GROWTH DIFFERENCES AMONG EIGHT LEAF LETTUCES CULTIVATED UNDER LED LIGHT AND COMPARISON OF TWO LEAF LETTUCES GROWN IN 2016 AND IN 2018

Mizuki Ozawa, Yuta Sano, Yuta Nakano and Masako Akutsu*

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Tokai University 9-1-1, Toroku, Kumamoto-City, Kumamoto 862-8652, Japan *Corresponding author: akutsu@tsc.u-tokai.ac.jp

Received May 2019; accepted August 2019

ABSTRACT. Effects of five kinds of LED irradiation in a growth chamber were compared. This study examined the growth and morphology of eight leaf lettuce (Lactuca sativa L.) cultivars. Plant growth under mixed red and blue, and under white with added red LED seemed best, respectively, for the growth of 'Red wave', 'Banchu sun bright', 'Sun bright' and 'Fancy green', and for 'Banchu sun bright', and 'Fancy green'. The other two cultivars, 'Red fire' and 'Frill lettuce', grew better under red LED than under other light. Furthermore, this study compared plant growth differences between 2016 and 2018 for two cultivars. Results show that plants grown in 2016 had significantly lower fresh weight, leaf weight, and dry weight. They were one-sixth to one-eighth of those achieved in 2018.

Keywords: Difference of wavelengths, Eight cultivars, Growth analysis, LED, Light quality

1. Introduction. Lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.) is often used as a model crop to grow in plant factories with artificial lighting, especially light-emitting diodes (LEDs), because of its fast growth, short production period, low energy demand, and high nutritional value [1,2]. As an important environmental factor affecting lettuce production in plant factories, light not only provides a source of energy but also acts as an ambient light signal inducing various physiological responses [3]. Fluorescent lamps have been applied mainly in commercial plant factories with artificial lighting until recent years [4]. However, LEDs are being used increasingly in newly built plant factories because LEDs provide tremendous potential attributable to their long operating life, low radiant heat output, and flexibility of spectral configuration [5].

An earlier paper described plant growth and morphological differences under light irradiation by LEDs that are red, blue, mixed red and blue, green, white, and white with added red, for four cultivars of leaf lettuce in growth cabinets to maintain environments in terms of temperature, humidity, and concentrations of CO_2 and nutrient solutions [6]. In addition, plants have different morphological and physiological responses according to a specific spectrum [7]. It is different for the most suitable LED depending on cultivars and how to grow lettuce depending on kind of LEDs. Before starting to cultivate in commercial plant factories, it is one of the most important to determine optimal LED.

This study investigated differences of plant growth and morphology under light irradiation by LEDs (red, blue, mixed red and blue, white, and white with added red) for eight leaf lettuces grown in a growth cabinet to maintain the same environment for temperature, humidity, and concentrations of CO_2 and nutrient solutions. Dry and fresh masses of plants were compared for eight leaf lettuce cultivars grown under LEDs of five kinds. In

DOI: 10.24507/icicelb.10.11.985

addition, we compared growth differences for plants cultivated in the same environment in a growth cabinet in 2016 and in 2018.

2. Materials and Methods.

2.1. Cultivation methods. Seeds for 'Red wave (Sakata Seed Co., Japan)', 'Red fire (Takii Seed Co., Japan)', 'Sanmarino (Takii Seed Co., Japan)', 'Banchu Sun Bright (Nakahara Seed Co., Ltd., Japan)', 'Sun Bright (Nakahara Seed Co., Ltd., Japan)' as red leaf lettuce, and 'Leaf Lettuce Green (Nakahara Seed Co. Ltd., Japan)', 'Fancy Green (Sakata Seed Co., Japan)', and 'Frill Lettuce (Sakata Seed Co., Japan)' were sown on urethane cubes (M Hydroponic Research Co., Ltd., Japan) with distilled water and were then germinated in a growth chamber (TGE-5-2L; Espec Corp., Japan) at 25°C, at 70% relative humidity, 600 ppm CO₂, for 16 hr under continuous illumination at 100 μ mol/m²/s¹ cool white fluorescent lamps (FHF32EX-D-HX-S; NEC Corp., Japan) for 1 week. Subsequently, the germinated seeds were transferred onto nutrient solution to grow for an additional week.

Groups of eight plantlets in a urethane cube were transferred to other containers (293 × 211 × 106 mm) with 6 liters of commercial nutrient solution (A treatment: OAT Agrio Co., Ltd., Japan) to observe growth under LEDs of five kinds (Union Electronics Industrial Co., Ltd.): red (660 mm max. wavelength), blue (450 nm max. wavelength), mixed red and blue (450 and 660 nm max. wavelength), white, and white with added red for 3 weeks. The wavelengths for all LEDs are shown in Figure 1 of an earlier paper [6]. During cultivation, their roots were given sufficient air by air pumping (Kotobuki Kougei Co., Ltd., Japan) to avoid root rot. Then all solutions were exchanged for new ones once a week, adjusted to 1.2 dSm^{-1} for electric conductivity (EC) value. All LED treatments had intensity of 100 µmol/m²/s¹.

