

Energy balance in production of chickpea in Turkey: A study performed in Adıyaman Province

M.F. Baran^{1,*} and O. Gökdoğan²

¹Department of Energy Systems Engineering, Faculty of Technology, University of Adıyaman, TR02040 Adıyaman, Turkey

²Department of Biosystem Engineering, Faculty of Engineering-Architecture, University of Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, TR50300 Nevşehir, Turkey

*Correspondence: mbaran@adiyaman.edu.tr

Abstract. In this study, it has been aimed to form the energy balance in the production of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) in Adıyaman province of Turkey. The material of the research consists of the chickpea enterprises in the center of Adıyaman province in the scope of the production season of 2015–2016. In this study, the number of enterprises for which is required to be made the study has been computed as 67 according to the simple random sampling method. Survey and observation studies have carried out in these designated enterprises. The energy equivalence of the chickpea samples taken from the enterprises has been determined by the calorimeter device. According to results of the study; the total energy input has been computed as 12,225.69 MJ ha⁻¹ and the total energy output has been computed as 31,527.52 MJ ha⁻¹. The energy inputs in the production of chickpea have been 3,575.69 MJ ha⁻¹ (29.25%), 3,523.08 MJ ha⁻¹ (28.82%), 3,280.32 MJ ha⁻¹ (26.83%), 1,230.39 MJ ha⁻¹ (10.07%), 358.20 MJ ha⁻¹ (2.93%), 131.52 MJ ha⁻¹ (1.08%) and 126.50 MJ ha⁻¹ (1.03%) as fuel energy, chemical fertilizers energy, seed energy, machinery energy, farmyard manure energy, human labour energy and chemicals energy inputs, respectively. In this study, indicators showing the energy ratio, specific energy, energy productivity and net energy were determined as 2.58, 7.07 MJ kg⁻¹, 0.14 kg MJ⁻¹ and 19,301.83 MJ ha⁻¹, respectively. According to the results of the study, it is clear that chickpea production is an economical production for the 2015–2016 production seasons.

Key words: Adıyaman, chickpea, energy balance, specific energy, Turkey.

INTRODUCTION

Among the edible grain legumes in Turkey, chickpea makes up 52.5% of the total cultivation areas and 44% of the total edible grain legume production. At the same time, chickpea is ranked first among edible legumes, in terms of both cultivation area and production level in Turkey. With a total chickpea production of 535,000 tons, Turkey is ranked third in the world, following India and Australia (Anonymous, 2014; Küçükbalbay & Akbolat, 2015). Chickpea appears as an important vegetable product to meet the protein need in nutrition, against the increasing population in Turkey and in the world. Because the dry grains of chickpea contain 18–31% protein, depending on the cultivar characteristics, environmental conditions of the cultivation area and the applied cultivation techniques. In addition, chickpea also has high biologic value. Digestible protein ratio is around 76–78% (Akçin, 1988; Erdin & Kulaz, 2014). Plant residues with

low C/N coefficient rupture rapidly and increase soil fertility. By taking into crop alternation, it will lead to a great increase in the amount of product to be removed from the field (Azkan, 1999; Erdin & Kulaz, 2014).

Computing energy inputs of agricultural production is more difficult than the industry production due to the high number of factors affecting the production (Yaldız et al., 1993; Mohammadi & Omid, 2010). The main objective in agricultural production is to increase yield and decrease costs. Energy budget is important. Energy budget is the comparison of the relationship between energy input-output of a system in terms of energy units (Gezer et al., 2003; Mohammadi & Omid, 2010). In general, increases in the agricultural production on a sustainable basis and at a competitive cost are important to improve the enterprises' economic condition (De et al., 2001; Mohammadi & Omid, 2010).

