugh	1	0.690	0.658	0.674
Myrtaceae	<u>Eugenia diplocampta</u> Diels	1	0.789	0.744	0.766
Arecaceae	<u>Euterpe precatoria</u> Mart.	1	0.273	0.269	0.271
Rubiaceae	<u>Ferdinandusa elliptica</u> Pohl.	1	0.650	0.590	0.620
Annonaceae	<u>Fusaea longifolia</u> (Aubl.) Saff.	1	0.653	0.615	0.634
Celastraceae	<u>Goupia glabra</u> Aubl.	1	0.747	0.677	0.712
Meliaceae	<u>Guarea scabra</u> A. Juss.	1	0.740	0.672	0.706
Meliaceae	<u>Guarea</u> sp.	1	0.691	0.605	0.648
Lecythidaceae	<u>Gustavia elliptica</u> S.A. Mori	13	0.669 (0.026)	0.627 (0.028)	0.648 (0.026)
Moraceae	<u>Helianthostylis sprucei</u> Baill.	3	0.585 (0.045)	0.597 (0.027)	0.591 (0.036)
Moraceae	<u>Helicostylis</u> sp.	2	0.709 (0.036)	0.713 (0.035)	0.711 (0.035)
Euphorbiaceae	<u>Hevea brasiliensis</u> (Willd ex Adr. Juss.) Muell. Arg.	1	0.533	0.522	0.528
Euphorbiaceae	<u>Hevea guianensis</u> Aubl.	1	0.514	0.556	0.535
Apocynaceae	<u>Himatanthus</u> cf. <u>sucuuba</u> (Spruce) Woodson.	1	0.404	0.438	0.421
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Hirtella</u> cf. <u>pimichina</u> Lass. & Mag.	1	0.824	0.759	0.791
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Hirtella</u> sp.	1	0.828	0.765	0.797
Humiriaceae	<u>Humiriastrum cuspidatum</u> (Benth.) Cuatr.	1	0.721	0.666	0.693
Mimosaceae	<u>Inga</u> sp.	1	0.503	0.530	0.517
Myristicaceae	<u>Iryanthera juruensis</u> Warb.	3	0.672 (0.059)	0.556 (0.013)	0.614 (0.033)
Myristicaceae	<u>Iryanthera ulei</u> Warb.	1	0.587	0.549	0.568
Bignoniaceae	<u>Jacaranda</u> sp.	1	0.457	0.543	0.500

Appendix 1. Continued

Family	Scientific name	N	Basic density at breast height ~1.36 m, mean (standard deviation)	Basic density at the top of the bole, mean (standard deviation)	Arithmetic mean of the bole (breast height and top of the bole)
Quiinaceae	<u>Lacunaria crenata</u> (Tul.) A. C. Sm.	1	0.773	0.725	0.749
Lecythidaceae	<u>Lecythis parvifructa</u> S.A.Mori	2	0.741 (0.023)	0.710 (0.046)	0.726 (0.034)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Lecythis poiteaui</u> Berg.	1	0.763	0.632	0.697
Lecythidaceae	<u>Lecythis prancei</u> S.A.Mori	2	0.875 (0.015)	0.791 (0.025)	0.833 (0.020)
Lecythidaceae	<u>Lecythis</u> sp.	2	0.705 (0.175)	0.668 (0.114)	0.686 (0.145)
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Licania</u> cf. <u>rodriguesii</u> Prance	1	0.844	0.757	0.800
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Licania impressa</u> Prance	2	0.921 (0.030)	0.403 (0.570)	0.662 (0.270)
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Licania micrantha</u> Miq.	1	0.811	0.746	0.779
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Licania prismatocarpa</u> Spruce ex Hook.f.	1	0.857	0.744	0.801
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Licania sothersae</u> Prance	1	0.839	0.736	0.788
Chrysobalanaceae	<u>Licania</u> spp.	5	0.817 (0.062)	0.763 (0.053)	0.790 (0.057)
Lauraceae	<u>Licaria guianensis</u> Aubl.	1	0.749	0.677	0.713
Euphorbiaceae	<u>Mabea caudata</u> Pax & K. Hoffm	1	0.670	0.573	0.621
Euphorbiaceae	<u>Mabea piriri</u> Aubl.	1	0.644	0.801	0.723
Sapotaceae	<u>Manilkara bidentata</u> (A.DC.) A.Chev.	1	0.813	0.702	0.758
Sapotaceae	<u>Manilkara cavalcantei</u> Pires & W. A. Rodrigues	1	0.834	0.759	0.797
Moraceae	<u>Maquira sclerophylla</u> (Ducke) C. C. Berg.	2	0.504 (0.020)	0.509 (0.011)	0.506 (0.016)
Sapidaceae	<u>Matayba</u> sp.	1	0.823	0.677	0.750
Lauraceae	<u>Mezilaurus duckei</u> van der Werff	1	0.716	0.685	0.700
Lauraceae	<u>Mezilaurus itauba</u> (Meissn.) Taubert ex Mez	1	0.659	0.654	0.657
Euphorbiaceae	<u>Micrandra rossiana</u> R.E.Schult	1	0.678	0.596	0.637
Euphorbiaceae	<u>Micrandra siphonioides</u> Benth.	1	0.584	0.570	0.577
Sapotaceae	<u>Micropholis guyanensis</u> (A. DC.) Pierre ssp. <u>duckeana</u> (Baehni) T.D. Penn.	2	0.719 (0.015)	0.641 (0.003)	0.680 (0.009)
Sapotaceae	<u>Micropholis guyanensis</u> (A. DC.) Pierre ssp. <u>guyanensis</u>	1	0.663	0.588	0.626
Sapotaceae	<u>Micropholis mensalis</u> (Baehni) Aubrév.	2	0.717 (0.180)	0.639 (0.155)	0.678 (0.168)
Sapotaceae	<u>Micropholis venulosa</u> (Mart. & Eichler) Pierre	2	0.608 (0.044)	0.565 (0.009)	0.587 (0.027)
Sapotaceae	<u>Micropholis williamii</u> Aubrév. & Pellegrin	1	0.718	0.650	0.684
Olacaceae	<u>Minquartia guianensis</u> Aubl.	1	0.777	0.756	0.766