After 3 weeks, all plants were harvested. We randomly selected five plants and measured their fresh weight (g; FW), leaf weight (g; LW), stem weight (g; SW), root weight (g; RW), maximum leaf length (cm; ML), main stem length (cm; MS), number of leaves (LN), SPAD value (SPAD-502; Konica Minolta Holdings Inc., Japan) and dry weight (g; DW) after they were kept in a dryer at 70°C for more than 3 days. Data were analyzed using Tukey's multiple test (Statcel; OMS Publishing Inc., Japan) and principal component analysis (Mulcel; OMS Publishing Inc., Japan).

2.2. Comparison of growth differences for two cultivars grown under the same environment in 2016 and in 2018. All conditions, measurements, and analysis grown lettuce cultivar, 'Red wave' and 'Leaf lettuce green', are the same in 2.1. All data from 2016 are referred from our other paper [8] for comparisons of growth differences between 2016 and 2018.

3. Results and Discussion. Morphological and physiological changes of plants show adaptation to light environments [9]. Nowadays, leaf lettuce is grown in controlled environments such as plant factories under red and/or blue LED light. However, it is more expensive and not easy to obtain compared to white LEDs because we are using white LEDs in our own life and can buy them easily [6]. Furthermore, a broad spectrum might be more practical and sufficient for plant growth under a controlled environment. Broad spectrum white LEDs were used for lettuce production in recent research [10].

Results of biomass measurements of eight leaf lettuce cultivars influenced by the light spectrum treatments are presented in Table 1. Plants showed distinct growth response to different light quality treatments. For 'Red wave' and 'Leaf lettuce green', plants under red LED had significantly lower FW, LW, SW, and RW than those under other LEDs, although completely opposite results were obtained for 'Red fire', 'San Marino', 'Banchu sun bright', 'Sun bright' and 'Frill lettuce'. Only for 'Fancy green' did differences not