Many researches have been done on energy balance analysis in several type of agricultural products, animal products etc. such as on energy balance activities of chick pea (Yaldız et al., 1993; Marakoglu et al., 2010), miscanthus x giganteus (Acaroğlu & Aksoy, 2005), vetch (Kökten et al., 2016), soybean (Mandal et al., 2002), wheat (Gökdoğan & Sevim, 2016), corn (Öztürk et al., 2006), corn silage (Barut et al., 2011; Pisghar-Komleh et al., 2011), cotton (Polat et al., 2006), sugar beet (Hacıseferoğulları et al., 2003), black carrot (Çelik et al., 2010), barley (Baran & Gökdoğan, 2014), maize (Konak et al., 2004), sweet cherry (Demircan et al., 2006), walnut (Baran et al., 2017a), dryland wheat (Ghorbani et al., 2011), rainfed wheat (Houshyar & Kiani, 2012), canola (Mousavi-Avval et al., 2011), orange (Nabavi-Pelesaraei et al., 2014), rice (Pishgar-Komleh et al., 2011), apple (Rafiee et al., 2010), orobanche (Semerci, 2013), pear (Tabatabaie et al., 2013), organic grape (Baran et al., 2017b), lamb (Köknaçoğlu et al., 2007), beef cattle (Demircan & Köknaçoğlu, 2007), broiler (Atılğan & Köknaçoğlu, 2006), organic broiler (Inci et al., 2016) etc. In this study, the purpose is to determine the energy balance of chickpea production in Adıyaman province.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study has been done in Adıyaman province of Turkey. The province of Adıyaman is located at the Southeast Anatolia Region of Turkey (Anonymous, 2015). Surveys and observations have been done face to face with 67 chickpea enterprises, in production season during in 2015–2016 in Adıyaman province. Total energy input in unit area (ha) constitutes of each total of input's energy. Fuel energy, chemical fertilizers energy, seed energy, machinery energy, farmyard manure energy, human labour energy and chemicals have been computed as energy inputs. Chickpea grain was computed as output. The surveys done to the enterprises have been computed by using the Simple Random Sampling method proposed by Çiçek & Erkan (1996). The formula was provided as below. In the formula; n , is the required sample size; N , the number of total enterprises in the area; s , standard deviation; t , the reliability coefficient (1.96 which represents, 95% confidence); d , acceptable error (5% deviation). The acceptable error value has been defined to be 5%, and the sample size has been calculated as 67 (50 da \leq enterprises), to achieve 95% reliability.

$$n = \frac{N \times s^2 \times t^2}{(N - 1)d^2 + (s^2 \times t^2)} \quad (1)$$

$$n = \frac{73 \times (105.49)^2 \times (1.65)^2}{(72) \times (6.08)^2 + ((105.49)^2 \times (1.65)^2)} = 67 \text{ chickpea enterprises have been determined.}$$

Energy balance computations have been made to determine the chickpea production productivity. The unit shown in Table 1 has been used to compute the values of the inputs in chickpea production. Input amounts have been computed and then these inputs data have been multiplied by the energy equivalent coefficient. By adding energy equivalents of all inputs in MJ unit, the total energy equivalent has been found. The energy ratio (energy use efficiency), energy productivity, specific energy and net energy have been computed using the following formulates (Mandal et al., 2002; Mohammadi et al., 2008; Mohammadi et al., 2010).

$$\text{Energy use efficiency} = \frac{\text{Energy output } \left(\frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{ha}}\right)}{\text{Energy input } \left(\frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{ha}}\right)} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Energy productivity} = \frac{\text{Yield output } \left(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{ha}}\right)}{\text{Energy input } \left(\frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{ha}}\right)} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Specific energy} = \frac{\text{Energy input } \left(\frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{ha}}\right)}{\text{Yield output } \left(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{ha}}\right)} \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Net energy} = \text{Energy output (MJ ha}^{-1}\text{)} - \text{Energy input (MJ ha}^{-1}\text{)} \quad (5)$$

