PERILLA FRUTESCENS: INTERESTING NEW MEDICINAL AND MELLIFEROUS PLANT IN ITALY
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The goal of this study is to inform those potentially interested (researchers, farmers, industry and public bodies) in the medicinal and aromatic properties, and profitability of Perilla frutescens (L.) Britton (Lamiaceae). Perilla, a medicinal and edible plant of Asian origin, was recently introduced to the Piedmont Region in the north-west of Italy. P. frutescens is commonly known for its anti-allergic, anti-tumor, and anti-oxidant properties. It is also widely used as human food. We collected a variety of data on Perilla crops in the Piedmont Region, including: agricultural practices, crop profitability, and its value as a bee plant. Our results suggest that ease of cultivation, approximate break-even economics, medicinal claims, and value for bees all contribute to make Perilla of economic interest in Italy.
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Currently, increased attention is being given to medicinal and aromatic plants (MAPs) that can serve as sources for the agricultural and industrial sectors [1-3]. Italy is among the largest markets for MAPs, ranking eighth after China, France, Germany, Japan, Spain, the UK, and the USA [4]. In addition, about 70% of the national MAPs market depends on imported herbs and/or their derivatives [1-3]. The cultivated area for Italian MAPs is both large and diverse; it covers more than 4,500 hectares and approximately 100 species are represented. The principal crops are mint, chamomile, sage, Florentine iris, and hypericum [3], most of which are typical and of very high quality [1-3].

One-third of the area under MAPs cultivation (approximately 700 hectares when bergamot and manna ash trees are excluded) is located in the Piedmont Region (52%), followed by Tuscany (15%), Calabria (12%), and other regions (31%) [3]. Across Italy, there are more than 4,000 farms with MAPs of relatively small size (0.55 hectares) situated in hilly and mountainous areas [3-5]. Generally, farmers have poorly organized business activities [1-2].

Perilla frutescens (L.) Britton, family Lamiaceae, is an annual, herbaceous species with toothed leaves and small white flowers. It is widely grown in China, Japan, and Korea, where it is known as either Shiso or Egoma. There are two cultivars of P. frutescens, red (P. frutescens cv. acuta Kudo) and green (P. frutescens cv. acuta forma viridis) [6]. Perilla has been used for hundreds of years in the Orient for its multiple medicinal properties [7]. While it is primarily valued for its high anti-oxidant [9] and anti-allergic qualities [6], several of its parts can be used for human food, as well as in industry and folk medicine (leaves, seeds and oil) [8]. Many compounds isolated from Perilla have been associated with medicinal qualities: luteolin [10] has been reported as anti-inflammatory and anti-allergic; luteolin [11] and triterpene acids [12] have been deemed to have anti-tumor qualities; rosmarinic acid [13] is considered to be a superoxide scavenger; and apigenin and 2,4,5-trimethoxycinnamic acid have been reported to be antidepressants [14].

Since Perilla is a relatively new species to Italy, this study aims to inform researchers, farmers, beekeepers, industry, and public bodies interested in medicinal and aromatic plants of its agricultural practices, profitability, and insect significance. Strangely, despite its distribution and wide use, no pollinator data exist for Perilla, nor has its potential forage by Apis mellifera (L.) been studied.

Investigations of the insects visiting Perilla were conducted in three different crops in the Province of Turin during September-October 2010. Area farmers, including two beekeepers, provided crop management information. Perilla is sown in seedbeds during late winter, then transplanted to the field in rows. Required agronomic
practices include plowing, manuring, ridging, and manual weeding. Perilla reaches a height of 60-100 cm and flowers between September and October. Irrigation is not strictly required. The seeds are collected in November and the leaves are harvested in the summer.