Dry weight (cm)	$2.62\pm0.10a$	3.45+0.19a. 3.45+0.19a.	$0.35 \pm 0.06b$	$0.58{\pm}0.06\mathrm{b}$	$0.61\pm0.16a$	$0.43{\pm}0.04a$	$0.21{\pm}0.02b$	$0.36\pm0.06ab$	$0.42\pm0.08ab$	$0.88 \pm 0.07 a$	$0.40{\pm}0.03b$	$0.67{\pm}0.07a$	$0.65{\pm}0.04a$	$0.64 \pm 0.07 ab$	1.12 ± 0.16	$0.71 {\pm} 0.05$	1.37 ± 0.18	$0.84 {\pm} 0.15$	1.08 ± 0.21	$2.24\pm0.34a$	$0.80{\pm}0.10{ m b}$	$1.91\pm0.17ac$	$1.19 \pm 0.14 bc$	$1.00{\pm}0.12b$	$0.85 \pm 0.07 \mathrm{ac}$	$0.61\pm0.10c$	$1.58{\pm}0.37\mathrm{a}$	$0.61\pm0.10c$	$2.44\pm0.10b$	$0.96 \pm 0.11 ab$	$0.75{\pm}0.08b$	$1.34{\pm}0.08a$	$0.95 \pm 0.13 ab$	$0.97\pm0.05ab$	$1.74\pm0.21a$	$0.81{\pm}0.06{ m b}$	$0.85 {\pm} 0.07b$	$0.92{\pm}0.08b$	$0.82{\pm}0.09{ m b}$	
SPAD value	17.06 ± 0.94	10.90 ± 0.94 18.52 ± 0.51	17.52 ± 0.80	$17.60{\pm}0.81$	15.46 ± 2.03	15.98 ± 0.95	17.00 ± 1.41	$13.54{\pm}1.49$	19.30 ± 3.31	16.78 ± 2.86	$29.74 {\pm} 4.60$	$25.28 {\pm} 3.75$	20.52 ± 1.81	19.72 ± 2.42	15.46 ± 0.81	17.44 ± 0.80	16.04 ± 0.70	16.22 ± 0.53	17.60 ± 0.99	$16.50\pm1.72a$	$19.00\pm 1.73a$	$26.30 \pm 1.01 \mathrm{b}$	$15.10{\pm}0.85a$	$16.30{\pm}1.78a$	19.14 ± 2.27	20.72 ± 1.88	17.42 ± 0.53	20.72 ± 1.88	16.62 ± 1.53	$27.00 \pm 1.19 ab$	$30.04\pm 2.06ab$	$32.24{\pm}1.76a$	$25.48 \pm 0.78 \mathrm{b}$	$28.66 \pm 1.36 ab$	25.58 ± 1.78	$22.80{\pm}1.19$	$23.16 {\pm} 0.89$	26.52 ± 1.48	29.12 ± 2.54	
Number of leaves	$11.20\pm0.58a$	o.s0±0.20b 10.80+0.58ab	9.60 ± 0.60 ab	$9.20{\pm}0.37\mathrm{ab}$	$13.60\pm 1.21a$	$9.20{\pm}0.37{ m b}$	$10.40 \pm 0.93 ab$	$11.20\pm0.73ab$	$10.20{\pm}0.37{ m b}$	$10.80\pm0.58a$	$8.40{\pm}0.24b$	$10.20{\pm}0.20a$	$9.80\pm0.20ab$	$10.60 \pm 0.40 a$	10.00 ± 0.32	$9.40 {\pm} 0.40$	11.00 ± 0.55	10.00 ± 0.45	10.40 ± 0.40	12.40 ± 1.00	10.60 ± 0.60	13.40 ± 0.40	11.80 ± 0.70	11.60 ± 0.68	7.80 ± 0.37	$7.80{\pm}0.58$	10.00 ± 1.10	7.80 ± 0.58	8.40 ± 0.87	10.00 ± 0.32	10.00 ± 0.55	10.80 ± 0.58	10.60 ± 0.51	10.60 ± 0.40	19.20 ± 1.98	$15.80{\pm}1.36$	17.00 ± 0.95	$16.00{\pm}1.38$	17.20 ± 1.39	level of 0.05.
Length of main stem (cm)	10.34±0.81a	5.54+0.41b	$4.56{\pm}1.00{ m b}$	$6.14{\pm}0.37{ m b}$	$7.60{\pm}1.00a$	$2.16{\pm}0.22b$	$1.00{\pm}0.04{ m b}$	$2.14{\pm}0.49{ m b}$	$1.76{\pm}0.12b$	$1.48\pm0.19a$	$0.86{\pm}0.07b$	$0.98{\pm}0.07b$	$1.20{\pm}0.07\mathrm{ab}$	$1.08 \pm 0.04 ab$	2.76 ± 0.11	$2.40{\pm}0.16$	$2.40 {\pm} 0.09$	2.46 ± 0.16	2.22 ± 0.12	3.84±0.34a	$3.10\pm0.26ab$	$3.00{\pm}0.10ab$	$3.00{\pm}0.21ab$	$2.80{\pm}0.10\mathrm{b}$	$7.44{\pm}1.52a$	$3.26{\pm}0.39{ m b}$	8.44±0.88a	$3.26 \pm 0.39 \mathrm{b}$	$6.10{\pm}1.15ab$	$5.04 \pm 0.51a$	$2.74{\pm}0.19{ m b}$	$1.72 {\pm} 0.18 { m b}$	$1.84 \pm 0.10 \text{b}$	$2.44{\pm}0.18{ m b}$	$8.00{\pm}0.50a$	$5.14 \pm 0.31 b$	$4.40{\pm}0.44{ m b}$	$4.76{\pm}0.45{ m b}$	$2.34 \pm 0.12 c$	rith a significance
Length of naximum leaf (cm)	$15.32\pm0.75ab$	17.60+0.72h	14.40 ± 0.80 ab	$13.32 \pm 0.48a$	$21.88\pm0.74a$	$15.46{\pm}0.68{ m b}$	$8.52{\pm}0.33c$	$17.67{\pm}1.01b$	$17.26{\pm}0.50{ m b}$	$16.44 \pm 0.81a$	$9.36{\pm}0.20{ m b}$	$10.94 \pm 0.46 m bc$	$13.16 {\pm} 0.10 { m c}$	$12.04{\pm}0.24c$	$18.20{\pm}0.79a$	$15.32{\pm}0.73{ m b}$	$14.50{\pm}0.53{ m b}$	$16.72 \pm 0.77 ab$	$14.52 {\pm} 0.56 { m b}$	16.30 ± 0.75	17.30 ± 0.94	16.40 ± 0.37	$16.40 {\pm} 0.72$	16.00 ± 0.20	$11.38\pm0.16a$	$15.16{\pm}0.60{ m b}$	$15.76 \pm 0.61 \mathrm{b}$	$15.16 \pm 0.60 \mathrm{b}$	$12.42\pm0.66a$	$25.06{\pm}0.47a$	$22.12 \pm 0.43 b$	$21.40{\pm}0.60{ m b}$	$21.72 \pm 0.63 b$	$22.26\pm0.24b$	$16.92{\pm}0.94a$	$14.12 \pm 0.88 ac$	$12.88 \pm 0.38 \mathrm{bc}$	$14.14{\pm}0.85{ m ac}$	$16.30{\pm}0.84a$	kev's multiple test w
