

Supplementary Tables

Table S1. Marketable yield (dt/ha) and percentage increase (%) of the ‘Gijnlim’, ‘Ravel’ and ‘Ramires’ asparagus variants in field trials across (A) three harvest years from site A and (B) two harvest years from site B. The soil treatments included chompost, clay minerals, mustard meal (biofumigation) and asparagus root treatment with Micosat.

(A)										
Market yield (dt/ha) site A	2020			2021			2022			2020–2022 Increase (%)
	Gijnlim	Ravel	Ramires	Gijnlim	Ravel	Ramires	Gijnlim	Ravel	Ramires	
Control	29 ± 2.5	27 ± 3.0	25 ± 1.6	67 ± 3.4	66 ± 4.2	70 ± 3.3	96 ± 12.5	89 ± 11.7	99 ± 9.8	
Chompost	32 ± 2.3	35 ± 1.8	27 ± 2.1	78 ± 1.8	79 ± 3.2	67 ± 0.3	115 ± 7.2	111 ± 12.9	105 ± 5.4	14
Clay minerals	34 ± 1.3	31 ± 1.1	26 ± 0.6	76 ± 3.3	77 ± 2.0	67 ± 4.9	102 ± 8.8	102 ± 12.2	92 ± 11.1	7
Biofumigation	37 ± 0.8	35 ± 1.8	30 ± 1.8	82 ± 6.5	89 ± 4.9	69 ± 3.7	105 ± 9.5	111 ± 18.9	103 ± 4.5	16
Micosat	36 ± 1.7	33 ± 2.3	28 ± 1.6	81 ± 2.3	79 ± 4.9	69 ± 5.8	106 ± 8.2	107 ± 14.9	95 ± 7.3	12
(B)										
Marketable yield (dt/ha) site B	2021			2022			2021–2022 Increase (%)			
	Gijnlim	Ravel	Ramires	Gijnlim	Ravel	Ramires				
Control	30 ± 1.8	31 ± 3.6	23 ± 1.1	39 ± 3.7	35 ± 2.2	36 ± 2.3				
Chompost	34 ± 1.2	34 ± 5.2	27 ± 1.8	41 ± 1.7	34 ± 3.1	40 ± 1.9	8			
Clay minerals	33 ± 2.0	26 ± 2.1	28 ± 2.2	44 ± 2.6	34 ± 2.0	40 ± 1.6	2			
Biofumigation	29 ± 1.1	26 ± 1.4	28 ± 1.3	40 ± 1.6	30 ± 3.9	38 ± 1.7	-2			
Micosat	30 ± 1.4	25 ± 0.9	27 ± 2.2	39 ± 2.2	35 ± 2.0	37 ± 2.3	-1			

± Standard error

Table S2. Marketable yield (dt/ha) of the ‘Gijnlim’, ‘Ravel’ and ‘Ramires’ variants grown in the field trials across all treatments. Different letters indicate significant differences among the cultivars in each year.

Market yield (dt/ha)	Site A			Site B	
	2020	2021	2022	2021	2022
Gijnlim	33 ± 1.0	77 ± 1.9	105 ± 4.0	31 ± 0.8	41 ± 1.1
Ravel	32 ± 0.8	78 ± 2.3	104 ± 6.0	29 ± 6.6	34 ± 1.2
Ramires	27 ± 1.1	68 ± 1.6	99 ± 3.4	27 ± 3.6	38 ± 0.9

± Standard error