Appendix 1. Continued

Family	Scientific name	N	Basic density at breast height ~1.36 m, mean (standard deviation)	Basic density at the top of the bole, mean (standard deviation)	Arithmetic mean of the bole (breast height and top of the bole)
Memecylaceae	<u>Mouriri brevipes</u> Hook	1	0.775	0.714	0.744
Nyctaginaceae	<u>Neea</u> sp.	2	0.571 (0.017)	0.594 (0.058)	0.582 (0.037)
Lauraceae	<u>Ocotea amazonica</u> (Meissn.) Mez.	1	0.443	0.473	0.458
Lauraceae	<u>Ocotea canaliculata</u> (Rich) Mez.	1	0.455	0.503	0.479
Lauraceae	<u>Ocotea fragantissima</u> Ducke	2	0.582 (0.021)	0.568 (0.006)	0.575 (0.014)
Lauraceae	<u>Ocotea myriantha</u> (Meissn.) Mez.	1	0.611	0.599	0.605
Lauraceae	<u>Ocotea percurrens</u> Vicentini	1	0.519	0.531	0.525
Arecaceae	<u>Oenocarpus</u> sp.	1	0.789	0.337	0.563
Papilionoideae	<u>Ormosia smithii</u> Rudd.	1	0.714	0.725	0.720
Myristicaceae	<u>Osteophloeum platyspermum</u> (A. DC.) Warb.	1	0.469	0.505	0.487
Ochnaceae	<u>Ouratea discophora</u> Ducke	1	0.791	0.778	0.785
Mimosoideae	<u>Parkia pendula</u> (Willd.) Walp.	1	0.544	0.507	0.525
Mimosaceae	<u>Parkia</u> sp.	1	0.617	0.589	0.603
Violaceae	<u>Paypayrola grandiflora</u> Tul.	1	0.630	0.611	0.620
Caesalpiniaceae	<u>Peltogyne</u> sp.	1	0.944	0.807	0.876
Icacinaceae	<u>Poraqueiba guianensis</u> Aubl.	1	0.751	0.688	0.719
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria anomala</u> (Pires) T. D. Penn.	4	0.760 (0.031)	0.691 (0.039)	0.726 (0.034)
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria caimito</u> (Ruiz & Pav.) Radlk.	2	0.897 (0.051)	0.800 (0.010)	0.849 (0.020)
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria</u> cf. <u>stipulifera</u> T.D.Penn	1	0.741	0.640	0.690
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria cladantha</u> Sandwith	1	0.894	0.842	0.868
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria flavilata</u> x T. D. Penn	1	0.665	0.588	0.627
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria macrophylla</u> (Lam.) Eyma	2	0.858 (0.026)	0.727 (0.056)	0.792 (0.041)
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria reticulata</u> (Engl.) Eyma	1	0.930	0.755	0.842
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria</u> spp.	9	0.695 (0.128)	0.618 (0.059)	0.656 (0.092)
Sapotaceae	<u>Pouteria vernicosa</u> T. D. Penn.	1	0.737	0.693	0.715
Burseraceae	<u>Protium altsonii</u> Sandwith	2	0.684 (0.272)	0.636 (0.177)	0.660 (0.224)
Burseraceae	<u>Protium fimbriatum</u> Swart.	1	0.599	0.554	0.577
Burseraceae	<u>Protium grandifolium</u> Engl.	1	0.638	0.594	0.616