Root weight (g)	$1.32\pm0.28a$	3.55+0.55b	$1.21\pm0.44a$	$3.00{\pm}0.11\mathrm{b}$	2.73 ± 0.98	1.91 ± 0.29	$0.47{\pm}0.05$	$2.05{\pm}1.06$	$2.04{\pm}0.32$	2.82 ± 0.67	$1.38 {\pm} 0.14$	1.90 ± 0.24	$6.06 {\pm} 4.52$	$1.75 {\pm} 0.20$	$3.36 {\pm} 0.58$	$2.86 {\pm} 0.63$	4.50 ± 0.78	$3.02 {\pm} 0.77$	$3.93{\pm}1.05$	4.48 ± 0.38	2.30 ± 0.44	4.36 ± 0.69	4.15 ± 0.22	$3.30{\pm}0.45$	$1.16 \pm 0.11a$	$2.04{\pm}0.42\mathrm{a}$	$4.83{\pm}1.27{ m b}$	$2.04{\pm}0.42a$	$0.81{\pm}0.06a$	2.55 ± 0.35	$2.91{\pm}1.13$	$3.79{\pm}1.44$	3.09 ± 0.60	$3.27 {\pm} 0.58$	$3.90{\pm}1.44$	$3.19 {\pm} 0.70$	2.93 ± 0.51	$2.46 {\pm} 0.37$	$3.18{\pm}0.38$	t differences by Tul
Stem weight (g)	$1.44\pm0.23a$	2.69+0.35b	$1.24\pm0.46a$	$2.80{\pm}0.11\mathrm{b}$	$1.75 \pm 0.41a$	$0.40{\pm}0.04b$	$0.10{\pm}0.02b$	$0.57{\pm}0.15b$	$0.40{\pm}0.06b$	$0.31 \pm 0.02a$	$0.13{\pm}0.02b$	$0.16{\pm}0.01\mathrm{b}$	$0.30{\pm}0.01a$	$0.17 \pm 0.02 b$	1.01 ± 0.14	$0.82 {\pm} 0.02$	1.14 ± 0.15	$0.86 {\pm} 0.20$	1.15 ± 0.30	$2.22\pm0.28a$	$1.24{\pm}0.07{ m b}$	$1.75\pm0.15ab$	$1.67\pm0.11ab$	$1.15 \pm 0.16 b$	$1.30{\pm}0.25a$	$0.81{\pm}0.19a$	$3.62{\pm}0.68{ m b}$	$0.91{\pm}0.22a$	$0.53{\pm}0.09a$	$1.68{\pm}0.18a$	$1.08{\pm}0.14b$	$0.94{\pm}0.13{ m b}$	$0.94{\pm}0.09b$	$1.18 \pm 0.10 ab$	$4.43{\pm}0.88a$	$1.74{\pm}0.20{ m b}$	$1.56{\pm}0.10\mathrm{b}$	$2.53{\pm}0.39{ m b}$	$0.72{\pm}0.04{ m b}$	denote significan
Leaf weight (g)	7.11±1.40a	16.91+1.87h	5.05±0.77a	$8.87{\pm}0.72a$	$14.56 \pm 3.45 a$	$8.81\pm0.63ab$	$2.44{\pm}0.30{ m b}$	$9.14{\pm}1.53ab$	$9.12{\pm}1.46\mathrm{ab}$	$15.27\pm 1.35a$	$4.49{\pm}0.41\mathrm{b}$	$7.63\pm0.58\mathrm{bc}$	$10.15\pm0.88c$	$8.74{\pm}1.07c$	22.55 ± 2.37	13.52 ± 0.83	$23.04{\pm}1.83$	19.13 ± 3.29	20.80 ± 3.54	$30.90 \pm 3.21a$	$17.30\pm 1.24b$	$27.50{\pm}2.40a$	$22.72 \pm 1.75 ab$	$17.82{\pm}1.40{ m b}$	$5.39\pm0.48a$	$6.51{\pm}0.94a$	$11.79 \pm 1.88 bc$	$7.22 \pm 1.12 ac$	$3.97\pm0.40a$	20.19 ± 0.52	18.42 ± 2.92	$22.97{\pm}1.34$	19.76 ± 1.43	21.86 ± 1.78	$25.31{\pm}2.57a$	$12.96\pm0.94b$	$12.57 \pm 1.11b$	$18.41 \pm 2.05 ab$	$16.16{\pm}1.51b$	Different letters of
Fresh weight (g)	$8.55\pm1.61a^{z}$	$19.61 \pm 2.21b$	$6.29{\pm}1.13a$	$11.67\pm0.83\mathrm{ac}$	$16.31 \pm 3.81a$	$9.20{\pm}0.67 { m ab}$	$2.54{\pm}0.67\mathrm{b}$	$9.66 \pm 1.67 \mathrm{ab}$	$9.51{\pm}1.52\mathrm{ab}$	$15.58 \pm 1.37a$	$4.62{\pm}0.43{ m b}$	$7.79\pm0.59\mathrm{bc}$	$10.45\pm0.89c$	$8.91{\pm}1.09c$	$23.56{\pm}2.48a$	$14.34{\pm}0.85{ m b}$	$24.14{\pm}1.87a$	$22.91{\pm}2.10a$	$21.95 \pm 3.81 a$	$33.15\pm 3.46a$	$18.58 \pm 1.25 b$	$29.24{\pm}2.54a$	$27.20{\pm}2.97a$	$19.00{\pm}1.55{ m b}$	$6.68{\pm}0.30a$	$7.32{\pm}1.12a$	$15.41 \pm 2.55 b$	$8.13 \pm 1.33a$	4.50±0.44a	21.87 ± 0.61	19.50 ± 3.05	$23.91{\pm}1.46$	20.70 ± 1.52	$23.04{\pm}1.84$	$29.74 \pm 3.40 a$	$14.71 \pm 1.13b$	$14.13 \pm 1.19b$	$20.95 \pm 2.40 \mathrm{ab}$	$16.87 \pm 1.55 b$	standard error.
Light source	1 Red	2 Diue 3 Red and blue	4 White	5 White added red	6 Red	7 Blue	8 Red and blue	9 White	10 White added red	11 Red	12 Blue	13 Red and blue	14 White	15 White added red	16 Red	17 Blue	18 Red and blue	19 White	20 White added red	21 Red	22 Blue	23 Red and blue	24 White	25 White added red	26 Red	27 Blue	28 Red and blue	29 White	30 White added red	31 Red	32 Blue	33 Red and blue	34 White	35 White added red	36 Red	37 Blue	38 Red and blue	39 White	40 White added red	represents the mean
Cultivars		Red wave					Red fire					Sanmarino				Demoku	Danciu	sun orignt				Sun bright				T and latting	Treat lettuce	RI CCII			Paner	oreen	81001			EL:11		lerruce		^z Each value