Table 1. Energy equivalents in agriculture production

Inputs and outputs	Unit	Energy equivalent (MJ per unit)	References
Human labour	h	1.96	Mani et al., 2007; Karaağaç et al., 2011
Machinery			
Machinery	h	64.80	Singh, 2002; Kızılaslan, 2009
Combine harvester	h	87.63	Hetz, 1992; Çanakcı et al., 2005; Tipi et al., 2009
Chemical fertilizers			
Nitrogen	kg	60.60	Singh, 2002
Phosphorous	kg	11.10	Singh, 2002
Diesel fuel	l	56.31	Singh, 2002; Demircan et al., 2006
Farmyard manure	kg	0.30	Singh, 2002
Chemicals	kg	101.20	Yaldız et al., 1993
Seed	kg	18.224	Measured
Output	Unit	Energy equivalent (MJ per unit)	References
Chickpea grain	kg	18.224	Measured

The results have been tabulated after the analysis of data has been done using Microsoft Excel program considering the inputs. Examining the values of chickpea

input-output and computations have been given in Table 2. The indirect energy consists of pesticide and fertilizer while the direct energy includes human and animal power, diesel and electricity energy used in the production process. On the other hand, non-renewable energy includes petrol, diesel, electricity, chemicals, fertilizers, machinery and renewable energy consists of human and animal (Mandal et al., 2002; Singh et al., 2003; Koçtürk & Engindeniz, 2009). Energy input-output and energy use efficiency computations in chickpea production have been given in Table 3. Direct, indirect, renewable and non-renewable energy forms have been given Table 4. For calorific values of chickpea IKA brand C200 model bomb calorimeter device has been used. For measuring purposes, the amount of fuel (~ 0.1 g) has been combusted inside the calorimeter bomb. The device has been measured a calorific value in MJ kg⁻¹ unit. For samples, reading of the calorific value has been measured repetitively for 3 times and then the average value have been reported in chickpea study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the enterprises, the amount of chickpea produced per hectare during the 2015–2016 production seasons have been computed as an average of 1,730 kg. In chickpea production, it is noteworthy that and diesel fuel energy, chemical fertilizers energy and seed energy have been used as the highest input. In this study, the energy input-output analysis of chickpea production in 2015–2016 has been given in Table 2. It can be seen that the first, second and third of the highest energy of inputs in chickpea production are 29.25% diesel fuel energy, 28.82% chemical fertilizers energy and 26.83% seed energy have been the inputs computed. In Table 2, The energy inputs in the production of chickpea have been 3,575.69 MJ ha⁻¹ (29.25%), 3,523.08 MJ ha⁻¹ (28.82%), 3,280.32 MJ ha⁻¹ (26.83%), 1,230.39 MJ ha⁻¹ (10.07%), 358.20 MJ ha⁻¹ (2.93%), 131.52 MJ ha⁻¹ (1.08%) and 126.50 MJ ha⁻¹ (1.03%) as diesel fuel energy, chemical fertilizers energy, seed energy, machinery energy, farmyard manure energy, human labour energy and chemicals energy inputs, respectively.

Table 2. Energy balance in chickpea production

Inputs and outputs	Unit	Energy equivalent (MJ per unit)	Input used per hectare (unit ha ⁻¹)	Energy value (MJ ha ⁻¹)	Ratio (%)
Human labour	h	1.96	67.10	131.52	1.08
Machinery				1,230.39	10.07
Machinery	h	64.80	17.50	1,134	9.28
Combine harvester	h	87.63	1.10	96.39	0.79
Chemical fertilizers				3,523.08	28.82
Nitrogen	kg	60.60	39.60	2,399.76	19.63
Phosphorous	kg	11.10	101.20	1,123.32	9.19
Diesel fuel	l	56.31	63.50	3,575.69	29.25
Farmyard manure	kg	0.30	1194	358.20	2.93
Chemicals	kg	101.20	1.25	126.50	1.03
Seed	kg	18.224	180	3,280.32	26.83
Total				12,225.69	100.00
Output	Unit	Energy equivalent (MJ per unit)	Output per hectare (unit ha ⁻¹)	Energy value (MJ ha ⁻¹)	Ratio (%)
Output-Chickpea grain	MJ kg ⁻¹	18.224	1,730	31,527.52	100.00