Table 1 shows the economic results of the examined crop:

i) direct cost, and indirect plus implicit costs were 39.6%, and 60.4%, respectively, of the total production cost;

ii) total production cost was mainly affected by indirect plus implicit costs, especially by the high cost of family labor (31.3%) and by the agricultural practice costs (39.6%) (Table 1);

iii) the difference between total output and total direct cost is highly positive (Table 1), while the economic profit is slightly negative. We can consider these economic results to be representative of the management performance of many small family farms with MAPs in Italy.

During flowering, the frequency of pollinators foraging on Perilla was high. Honeybees comprised 93% of all insect visitors to this crop, with an average number of 14 individuals per square meter. The nectar was the only harvested product. In addition to the honey bee, Bomus pascuorum (Scopoli) was the main pollinator. Similar results were obtained from observations made by farmers in the two other areas studied in Turin Province.

The utility of this plant to honey bees is in the late period of flowering given the scarcity of other blossoming plants. Beekeepers are very interested in new species, which can be alternative resources during periods of wild flower scarcity or to achieve higher honey production yields.

In fact, Perilla might be a resource that could provide an autumn harvest, indirectly extend the queen bee egg-laying period, and, thereby, mitigate losses from the parasite Varroa destructor (Anderson & Trueman). Another advantage for beekeepers is the Perilla reseeding it provides a new bloom for the following year without additional farmwork. Perilla seems to be an interesting plant for bees, a value which must be added to its acclaimed medicinal properties. Its ease of cultivation, positive economics, important medicinal properties, and value as a bee plant, conspire to make Perilla a medicinal plant of great interest in Italy.

Experimental

Farm business analysis: We collected the economic data from a small family farm. The total utilized agricultural area (UAA) of the farm was 1.5 hectares, of which 0.5 was assigned to Perilla. There was a single labor unit. At the beginning of 2011, economic data were collected through two personal interviews and an ad hoc questionnaire [15-19]. Total output, costs, and economic profit of Perilla were calculated assuming 1,000 sq m during 2010. The hourly wage used to estimate the cost of the family labor was the only data referenced to 2011.

The value of the total output provided by the Perilla farmer used in our case study included all cash revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Total output, production cost and economic profit of Perilla frutescens (open field, 2010).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Output/Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowing, and Manuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transplanting, Ridging, and Manual Weeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting, and Post-Harvesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect and Implicit Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation, Insurance, and Repairs**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs, and Machinery (Interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Capital Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect, and Implicit Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Output - Total Direct Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Profit (Total Output - Total Costs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


from the crop, be it dried leaves or seed. In this work, the total production cost was divided into three categories: direct costs, indirect costs, and implicit costs [15-17]. The farmer provided the direct cost information, which included the real costs of Perilla production according to the agricultural practices.

Indirect costs, which are those associated with the entire farm, include both cash- and non-cash costs, such as overheads, taxes, depreciation, insurance, and machine repairs. These are shared costs and difficult to assign to a specific product. In this case study, we allocated the cash shard costs using a method in which the shared costs of the farm were divided by 15,000 sq m (total UAA), and the calculated value was apportioned assuming 1,000 sq m of Perilla. Depreciation, a non-cash expense, was calculated by the straight-line method [15-17], and referenced to 1,000 sq m.

Farmer-owned inputs (e.g. family labor), implicit costs, are not real costs, so they were calculated according to the principle of opportunity cost or “the income that would have been received if the input had been used in its most profitable alternative use” [17]. We determined the labor cost by multiplying the total hours of work needed to produce 1,000 sq m of Perilla by 7.20 euros per hectare, which is the basic hourly wage of a ‘qualified horticultural worker’ referenced to the year 2011 [15,17,20]. The capital cost of the land was calculated assuming a value of 69,452 euros per hectare [21] and an annual interest rate of
During the flowering period, investigations were carried out every 3 days on the insects visiting the crop. The investigations, based on methods developed by several researchers [22-23], were conducted from 8 am to 6 pm, counting the number of individuals of different species that frequented the flowers of Perilla for 5 minutes in 1 sq m, in different parts of the plot. The nectar and/or pollen products collected from Perilla by the honey bees were assessed.
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