Appendix 1. Continued

Family	Scientific name	N	Basic density at breast height ~1.36 m, mean (standard deviation)	Basic density at the top of the bole, mean (standard deviation)	Arithmetic mean of the bole (breast height and top of the bole)
Burseraceae	<u>Protium guianense</u> (Aubl.) March. ssp. <u>guianense</u>	1	0.711	0.701	0.706
Burseraceae	<u>Protium</u> spp.	6	0.567 (0.058)	0.520 (0.088)	0.543 (0.073)
Burseraceae	<u>Protium tenuifolium</u> (Engl.) Engl.	2	0.556 (0.008)	0.581 (0.013)	0.568 (0.002)
Burseraceae	<u>Protium trifoliolatum</u> Engl.	1	0.640	0.624	0.632
Moraceae	<u>Pseudolmedia laevis</u> (Ruiz & Pavan) Macbr.	1	0.598	0.552	0.575
Moraceae	<u>Pseudolmedia murure</u> standl.	1	0.756	0.693	0.725
Papilionoideae	<u>Pterocarpus amazonicus</u> Hub.	1	0.528	0.527	0.527
Quiinaceae	<u>Quiina obovata</u> Tul.	1	0.851	0.760	0.805
Violaceae	<u>Rinorea guianensis</u> Aubl. var. <u>subintegrifolia</u>	1	0.780	0.700	0.740
Violaceae	<u>Rinorea racemosa</u> (Mart.) Kuntze	2	0.682 (0.053)	0.647 (0.079)	0.664 (0.066)
Hippograteaceae	<u>Salacia</u> sp.	1	0.713	0.679	0.696
Sapotaceae	<u>Sarcaulus brasiliensis</u> ssp. <u>brasiliensis</u> (A. DC.) Eyma	1	0.615	0.543	0.579
Caesalpinioideae	<u>Sclerolobium</u> cf. <u>micropetalum</u> Ducke	1	0.690	0.603	0.647
Caesalpinioideae	<u>Sclerolobium melanocarpum</u> Ducke	2	0.524 (0.134)	0.572 (0.211)	0.548 (0.172)
Caesalpinioideae	<u>Sclerolobium paraense</u> Hub.	1	0.802	0.723	0.763
Bombacaceae	<u>Scleronema micranthum</u> Ducke	4	0.552 (0.032)	0.563 (0.007)	0.558 (0.014)
	Without botanical sample	2	0.773 (0.095)	0.656 (0.058)	0.714 (0.077)
Combretaceae	Unidentified	1	0.848	0.800	0.824
Simaroubaceae	<u>Simaba</u> sp.	1	0.617	0.646	0.632
Siparunaceae	<u>Siparuna argyrochyse</u> Pert.	1	0.617	0.620	0.618
Siparunaceae	<u>Siparuna cuspidata</u> (Tul.) A. DC.	1	0.632	0.605	0.618
Siparunaceae	<u>Siparuna decipiens</u> (Tul.) A. DC.	1	0.591	0.519	0.555
Elaeocarpaceae	<u>Sloanea guianensis</u> (Aubl.) Benth.	1	0.856	0.801	0.828
Elaeocarpaceae	<u>Sloanea schomburgkii</u> Benth.	1	0.870	0.808	0.839
Elaeocarpaceae	<u>Sloanea synandra</u> Spruce ex Benth.	1	0.653	0.581	0.617
Mimosaceae	<u>Stryphnodendron racemiferum</u> (Duke) Rodr.	1	0.752	0.679	0.715
Rubiaceae	<u>Duroia fusifera</u> Hook. Fex. K.Schum.	1	0.672	0.529	0.600
Papilionoideae	<u>Swartzia corrugata</u> Benth.	1	0.913	0.703	0.808