Energy input, energy output, energy use efficiency, energy productivity, specific energy and net energy in chickpea production have been computed as 12,225.69 MJ ha⁻¹, 31,527.52 MJ ha⁻¹, 2.58; 0.14 kg MJ⁻¹; 7.07 MJ kg⁻¹ and 19,301.83 MJ ha⁻¹, respectively (Table 3). In previous studies, Yıldız et al. (1993), computed energy use efficiency in chickpea study as 3.33, Marakoğlu et al. (2010) computed energy use efficiency in chickpea study as 0.205–2, Baran & Gökdoğan (2016) computed energy use efficiency in sugar beet study as 8.35, Mobtaker et al. (2010) computed energy use efficiency in barley study as 2.86, Bayhan (2016) computed energy use efficiency in sunflower study 9.57–11.82, Yıldız (2016) computed energy use efficiency in wheat study 2.36.

Table 3. Energy balance computations in chickpea production

Computations	Unit	Values
Chickpea grain	kg ha ⁻¹	1,730
Energy input	MJ ha ⁻¹	12,225.69
Energy output	MJ ha ⁻¹	31,527.52
Energy use efficiency		2.58
Energy productivity	kg MJ ⁻¹	0.14
Specific energy	MJ kg ⁻¹	7.07
Net energy	MJ ha ⁻¹	19,301.83

The total energy input consumed could be classified as renewable 30.84%, non-renewable 69.16%, direct 30.32% and 69.68% indirect in chickpea production (Table 4). Renewable energy has smaller than non-renewable energy. Similarly, in previous studies, it has been determined that the ratio of renewable energy has smaller than the ratio of non-renewable energy in sugar beet (Erdal et al., 2007), cucumber (Mohammadi & Omid, 2010), maize (Vural & Efekan, 2012), vetch (Kökten et al., 2016) and lentil (Asakereh et al., 2010).

Table 4. Energy input in the forms energy for chickpea production

Type of energy	Energy input (MJ ha ⁻¹)	Ratio (%)
Direct energy ^a	3,707.20	30.32
Indirect energy ^b	8,518.49	69.68
Total	12,225.69	100.00
Renewable energy ^c	3,770.04	30.84
Non-renewable energy ^d	8,455.66	69.16
Total	12,225.69	100.00

^aIncludes human labour and diesel; ^bIncludes seed, farmyard manure, chemical fertilizers, chemicals and machinery; ^cIncludes human labour, farmyard manure and seed; ^dIncludes diesel, chemical fertilizers, chemicals and machinery.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on this study, following conclusions are explained:

1. Chickpea production consumed a total energy of 12,225.69 MJ ha⁻¹, which has the highest due to diesel fuel (29.25%). The energy input of chemical fertilizers (28.82%) and seed (26.83%) have the second and third share within the total energy inputs.
2. Energy use efficiency, energy productivity, specific energy and net energy have been determined as 2.58, 0.14 kg MJ⁻¹, 7.07 MJ kg⁻¹ and 19,301.83 MJ ha⁻¹.

3. The renewable and non-renewable energy inputs were 30.84% and 69.16% of the total energy input, respectively.
4. Decreasing of diesel fuel and nitrogen consumption are important for energy management. Suitable combine machines may be used and farm fertilizer using may be increased.
5. In this study, the energy balance of chickpea production in the Adıyaman province has been determined. According to the evaluated results, chickpea production is an economic production in terms of energy efficiency (2.58).

