**Table 1.** The total protein, gallotannin, total phenolic and proanthocyanidin contents of the leaf samples

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tests | Plants | N | Mean | SE | \*Significantgroups | ANOVA |
| F | *P* |
| Total Protein (%) | *Hippophae rhamnoides* | 10 | 15,1 | 0,06 | a | 1577,5 | < 0,001 |
|  | *Quercus cerris* | 10 | 10,0 | 0,09 | b |
|  | *Corylus maxima* | 10 | 10,9 | 0,08 | c |
|  | *Crataegus monogyna* | 10 | 8,3 | 0,07 | d |
| Gallotannin (%) | *Hippophae rhamnoides* | 10 | 5,2 | 0,04 | a | 1508 | < 0,001 |
|  | *Quercus cerris* | 10 | 2,6 | 0,04 | b |
|  | *Corylus maxima* | 10 | 4,3 | 0,04 | c |
|  | *Crataegus monogyna* | 10 | 1,8 | 0,03 | d |
| Proantociyanidin (%) | *Hippophae rhamnoides* | 10 | 3,9  | 0,03 | a | 11542,5 | < 0,001 |
|  | *Quercus cerris* | 10 | 7,6 | 0,04 | b |
|  | *Corylus maxima* | 10 | 11,5 | 0,02 | c |
|  | *Crataegus monogyna* | 10 | 7,2 | 0,03 | d |
| Total phenolic (%) | *Hippophae rhamnoides* | 10 | 10,1 | 0,03 | a | 3208,7 | < 0,001 |
|  | *Quercus cerris* | 10 | 7,9 | 0,03 | b |
|  | *Corylus maxima* | 10 | 9,9 | 0,04 | c |
|  | *Crataegus monogyna* | 10 | 6,2 | 0,03 | d |

\*Different letters stand for significantly different group means (*p* < 0.05). (The groups named as a, b, c and d have statistically significant means according to Duncan’s Multiple Range Test).

**Table 2.** The comparison of the consumption amount of virus-infected larvae with those in control group in regard to plants

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plants  | N | Groups | Mean ± SE | t | *P* |
| *Hippophae rhamnoides* | 27 | Infected | 395.3 ± 1.6 | - 30.0 | < 0,001 |
| 45 | Control | 440,8 ± 0,7 |
| *Quercus cerris* | 12 | Infected | 302.7 ± 5.2 | - 45.7 | < 0,001 |
| 39 | Control | 414.3 ± 0.8 |
| *Corylus maxima* | 12 | Infected | 265.8 ± 2.3 | - 64.1 | < 0,001 |
| 42 | Control | 391,3 ± 5,2 |
| *Crataegus monogyna* | 9 | Infected | 297.0 ± 2.1 | - 54.4 | < 0,001 |
| 36 | Control | 412.5 ± 1.0 |

**Table 3.** The survival rates of virus-infected larvae

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plants | N | Died larvae | Alived  | Percent of alive (%) |
| Larvae | Pupated |
| *Hippophae rhamnoides*  | 45 | 3 | 30 | 12 | 93.3 |
| *Quercus cerris*  | 45 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 53.3 |
| *Corylus maxima*  | 45 | 12 | 21 | 12 | 73.3 |
| *Crataegus monogyna*  | 45 | 27 | 9 | 9 | 40.0 |
| Toplam | 180 | 63 | 117 | 65.0 |

**Table 4**. The comparison of the survival rates of the larvae feeding on the plants infected by virus in regard to plants with Log Rank test

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plants | *Hippophae rhamnoides* | *Quercus**cerris* | *Corylus maxima* | *Crataegus monogyna* |
| Chi-Square | *P* | Chi-Square | *P* | Chi-Square | *P* | Chi-Square | *P* |
| *Hippophae rhamnoides* |  |  | 6,285 | ,012 | 2,102 | ,147 | 9,009 | ,003 |
| *Quercus cerris* | 6,285 | ,012 |  |  | 1,359 | ,244 | ,263 | ,608 |
| *Corylus maxima* | 2,102 | ,147 | 1,359 | ,244 |  |  | 2,921 | ,087 |
| *Crataegus monogyna* | 9,009 | ,003 | ,263 | ,608 | 2,921 | ,087 |  |  |

**Table 5.** The comparison of the effect of virus infection, protein and secondary substances on survival by Cox-Regression analysis

|  | B | SE | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp (B) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Infection with virus | 2,503 | ,865 | 8,372 | 1 | ,004 | 12,225 |
| Protein | -,939 | ,319 | 8,664 | 1 | ,003 | ,391 |
| Phenolic | -,177 | ,026 | 46,030 | 1 | ,000 | ,838 |
| Gallotannin | -,302 | ,057 | 27,987 | 1 | ,000 | ,740 |
| Proanthocyanidin | -,466 | ,155 | 9,064 | 1 | ,003 | ,628 |