Appendix 1. Continued

Family	Scientific name	N	Basic density at breast height ~1.36 m, mean (standard deviation)	Basic density at the top of the bole, mean (standard deviation)	Arithmetic mean of the bole (breast height and top of the bole)
Papilionoideae	<u>Swartzia cuspidata</u> Spruce ex Benth.	1	0.678	0.640	0.659
Papilionoideae	<u>Swartzia ingifolia</u> Ducke	2	0.815 (0.002)	0.721 (0.047)	0.768 (0.025)
Papilionoideae	<u>Swartzia polyphylla</u> DC.	1	0.643	0.573	0.608
Sapindaceae	<u>Talisia cf. microphylla</u> Uitt.	2	0.773 (0.017)	0.681 (0.016)	0.727 (0.001)
Burseraceae	<u>Tetragastris panamensis</u> (Engl.) Kuntze	1	0.783	0.726	0.754
Sterculiaceae	<u>Theobroma sylvestre</u> Mart.	3	0.668 (0.031)	0.473 (0.090)	0.571 (0.060)
Leguminosae	Tintarana	1	0.638	0.692	0.665
Clusiaceae	<u>Tovomita</u> sp.	1	0.764	0.693	0.729
Burseraceae	<u>Trattinnickia peruviana</u> Loes.	2	0.560 (0.054)	0.561 (0.016)	0.561 (0.019)
Moraceae	<u>Trymatococcus amazonicus</u> Poepp. & Endl.	1	0.548	0.555	0.552
Annonaceae	<u>Unonopsis</u> sp.	1	0.727	0.651	0.689
Annonaceae	<u>Unonopsis stipitata</u> Diels	1	0.686	0.627	0.656
Humiriaceae	<u>Vantanea macrocarpa</u> Ducke	2	0.953 (0.007)	0.831 (0.058)	0.892 (0.032)
Myristicaceae	<u>Virola caducifolia</u> W.A.Rodrigues	1	0.461	0.515	0.488
Myristicaceae	<u>Virola michelli</u> Heck	1	0.586	0.492	0.539
Myristicaceae	<u>Virola</u> sp.	2	0.511 (0.017)	0.483 (0.007)	0.497 (0.012)
Myristicaceae	<u>Virola venosa</u> (Benth.) Warb.	1	0.622	0.559	0.590
Vochysiaceae	<u>Vochysia cf. melinonii</u> Bechmann	1	0.591	0.634	0.612
Annonaceae	<u>Xylopiya amazonica</u> R.E.Fr.	1	0.787	0.657	0.722
Mimosoideae	<u>Zygia juruana</u> (Harms) L.Rico	1	0.851	0.740	0.796
Mimosaceae	<u>Zygia racemosa</u> (Ducke) Barneby & J. W. Grimes	3	0.748 (0.022)	0.701 (0.032)	0.725 (0.026)

Appendix 2. Common names for species for which wood density was determined.¹

Scientific name	Common names
<u>Anacardium parvifolium</u> Ducke	Cajuí. cajuí-folha-miúda
<u>Andira</u> sp.	Sucupira
<u>Andira unifoliolata</u> Ducke	Acapurana
<u>Aniba cylindriflora</u> kosterm.	
<u>Aniba hostmanniana</u> (Nees) Mez.	Louro-amarelo. louro-capitium
<u>Aniba panurensis</u> (Meissn.) Mez.	
<u>Aniba williamsii</u> O.C.Schmidt	Louro-amarelo
<u>Annona foetida</u> Mart.	Envira-alta. graviola-da-mata
<u>Aspidosperma discolon</u> A.D.C.	Araruába. cabo-de-machado. canela-de-veado
<u>Astronium le-cointei</u> Ducke	Muiraquatiara. aroeira
<u>Blepharocalyx eggersii</u> (Kiaersk.) Landrum	
<u>Bocageopsis multiflora</u> (Mart.) R.E.Fr.	Envira-preta. envira-surucucu. envira-surucucu-folha-miúda
<u>Bocageopsis</u> sp.	Envira
<u>Bocoa viridiflora</u> (Ducke) R.S.Cowan	Muirajibóia-preta
<u>Botryarrhena pendula</u> Ducke	
<u>Brosimum guianense</u> (Aubl.) Huber	Pau-rainha-roxo
<u>Brosimum lactescens</u> (S.Moore) C.C.Berg.	Leiteira. muiratinga
<u>Brosimum parinarioides</u> Ducke	Amapá. amapá-roxo. amaparana
<u>Brosimum rubescens</u> Taub.	Garrote. pau-rainha. muirapiranga. pau-brasil. rainha
<u>Brosimum utile</u> (H.B.K.) Pittier ssp. <u>ovatifolium</u> (Ducke) C.C.Berg.	Garrote. leiteira
<u>Byrsonima</u> sp.	Murici. murixi
<u>Cariniana decandra</u> Ducke	Tauari. castanha-de-macaco
<u>Cariniana micrantha</u> Ducke	Tauri. castanha-de-macaco
<u>Caryocar</u> sp.	Piquiarana
<u>Chaunochiton kappleri</u> (Sagot ex Engl.) Ducke	Capoteiro. pau-branco
<u>Chimarrhis turbinata</u> DC.	Pau-de-remo
<u>Chrysophyllum amazonicum</u> T.D.Penn.	Abiurana
<u>Chrysophyllum lucentifolium</u> Cronquist ssp. <u>pachycarpum</u> Pires & T.D.Penn.	Vaca
<u>Chrysophyllum prieurii</u> A. DC.	Massaranduba. castanha-vermelha. abiurana vermelha. abiurana maçaranduba. maçarandubarana
<u>Chrysophyllum sanguinolentum</u> (Pierre) Baehni ssp. <u>sanguinolentum</u>	Coquirana. pau-de-porco. ucuquirana
<u>Chrysophyllum sanguinolentum</u> (Pierre) Baehni ssp. <u>spurium</u> (Ducke) T. D. Penn.	Balata-brava. ucuquirana
<u>Chrysophyllum ucuquirana-branca</u> (Aubrév. & Pellegrin) T. D. Penn.	Coquirana-branca
<u>Clusia</u> sp.	Bacupari. criúva. clúsia. guanandi-de-areia. pororoca
<u>Corythophora alta</u> Kunth	Ripeiro. ripeiro-vermelho
<u>Corythophora rimosa</u> W. A. Rodrigues ssp. <u>rimosa</u>	Castanha-jacaré. casca-jacaré
<u>Corythophora rimosa</u> W.A. Rodrigues	Castanha-jacaré. casca-jacaré
<u>Couepia</u> sp.	Amescla. bom-nome-preto. cabatã-cega-machado. carrapeta. carrapeta-tataburá
<u>Couepia ulei</u> Pilg.	
<u>Coussarea ampla</u> Mull.Arg.	
<u>Coussarea hirticalix</u> Standl.	