REFERENCES

- Acaroğlu, M. & Aksoy, A.Ş. 2005. The cultivation and energy balance of *Miscanthus x giganteus* production in Turkey. *Biomass and Bioenergy* **29**, 42–48.
- Akçin, A. 1988. Cooked Legume Research, Selçuk University Publishing, 43, Agriculture Faculty, 8, Konya (In Turkish).
- Anonymous. 2014. Turkish Statistical Institute, Plant Production Statistics. <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/>, Erişim, 29 Mayıs 2014 (In Turkish).
- Anonymous. 2015. Adıyaman Accountancy. <http://www.adiyamandefterdarligi.gov.tr/adiyaman/COGRAFI.htm>, 09 April 2015 (In Turkish).
- Asakereh, A., Shiekhdavoodi, M.J., Safaieenejad, M. 2010. Energy consumption pattern of organic and conventional lentil in Iran a case study: Kuhdasht county. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* **2**(3), 111–116.
- Atılğan, A. & Köknaroglu, H. 2006. Cultural energy analysis on broilers reared in different capacity poultry houses. *Italian Journal of Animal Science* **5**, 393–400.
- Azkan, N., 1999. Cooked Legume Research, Uludağ University Agriculture Faculty Lesson Notes, 40, 107s., Bursa (In Turkish).
- Baran, M.F. & Gökdoğan, O. 2014. Energy input-output analysis of barley production in Thrace region of Turkey. *American-Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci.* **14**(11), 1255–1261.
- Baran, M. F. & Gökdoğan, O. 2016. Determination of energy balance of sugar beet production in Turkey: a case study of Kırklareli province. *Energy Efficiency* **9**, 487–494.
- Baran, M.F., Gökdoğan, O. & Oğuz, H.I. 2017a. Determining the energy usage efficiency of walnut (*Juglans Regia* L.) cultivation in Turkey. *Erwerbs-Obstbau* **59**, 77–82.
- Baran, M.F., Lüle, F. & Gökdoğan, O. 2017b. Energy input-output analysis of organic grape production: A case study from Adıyaman Province, *Erwerbs-Obstbau*, DOI 10.1007/s10341-017-0322-1.
- Barut, Z.B., Ertekin, C. & Karaağaç, H.A. 2011. Tillage effects on energy use for corn silage in Mediterranean Coastal of Turkey. *Energy* **36**, 5466–5475.
- Bayhan, Y. 2016. Comparison of energy use efficiency of different tillage methods and no tillage on the secondary crop sunflower production. *Journal of Tekirdag Agricultural Faculty* **13**(02), 102–109.
- Çanakcı, M., Topakcı, M., Akıncı, I. & Özmerzi, A. 2005. Energy use pattern of some field crops and vegetable production: case study for Antalya Region, Turkey. *Energy and Conversion Management* **46**(4), 655–666.
- Çelik, Y., Peker, K. & Oğuz, C. 2010. Comparative analysis of energy efficiency in organic and conventional farming systems: A case study of black carrot (*Daucus carota* L.) production in Turkey. *Philipp Agric. Scientist* **93**(2), 224–231.
- Çiçek, A. & Erkan, O. 1996. Agricultural Economics Research and Sampling Methods. Gaziosmanpaşa University, Agriculture Faculty Publishing, No: 12, Lesson Notes No: 6, Tokat, Turkey (In Turkish).