TABLE 1. Growth differences by LED wave length for leaf lettuce cultivars

depend significantly on LED treatments for FW, LW, RW, and NL. For six cultivars, the main stem length was affected strongly by red LED treatment: half of them (FW, LW, and DW) were significantly increased under red LED. Nevertheless, two of them were significantly decreased. The mixed red and blue LED treatment had increased FW, LW, and DW for in 'Red wave', 'Banchu sun bright', 'Sun bright' and 'Leaf lettuce green'. These results suggest that growth under red or mixed red and blue LED light might be useful, depending on the cultivar.

Furthermore, principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted to ascertain general trends related to the effects on plant growth of LEDs. Plants showed distinct growth response to different light treatments. As first components found through principal component analysis, FW, LW, SW, RW, ML, MS, LN, and DW were found to have positive factor loadings: only SPAD was negative. As second components, SW, ML, and MS were positive; the others were negative. The respective contributions of first and second components were 55.60% and 16.18% (Table 2).

Charactoristic	Coi	nponent	No.
Characteristic	1	2	3
Fresh weight (g)	0.425	-0.100	0.127
Leaf weight (g)	0.424	-0.148	0.133
Stem weight (g)	0.366	0.103	0.096
Root weight (g)	0.342	-0.355	-0.085
Maximum leaf length (cm)	0.224	0.321	0.717
Length of main stem (cm)	0.268	0.549	-0.048
No. of leaves	0.333	-0.217	-0.357
SPAD value	-0.104	-0.613	0.495
Dry weight (g)	0.380	-0.057	-0.247
Eigen value	4.106	1.195	0.749
Contribution	55.60%	16.18%	10.14%
Cumulative contribution	55.60%	71.78%	88.12%

TABLE 2. Eigen value, contribution and factor loading of 1st, 2nd and 3rd principal components in leaf lettuce cultivars

Figure 1 presents results of the PCA and the score plots obtained for each treatment along the first and second components, Z1 and Z2. Each LED treatment was well separated along Z1, except for two plants under red or white with added red, one plant under blue, and three plants under mixed red and blue, and under white LED that fall near scores corresponding to LED treatment. Additionally, in general, plants grown under red or mixed red and blue LED light are apparently separated along Z2 and to increase tendency compared plants under other LEDs. In addition, plants grown under mixed red and blue and white with added red LED are apparently separated along Z1 and to decrease tendency compared plants grown under other ones.