Appendix 2. Continued

Scientific name	Common names
<u>Cupania scrobiculata</u> L.C.Rich.	Espeturana
<u>Dipterix</u> sp.	
<u>Duguetia chysea</u> Maas	
<u>Duguetia megalocarpa</u> Maas	Envira-cajú
<u>Duguetia stelechantha</u> (Diels) R.E.Fr.	
<u>Duguetia surinamensis</u> R.E.Fr.	Envira-amargosa
<u>Ecclinusa guianensis</u> Eyma	Abiurana-caju. abiurana-bacuri. cauchorana
<u>Endopleura uchi</u> (Huber) Cuatrec.	Uchi. uxi-amarelo. uxi-liso. uxi-pucu
<u>Eperua duckeana</u> R. S. Cowan	Muirapiranga-folha-grande
<u>Eperua glabriflora</u> (Ducke) R. S. Cowan	Muirapiranga-folha-miúda
<u>Ephedrantus amazonicus</u> R.E.Fr.	Envira-dura. envira-taia. envira-dura
<u>Eschweilera amazoniciformis</u> S.A. Mori	Matamatá
<u>Eschweilera atropetiolata</u> S.A.Mori	Castanha-vermelha
<u>Eschweilera carinata</u> S.A.Mori	
<u>Eschweilera collina</u> Eyma	Ripeiro-branco
<u>Eschweilera coriaceae</u> (DC.) Mart. ex Berg.	Matamatá-verdadeira
<u>Eschweilera grandiflora</u> (Aubl.) Sandwith	Matamatá-rósea
<u>Eschweilera pseudodecolorans</u> S.A.Mori	Matamatá
<u>Eschweilera rodriguesiana</u> Mori	
<u>Eschweilera</u> sp.	Burangica. cuia-de-macaco. embiribaçu. jatereu. mangue. quiriba. macaco-de-cuia. tiriba
<u>Eschweilera tessmannii</u> Knuth	Ripeiro-vermelho
<u>Eschweilera wachenheimii</u> (Benoist) Sandwith	Matamatá-mirim
<u>Eugenia</u> aff. <u>citriifolia</u> Poir.	
<u>Eugenia</u> cf. <u>illepida</u> McVaugh	
<u>Eugenia diplocampta</u> Diels	
<u>Euterpe precatoria</u> Mart.	Açaí-da-mata
<u>Ferdinandusa elliptica</u> Pohl.	Café-bravo
<u>Fusaea longifolia</u> (Aubl.) Saff.	Envira-preta. envira-surucucu
<u>Goupia glabra</u> Aubl.	Cupiúba
<u>Guarea scabra</u> A. Juss.	
<u>Guarea</u> sp.	Gito-vermelho. café-branco. cajarana. cedro-baio
<u>Gustavia elliptica</u> S.A. Mori	Mucurão
<u>Helianthostylis sprucei</u> Baill.	Falsa-rainha
<u>Helicostylis</u> sp.	Inharé
<u>Hevea brasiliensis</u> (Willd ex Adr. Juss.) Muell. Arg.	Seringueira. seringa-verdadeira
<u>Hevea guianensis</u> Aubl.	Seringueira. seringa-itaúba. seringa-vermelha
<u>Himatanthus</u> cf. <u>sucuuba</u> (Spruce) Woodson.	Sucuúba. sucuba. janaguba
<u>Hirtella</u> cf. <u>pimichina</u> Lass. & Mag.	
<u>Hirtella</u> sp.	Amescla-seca. carrapeta-amarela. casca-dura. cega-machado. estalador. oitizinho
<u>Humiriastrum cuspidatum</u> (Benth.) Cuatr.	
<u>Inga</u> sp.	Ingá. alho-bravo. cedro-amarelo. cega-machado. favinha
<u>Iryanthera juruensis</u> Warb.	Lacre-da-mata
<u>Iryanthera ulei</u> Warb.	Ucuuba-branca
<u>Jacaranda</u> sp.	Tamanqueira. falsa-caroba
<u>Lacunaria crenata</u> (Tul.) A. C. Sm.	
<u>Lecythis parvifructa</u> S.A.Mori	Jarana-de-folha-pequena
<u>Lecythis poiteaui</u> Berg.	Jarana-amarela
<u>Lecythis prancei</u> S.A.Mori	Castanha-jarana