- De, D., Singh, R.S. & Chandra, H. 2001. Technological impact on energy consumption in rainfed soybean cultivation in Madhya Pradesh, *Applied Energy*, **70**, 193–213.
- Demircan, V., Ekinci, K., Keener, H.M., Akbolat, D. & Ekinci, C. 2006. Energy and economic analysis of sweet cherry production in Turkey: A case study from Isparta province. *Energy Conversion and Management* **47**, 1761–1769.
- Demircan, V. & Köknaroğlu, H. 2007. Effect of farm size on sustainability of beef cattle production. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture* **31**(1), 75–87.
- Erdal, G., Esengün, K., Erdal, H. & Gündüz, O. 2007. Energy use and economical analysis of sugar beet production in Tokat province of Turkey. *Energy* **32**, 35–41.
- Erdin, F. & Kulaz, H. 2014. Van-Gevaş ekolojik koşullarında bazı nohut (*Cicer arietinum* L.) çeşitlerinin ikinci ürün olarak yetiştirilmesi, *Turkish Journal of Agricultural and Natural Sciences* **S1**, 910–914.
- Gezer, I., Acaroğlu, M. & Haciseferoğulları, H. 2003. Use of energy and labour in apricot in Turkey. *Biomass Bioenergy* **24**(3), 215–219.
- Ghorbani, R., Mondani, F., Amirmoradi, S., Feizi, H., Khorramdel, S., Teimouri, M., Sanjani, S., Anvarkhah, S. & Aghel, H. 2011. A case study of energy use and economical analysis of irrigated and dryland wheat production systems. *Applied Energy* **88**(1), 283–288.
- Gökdoğan, O. & Sevim, B. 2016. Determination of energy balance of wheat production in Turkey: A case study of Eskişehir district of Aksaray province, *Tekirdağ Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, **13**(04), 36–43.
- Haciseferoğulları, H., Acaroğlu, M. & Gezer, I. 2003. Determination of the energy balance of the sugar beet plant. *Energy Sources* **25**, 15–22.
- Hetz, E. 1992. Energy utilization in fruit production in Chile, *Agricultural mechanization in Asia, Africa and Latin America* **29**, 17–20.
- Houshyar, E. & Kiani, S. 2012. Energy Consumption of Rainfed Wheat Production in Conventional and Conservation Tillage Systems. *International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences* **4**, 213–219.
- Inci, H., Söğüt, B., Gökdoğan, O., Ayaşan, T. & Şengül, T. 2016. Determining the energy usage efficiency and economic analysis of broiler chickens raised under organic conditions. *Indian Journal of Animal Sciences* **86**(11), 1323–1327.
- Karaağaç, M.A., Aykanat, S., Çakır, B., Eren, O., Turgut, M.M., Barut, Z.B. & Öztürk, H.H. 2011. Energy balance of wheat and maize crops production in Hacıali undertaking, 11th International Congress on Mechanization and Energy in Agriculture Congress, 21–23 September, Istanbul, Turkey, 388–391.
- Kızılaslan, H. 2009. Input-output energy analysis of cherries production in Tokat province of Turkey. *Applied Energy* **86**, 1354–1358.
- Koçtürk, O. M. & Engindeniz, S. 2009. Energy and cost analysis of sultana grape growing: A case study of Manisa, west Turkey. *African Journal of Agricultural Research* **4**(10), 938–943.
- Konak, M., Marakoğlu, T. & Özbek, O. 2004. Energy balance at corn production. Selçuk University, Agriculture Faculty Journal, Konya, Turkey, **18**(34), 28–30 (In Turkish).
- Köknaroğlu, H., Ali, A., Ekinci, K., Morrical, D.G. & Hoffman, M.P. 2007. Cultural energy analysis of lamb production in the feedlot or on pasture and in the feedlot. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture* **30**(4), 95–108.
- Kökten, K., Çaçan, E., Gökdoğan, O. & Baran, M.F. 2016. Determination of energy balance of common vetch (*Vicia sativa* L.), hungarian vetch (*Vicia pannonica* C.) and narbonne vetch (*Vicia narbonensis* L.) production in Turkey, *Legume Research*. DOI: 10.18805/lr.v0i0.6842.
- Küçükaltay, M. & Akbolat, D. 2015. Investigation of different tillage and seeding methods in chickpea cultivation. *Süleyman Demirel University Agriculture Faculty Journal* **10**(2), 1–10 (In Turkish).