As a conclusion obtained from PCA, considering separation along Z1 observed in Figure 1, it can be inferred that the main affected characteristics attributable to LED treatment were FW, LW, SW, RW, ML, MS, LN, and DW. However, SW and MS were not good characteristics for growth in leaf lettuce because they would be decreased in terms of quality, taste, and appearance. However, LED treatment by mixed red and blue, and white with added red LED seem to be the best, respectively, to grow 'Red wave', 'Banchu sun bright', 'Sun bright' and 'Fancy green', and to grow 'Banchu sun bright', and 'Fancy green'.

When people grow plants in a growth chamber (plant factory), they can control environmental factors such as temperature, humidity, light intensity, kinds of light, and





■: Red LED, ◆: Blue LED, △: Mixed red and blue LED, ×: White LED,
 O: White added with red LED.
 * Number indicates in Table 1.



 CO_2 concentration. However, it would be impossible to keep from changing the personnel growing plants in the laboratory of university. Even for the present study, different research team members conducted these experiments in 2016 and in 2018. When scientists and researchers conduct experiments for cultivation in field and greenhouse, they might obtain different data depending on the season and year especially [11]. By contrast, a growing factory facilitates control of the environment to support plant growth in a growth chamber as desired. They then might be able to obtain similar data from any experiment. Therefore, we confirmed growth differences in plants grown under identical environments in 2016 and in 2018.

Results of biomass measurements of two cultivars in leaf lettuce influenced by light spectra treatments between in 2018 and in 2016 are presented in Table 3. For both cultivars, plants grown in 2016 had significantly lower FW, LW, and DW: one-sixth to one-eighth of those compared in 2018.

Furthermore, to ascertain general trends of plant growth and the year during which plants were grown, principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted. Plants showed distinct growth response to different light quality treatments. As first components found through principal component analysis, FW, LW, SW, ML, MS, LN, and DW were found to have positive factor loadings: only RW and SPAD were negative. As second components, ML and LN were positive. The others were negative. The respective contributions of first and second components were 55.74% and 18.26% (Table 4), especially lettuce under red LED.

Figure 2 presents results of the PCA and the score plots obtained respectively for each treatment along the first and second components, Z1 and Z2. Red LED treatments were separated completely along Z1 between 2016 and 2018. This result indicates that plants grown in 2016 had significantly lower FW, LW, and DW compared to plants grown in 2018.

Cultivars	Light source	Fresh weight (g)	Leaf weight (g) 5	Stem weight (g)]	Root weight (g)	Length of maximum leaf (cm)	Length of main stem (cm)	Number of leaves	SPAD value	Dry weight (cm)
	1 Red	$8.55\pm 1.61a^{x}$	$7.11{\pm}1.40a$	$1.44{\pm}0.23a$	$1.32 \pm 0.28a$	$15.32 \pm 0.75 a$	$10.34\pm0.81a$	$11.20\pm0.58a$	$17.06\pm0.94a$	$2.62{\pm}0.10a$
	2018^z 2 Blue	$15.10{\pm}0.67{ m b}$	$12.99 \pm 0.53 \mathrm{ab}$	$2.11\pm0.14ab$	$3.21{\pm}0.38\mathrm{b}$	$16.86{\pm}0.64{\rm a}$	$5.58{\pm}0.22\mathrm{b}$	$8.80{\pm}0.20\mathrm{b}$	$15.96\pm0.94a$	$3.05{\pm}0.06a$
Dod more	3 Red and blue	$19.61{\pm}2.21{ m b}$	$16.91{\pm}1.87{ m b}$	$2.69{\pm}0.35{ m b}$	$3.55{\pm}0.55{ m b}$	$17.60{\pm}0.72a$	$5.54{\pm}0.41\mathrm{b}$	$10.80{\pm}0.58\mathrm{ab}$	$18.52{\pm}0.51{ m a}$	$3.45{\pm}0.19a$
TRA MANE	4 Red	$2.99 \pm 0.43 c$	$2.25\pm0.43c$	$0.39 \pm 0.03 ac$	$0.35\pm0.02a$	$11.58\pm0.27b$	$5.46 \pm 0.41 b$	$5.38 \pm 0.26c$	$19.86\pm0.86a$	$0.29 \pm 0.03b$
	2016^{y} 5 Blue	$2.93{\pm}1.37c$	$0.60{\pm}0.14d$	$0.19 \pm 0.01 c$	$2.33 \pm 1.43 \mathrm{ab}$	$7.55 \pm 0.33 c$	$7.45\pm0.71\mathrm{b}$	$4.38{\pm}0.26c$	$27.56 \pm 1.97 b$	$0.13 {\pm} 0.01 c$
	6 Red and blue	$3.11\pm0.73c$	$2.48{\pm}0.63c$	$0.16{\pm}0.04c$	$0.47\pm0.10\mathrm{b}$	$10.29{\pm}0.60{ m b}$	$1.70{\pm}0.47c$	$5.75 {\pm} 0.31 c$	$17.73{\pm}0.81a$	$0.44\pm0.23\mathrm{b}$
	7 Red	$6.68{\pm}0.30a$	$5.39\pm0.48a$	$1.30{\pm}0.25a$	$1.16\pm0.11a$	$11.38\pm0.16a$	7.44±1.52a	7.80±0.37a	$19.14{\pm}2.27a$	$0.85\pm0.07ab$
	2018 8 Blue	$7.32{\pm}1.12a$	$6.51{\pm}0.94a$	$0.81{\pm}0.19a$	$2.04{\pm}0.42a$	$15.16{\pm}0.60{ m b}$	$3.26{\pm}0.39\mathrm{b}$	$7.80{\pm}0.58a$	$20.72 \pm 1.88a$	$0.61{\pm}0.10b$
Leaf lettuc	e 9 Red and blue	$15.41{\pm}2.55b$	$11.79{\pm}1.88b$	$3.62{\pm}0.68{ m b}$	$4.83{\pm}1.27{ m b}$	$15.76{\pm}0.61{ m b}$	$8.44{\pm}0.88a$	$10.00{\pm}1.10a$	$17.42{\pm}0.53\mathrm{ab}$	$1.58{\pm}0.37a$
green	10 Red	$2.90{\pm}0.48c$	$1.91\pm0.31c$	$0.63 \pm 0.11a$	$0.35 \pm 0.06c$	$11.20{\pm}0.48a$	$14.39 \pm 1.31c$	8.38±0.78a	11.86±1.11c	$0.26{\pm}0.04c$
	2016 11 Blue	$1.75\pm0.4c$	$1.29{\pm}0.3c$	$0.07{\pm}0.04c$	$0.39 {\pm} 0.10 c$	$7.31{\pm}0.54c$	$1.38\pm0.69d$	$6.13{\pm}0.48\mathrm{b}$	$19.88 \pm 0.65 a$	$0.19{\pm}0.04c$
	12 Red and blue	$2.15{\pm}0.54\mathrm{c}$	$1.56\pm0.16c$	$0.17\pm0.06c$	$0.41{\pm}0.12c$	$7.65 \pm 0.73 c$	$3.06\pm0.82\mathrm{bc}$	$5.88{\pm}0.48\mathrm{b}$	$15.71{\pm}1.41\mathrm{b}$	$0.26\pm0.02c$
^z Data is fr	om this paper in Table 1.									
^y Data are	from Ishii et al. [8] in Tak	les $2 \text{ and } 3$.								