Appendix 2. Continued

Scientific name	Common names
<u>Lecythis</u> sp.	Embiratã. pininga. sapucaia-de-pilão. sapucarana. Sapucarana-verdadeira
<u>Licania</u> cf. <u>rodriguesii</u> Prance	
<u>Licania impressa</u> Prance	Macucu
<u>Licania micrantha</u> Miq.	Pintadinha
<u>Licania prismatocarpa</u> Spruce ex Hook.f.	
<u>Licania sothersae</u> Prance	
<u>Licania</u> sp.	Caraipé. caripé. cariperana. uxi-do-igapó. uchirana
<u>Licaria guianensis</u> Aubl.	Louro-mangarataia
<u>Mabea caudata</u> Pax & K. Hoffm	Taquari. seringáí
<u>Mabea piriri</u> Aubl.	
<u>Manilkara bidentata</u> (A.DC.) A.Chev.	Massaranduba
<u>Manilkara cavalcantei</u> Pires & W. A. Rodrigues	Massaranduba-de-folha-miúda
<u>Maquira sclerophylla</u> (Ducke) C. C. Berg.	Muiratinga. pau-tanino
<u>Matayba</u> sp.	Breu-pitomba
<u>Mezilaurus duckei</u> van der Werff	Itaúba-abacate
<u>Mezilaurus itauba</u> (Meissn.) Taubert ex Mez	Itaúba. louro-itaúba
<u>Micrandra rossiana</u> R.E.Schult	Cauchorana
<u>Micrandra siphonioides</u> Benth.	Seringarana. cauchorana
<u>Micropholis guyanensis</u> (A. DC.) Pierre ssp. <u>duckeana</u> (Baehni) T.D. Penn.	Balata-rosadinha. chile-bravo. abiurana-bacuri. cauchorana
<u>Micropholis guyanensis</u> (A. DC.) Pierre ssp. <u>guyanensis</u>	Balata-brava. maparajuba. abiurana-bacuri. cauchorana
<u>Micropholis mensalis</u> (Baehni) Aubrév.	Abiurana-goiabinha. abiurana-roxa
<u>Micropholis venulosa</u> (Mart. & Eichler) Pierre	Abiurana-branca. Mulungu. rosada-verde
<u>Micropholis williamii</u> Aubrév. & Pellegrin	Abiurana. balata-brava
<u>Minquartia guianensis</u> Aubl.	Acariquara. aquariquara-roxa. acariúba
<u>Mouriri brevipes</u> Hook	Muiráúba
<u>Neea</u> sp.	João-mole
<u>Ocotea amazonica</u> (Meissn.) Mez.	Canela-mamelada
<u>Ocotea canaliculata</u> (Rich) Mez.	Louro-branco. louro-pimenta
<u>Ocotea fragantissima</u> Ducke	Louro-preto
<u>Ocotea myriantha</u> (Meissn.) Mez.	Louro-abacate
<u>Ocotea percurrens</u> Vicentini	
<u>Oenocarpus</u> sp.	
<u>Ormosia smithii</u> Rudd.	
<u>Osteophloeum platyspermum</u> (A. DC.) Warb.	Ucuuba-chico-de-assis. lacre-da-mata. ucuúba-amarela. ucuúba-branca. ucuubarana
<u>Ouratea discophora</u> Ducke	Uxi-de-morcego
<u>Parkia pendula</u> (Willd.) Walp.	Visgueiro. arara-tucupi. faveira-arara-tucupi. faveira-parquia
<u>Parkia</u> sp.	Faveira
<u>Paypayrola grandiflora</u> Tul.	Manacarana. paparola
<u>Peltogyne</u> sp.	
<u>Poraqueiba guianensis</u> Aubl.	Marirana. umari-amarelo. umari-bravo. umarirana
<u>Pouteria anomala</u> (Pires) T. D. Penn.	Abiurana-balatinha. abiurana-rosadinha. mangabarana. rosadinha. rosadinho
<u>Pouteria caimito</u> (Ruiz & Pav.) Radlk.	Abiurana-aquariquara
<u>Pouteria</u> cf. <u>stipulifera</u> T.D.Penn	
<u>Pouteria cladantha</u> Sandwith	Abiurana-seca
<u>Pouteria flavilatex</u> T. D. Penn	
<u>Pouteria macrophylla</u> (Lam.) Eyma	Acará-uba