- Mani, I., Kumar, P., Panwar, J.S. & Kant, K. 2007. Variation in energy consumption in production of wheat-maize with varying altitudes in hill regions of Himachal Pradesh, India. *Energy* **32**, 2336–2339.
- Mandal, K.G., Saha, K.P., Ghosh, P.K., Hati, K.M. & Bandyopadhyay, K.K. 2002. Bioenergy and economic analysis of soybean based crop production systems in central India. *Biomass and Bioenergy* **23**, 337–345.
- Marakoğlu, T., Özbek, O. & Çarman, K. 2010. Energy balance of different soil tillage systems in chickpea production. *Journal of Agricultural Machinery Science* **6**(4), 229–235 (In Turkish).
- Mobtaker, H.G., Keyhani, A., Mohammadi, A., Rafiee, S. & Akram, A. 2010. Sensitivity analysis of energy inputs for barley production in Hamedan Province of Iran. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **137**, 367–372.
- Mohammadi, A., Tabatabaefar, A., Shahin, S., Rafiee, S. & Keyhani, A. 2008. Energy use and economical analysis of potato production in Iran a case study: Ardabil province. *Energy Conversion Management* **49**, 3566–3570.
- Mohammadi, A. & Omid, M. 2010. Economical analysis and relation between energy inputs and yield of greenhouse cucumber production in Iran. *Applied Energy* **87**(1), 191–196.
- Mohammadi, A., Rafiee, S., Mohtasebi, S.S. & Rafiee, H. 2010. Energy inputs-yield relationship and cost analysis of kiwifruit production in Iran. *Renewable Energy* **35**, 1071–1075.
- Mousavi-Avval, S.H., Rafiee, S., Jafari, A. & Mohammadi, A. 2011. Energy efficiency and cost analysis of canola production in different farm sizes. *International Journal of Energy and Environment* **2**(5), 845–852.
- Nabavi-Pelesaraei, A., Abdi, R., Rafiee, S. & Mobtaker, H.G. 2014. Optimization of energy required and greenhouse gas emissions analysis for orange producers using data envelopment analysis approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **65**(15), 311–317.
- Öztürk, H.H., Ekinci, K. & Barut, Z.B. 2006. Energy analysis of the tillage systems in second crop corn production. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture* **28**(3), 25–37.
- Pishgar-Komleh, S.H., Sefedpari, P. & Rafiee, S. 2011. Energy and economic analysis of rice production under different farm levels in Guilan province of Iran. *Energy* **36**(10), 5824–5831.
- Pishgar-Komleh, S.H., Keyhani, A., Rafiee, S. & Sefedpari, P. 2011. Energy use and economic analysis of corn silage production under three cultivated area levels in Tehran province of Iran. *Energy* **36**(5), 3335–3341.
- Polat, R., Çopur, O., Sağlam, R. & Sağlam, C. 2006. Energy use pattern and cost analysis of cotton agriculture: A case study for Sanliurfa, Turkey. *The Philippine Agricultural Scientist* **89**(4), 368–371.
- Rafiee, S., Avval, S.H.M. & Mohammadi, A. 2010. Modeling and sensitivity analysis of energy inputs for apple production in Iran. *Energy* **35**(8), 3301–3306.
- Semerçi, A. 2013. Economic analysis of sunflower production in the view of orobanche resistance conditions. *Pak J. Agri. Sci.* **50**(3), 409–504.
- Singh, J.M. 2002. On garden energy use pattern in different cropping systems in Haryana, India. International Institute of Management University of Flensburg, Sustainable Energy Systems and Management, Master of Science, Germany.
- Singh, H., Mishra, D., Nahar, N.M. & Ranjan, M. 2003. Energy use pattern in production agriculture of a typical village in Arid Zone India (Part II). *Energy Conversion and Management* **44**, 1053–1067.
- Tabatabaie, S.M.H., Rafiee, S., Keyhani, A. & Heidari, M.D. 2013. Energy use pattern and sensitivity analysis of energy inputs and input costs for pear production in Iran, *Renewable Energy*, **51**, 7–12.
- Tipi, T., Çetin, B. & Vardar, A. 2009. An analysis of energy use and input costs for wheat production in Turkey, *Journal of Food, Agriculture & Environment* **7**(2), 352–356.

- Vural, H. & Efecan, I. 2012. An analysis of energy use and input costs for maize production in Turkey. *Journal of Food, Agriculture & Environment* **10**(2), 613–616.
- Yaldız, O., Öztürk, H.H., Zeren, Y. & Başçetinçelik, A. 1993. Energy usage in production of field crops in Turkey, In: 5th International Congress on Mechanization and Energy Use in Agriculture; 11–14 October, Kuşadası, Turkey (In Turkish).
- Yıldız, T. 2016. An input-output energy analysis of wheat production in Çarşamba district of Samsun Province. *Gaziosmanpaşa University Agriculture Faculty Journal* **33**(3), 10–20.