and		
016		
in 2		
green		
1ce g		
lettı		
leaf		
and		
wave		
red		
for		
tion		
tiva		
cul		
ar of		
l yea		
anc		
ngth		
e lei		
wav		
ED		
by L		
on k		
oaris		
luoc		
nd c		
es a		
renc		
diffe		
vth (
Grov		
э. Э.		
BLE	x	
TAJ	201	

* Dava are noun usuated at 10 m 1 abuve 2 and 9. *Each value represents the mean±standard error. Different letters denote significant differences by Tukey's multiple test with a significance level of 0.05.

Characteristic	Cor	nponent No.					
Characteristic	1	2	3				
Fresh weight (g)	0.422	-0.129	-0.064				
Leaf weight (g)	0.441	-0.111	-0.044				
Stem weight (g)	0.362	-0.007	0.407				
Root weight (g)	-0.002	-0.587	0.594				
Maximum leaf length (cm)	0.384	-0.137	-0.144				
Length of main stem (cm)	0.027	0.580	0.661				
No. of leaves	0.322	0.374	-0.095				
SPAD value	-0.290	-0.317	0.097				
Dry weight (g)	0.401	-0.177	-0.011				
Eigen value	3.648	1.195	0.718				
Contribution	55.74%	18.26%	10.97%				
Cumulative contribution	55.74%	74.00%	84.97%				

TABLE 4. Eigen value, contribution and factor loading of 1st, 2nd and 3rd principal components in lettuces cultivated in 2016 and 2018



■: Red LED, \blacklozenge : Blue LED, \triangle : Mixed red and blue LED. * Number indicates in Table 3.

FIGURE 2. Scatter diagram in Z1-Z2 plane nine characteristics in lettuce arranged by the principal component analysis in lettuce cultivated in 2016 and 2018

This result suggests that growing plants during the same period with the same personnel, even in plant factories, might be important to control the environment. For this experiment, we sowed all seeds into urethane cubes and made all nutrient solutions by hand. Light quality signals captured by plants during the seedling stage affected subsequent growth and quality remarkably [12]. However, the environment during the seedling stage influenced subsequent plant growth and quality. When people have a habit of sowing seeds into urethane cubes, depth and direction might be different for growth from seedlings to mature plants depending on the personnel. Of course, one must also consider human error when people mix a nutrient solution. Consequently, when growing plants in a commercial plant factory, it might be necessary to use an automatic system for all of them. Furthermore, when conducting experiments even in a growth cabinet and chamber, one must grow plants during the same period and with the same people conducting experiments. The same experiments should be repeated even after changing the personnel conducting the experiments.