Appendix 2. Continued

Scientific name	Common names
<u>Pouteria reticulata</u> (Engl.) Eyma	Abiurana-cascuda
<u>Pouteria</u> sp.	Abiurana
<u>Pouteria vernicosa</u> T. D. Penn.	Abiurana
<u>Protium altsonii</u> Sandwith	
<u>Protium fimbriatum</u> Swart.	
<u>Protium grandifolium</u> Engl.	
<u>Protium guianense</u> (Aubl.) March. ssp. <u>guianense</u>	Pau-de-incenso
<u>Protium</u> sp.	Breu
<u>Protium tenuifolium</u> (Engl.) Engl.	Breu. breu-preto
<u>Protium trifoliolatum</u> Engl.	Breu-branco
<u>Pseudolmedia laevis</u> (Ruiz & Pavan) Macbr.	Inharé-folha-miúda. muiratinga
<u>Pseudolmedia murure</u> standl.	
<u>Pterocarpus amazonicus</u> Hub.	Mututi. mututi-da-várzea. pau-sangue
<u>Quiina obovata</u> Tul.	
<u>Rinorea guianensis</u> Aubl. var. <u>subintegriifolia</u>	Falsa-cupiúba
<u>Rinorea paniculata</u> (Mart.) Kuntze	
<u>Salacia</u> sp.	Chichuasca
<u>Sarcaulus brasiliensis</u> ssp. <u>brasiliensis</u> (A. DC.) Eyma	Guajará
<u>Sclerolobium</u> cf. <u>micropetalum</u> Ducke	
<u>Sclerolobium melanocarpum</u> Ducke	Taxi-vermelho
<u>Sclerolobium paraense</u> Hub.	Pau-de-formiga. pau-ponga. taxi-branco. taxi-preto. taxirana
<u>Scleronema micranthum</u> Ducke	Cardeiro. cedro-bravo. cedrorana
Sem amostra	Envireira (anonaceae)
Sem amostra	Pajurá
Sem identificação	Tanibuca
<u>Simaba</u> sp.	Calunga
<u>Siparuna argyrochrysea</u> Pert.	
<u>Siparuna cuspidata</u> (Tul.) A. DC.	
<u>Siparuna decipiens</u> (Tul.) A. DC.	Limão-do-mato. louro-capitiú
<u>Sloanea guianensis</u> (Aubl.) Benth.	Urucurana
<u>Sloanea schomburgkii</u> Benth.	
<u>Sloanea synandra</u> Spruce ex Benth.	
<u>Stryphnodendron racemiferum</u> (Duke) Rodr.	Ingarana
<u>Suroia fusifera</u> Hook. Fex. K.Schum.	
<u>Swartzia corrugata</u> Benth.	Coração-de-negro
<u>Swartzia cuspidata</u> Spruce ex Benth.	Muirapiranga-folha-miúda
<u>Swartzia ingifolia</u> Ducke	Acapú-amarelo. carrapatinho
<u>Swartzia polyphylla</u> DC.	Paracutaca. jabelona
<u>Talisia</u> cf. <u>microphylla</u> Uitt.	
<u>Tetragastris panamensis</u> (Engl.) Kuntze	Barrote. breu-areu-areu. breu-preto
<u>Theobroma sylvestre</u> Mart.	Cacau-do-mato. cacauí. cacau-azul
Tintarana	Tintarana
<u>Tovomita</u> sp.	Mangue. mangue-branco. mangue-preto. mangue-vermelho
<u>Trattinnickia peruviana</u> Loes.	
<u>Trymatococcus amazonicus</u> Poepp. & Endl.	Päima
<u>Unonopsis</u> sp.	
<u>Unonopsis stipitata</u> Diels	Envira. envireira. envira-preta. envira-surucucu
<u>Vantanea macrocarpa</u> Ducke	Uchirana. quebra-machado. macucu-murici. uxi-quebra-machado
<u>Virola caducifolia</u> W.A.Rodrigues	Ucuuba-peluda

Appendix 2. Continued

Scientific name	Common names
<u>Virola michelli</u> Heck	Ucuuba-preta
<u>Virola</u> sp.	
<u>Virola venosa</u> (Benth.) Warb.	Ucuuba-branca. ucuúba-da-mata
<u>Vochysia</u> cf. <u>melinonii</u> Bechmann	Quaruba. quaruba-branca. quarubatinga
<u>Xylopia amazonica</u> R.E.Fr.	Louro-bosta. envira-sarassará. envireira-vermelha. envirataia-vermelha. envirataia-sarassará
<u>Zygia juruana</u> (Harms) L.Rico	Inga-cauliflora
<u>Zygia racemosa</u> (Ducke) Barneby & J. W. Grimes	Angelim-rajado

¹ Names from Pinto et al. (2003), Camargos et al. (2001). Ribeiro et al. (1999) and Silva et al. (1977).

Table 2. Models to estimate basic density of the disk [BDD]¹, arithmetic mean basic density of the bole [MBDB] and taper-adjusted mean basic density of the bole [AMBDB] from heartwood basic density [HBD]¹ (green volume), from re-hydrated heartwood density [RHD]¹ (re-hydrated volume) and from basic density of the full disk [BDD]¹.

Models	Coefficients (Standard Error)		R ²	MSE	F	n
	α	β				
BDD= $\alpha + \beta$ (HBD) + ε	0.146 ^(0.014)	0.765 ^(0.017)	0.931	0.033	1945	146
BDD= $\alpha + \beta$ (RHD) + ε	0.167 ^(0.016)	0.718 ^(0.020)	0.903	0.040	1291	141
MBDB= $\alpha + \beta$ (HBD) + ε	0.219 ^(0.014)	0.630 ^(0.018)	0.893	0.034	1199	145
MBDB= $\alpha + \beta$ (RHD) + ε	0.235 ^(0.015)	0.592 ^(0.019)	0.873	0.038	947	140
AMBDB= $\alpha + \beta$ (BDD) + ε	0.099 ^(0.020)	0.808 ^(0.028)	0.925	0.027	832	69
AMBDB= $\alpha + \beta$ (HBD) + ε	0.219 ^(0.027)	0.611 ^(0.035)	0.871	0.038	298	46
AMBDB= $\alpha + \beta$ (RHD) + ε	0.228 ^(0.029)	0.585 ^(0.038)	0.847	0.041	243	46

¹At breast height

Table 1. Test of mean for density values obtained from dry weight determined at 80 and 103°C, fresh volume and volume obtained through re-hydration.

Density (sampling position)	N	Temperature for determination of the dry weight, mean (standard deviation), comparison of means*	
		80°C	103°C
Breast height (~1.36 m above the ground)	310	0.712 (0.119) ^{aA}	0.704 (0.117) ^{aB}
Top of the bole (at location of the first thick branch)	307	0.654 (0.093) ^{bA}	0.647 (0.093) ^{bB}
Arithmetic mean of the bole (density at breast height and at the top of the bole)	307	0.683 (0.102) ^{cA}	0.675 (0.101) ^{cB}
Average arithmetic of the bole (breast height, top of the bole and 2 intermediate samples)	73	0.682 (0.099) ^{cA}	0.675 (0.098) ^{bcB}
Average adjusted for the volume of the segments of the bole (breast height, top of the bole and 2 intermediate samples)	71	0.678 (0.100) ^{abcA}	0.670 (0.099) ^{abcB}
Heartwood at breast height (green volume)	145	0.775 (0.162) ^{dA}	0.766 (0.158) ^{dBa}
Heartwood at breast height (re-hydrated volume)	145	-	0.785 (0.167) ^{dB}

* The same lower-case letters appearing in the same column indicate that values do not differ significantly (Tukey test, $p > 0.05$). Different capital letters in the same line differ statistically (paired t-test, $p \leq 0.001$). Different Greek letters in the same column indicate that values differ statistically (paired t-test, $p \leq 0.001$).

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Variation of the density along the bole (n=73, trees with DBH = 5 to 122 cm). Where: BH = breast height; top = top the bole; 33 and 66% = intermediate heights.

Figure 2. Different density types at breast height, showing mean, 1st and 3rd quartiles, and range of the data for trees with DBH \geq 5 cm. 1 = basic density of the heartwood; 2= basic density of the entire disk with bark and 3= density of the heartwood obtained with re-hydrated volume.

Figure 3. Total tree height and DBH are not correlated with wood density (Pearson correlations, density is at breast height).