4. **Conclusion.** We used eight leaf lettuce cultivars for this experiment. Their response differed depending on the kind of LED. LED treatment by mixed red and blue, and by white with added red LED seem best, respectively, to grow 'Red wave', Banchu sun bright', 'Sun bright', and 'Fancy green', and to grow 'Banchu sun bright' and 'Fancy green'. The remaining two cultivars, 'Red fire' and 'Frill lettuce', grew better under red LED than under other lights.

Furthermore, we compared the differences of plant growth in 2016 and in 2018 for two cultivars. Results show that plants grown in 2016 had significantly lower FW, LW, and DW: one-sixth to one-eighth of those in 2018. That finding suggests that it might be important to grow plants during the same period with the same personnel, even in plant factories with a controlled environment. However, it is difficult that the same personnel continue to sow and cultivate in plant factories, so it might be the most important to find a stable cultivation system without automation or it might be necessary to induce automation system for all cultivation period. Our results suggested that it might have to repeat the same experiments even under the same controlled environment and condition when the researchers changed.

Acknowledgements. This paper was supported as an environment-related QOL project.

REFERENCES

- Q. Li and C. Kubota, Effects of supplemental light quality on growth and phytochemicals of baby leaf lettuce, *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, vol.67, pp.59-64, 2009.
- [2] K.-L. Lin, M.-Y. Huang, W.-D. Huang, M.-H. Hsu, Z.-W. Yang and C.-M. Yang, The effects of red, blue, and white light-emitting diodes on the growth, development, and edible quality of hydroponically grown lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L. var. *capitata*), *Scientia Horticulturae*, vol.150, pp.86-91, 2013.
- [3] F. Abidi, T. Girault, O. Douillet, G. Guillemain, G. Sintes, M. Laffaire and N. Leduc, Blue light effects on rose photosynthesis and photomorphogenesis, *Plant Biol.*, vol.15, pp.67-74, 2013.
- [4] T. Kozai, G. Niu and M. Takagaki, Plant Factory: An Indoor Vertical Farming System for Efficient Quality Food Production, Academic Press, 2016.
- [5] C. A. Mitchell, M. P. Dzakovich, C. Gomez, R. Lopez, J. F. Burr, R. Hernández, C. Kubota, C. J. Currey, Q. W. Meng, E. S. Runkle, C. M. Bourget, R. C. Morrow and A. J. Both, Light-emitting diodes in horticulture, in *Horticultural Reviews*, J. Janick (ed.), John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2016.
- [6] T. Minamida, S. Sasahara, Y. Tashiro, K. Yoshida, Y. Tabada and M. Akutsu, Effect of light qualities from different LED light sources on the growth of four leaf lettuce cultivars, *ICIC Express Letters*, *Part B: Applications*, vol.10, no.6, pp.509-513, 2019.
- [7] Z. Yang, W. He, S. Mou, X. Wang, D. Chen, X. Hu, L. Chen and J. Bai, Plant growth and development of pepper seedlings under different photoperiods and photon flux ratios of red and blue LEDs, *Trans. Chin. Soc. Agric. Eng.*, vol.33, no.17, pp.173-180, 1995.
- [8] T. Ishii, R. Iisako, K. Kawano and M. Akutsu, Growth responses in leaf lettuce cultivar grown under different qualities of light from LED sources, *Horticultural Research (Japan)*, vol.17, no.4, pp.439-447, 2018.
- [9] Z. Yan, D. He, G. Niu and H. Zhai, Evaluation of growth and quality of hydroponic lettuce at harvest as affected by the light intensity, photoperiod and light quality at seedling stage, *Scientia Horticulturae*, vol.248, pp.138-144, 2019.
- [10] M. A. Mickens, E. J. Skoog, L. E. Reese, P. L. Barnwell, L. E. Spencer, G. D. Massa and R. M. Wheeler, A strategic approach for investigating light recipes for 'Outredgeous' red romaine lettuce using white and monochromatic LEDs, *Life Sci. Space Res.*, vol.19, pp.53-62, 2018.

- [11] M. Akutsu, J. Izena and T. Takakura, Effects of EOD-FR on the growth and morphology of Brassicaceae family plants in each cropping season, *Horticultural Research (Japan)*, vol.15, no.4, pp.409-415, 2016.
- [12] C. L. Chang, K. P. Chang, E. Ono and H. Watanabe, The growth response of leaf lettuce at different stages to multiple wavelength-band light-emitting diode lighting, *Scientia Horticulturae*, vol.179, pp.78-84, 2014.