



Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report

Similarity Found: 18%

Date: Monday, June 24, 2019

Statistics: 784 words Plagiarized / 4377 Total words

Remarks: Low Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Optional Improvement.

Available online freely at www.isisn.org Bioscience Research Print ISSN: 1811-9506
Online ISSN: 2218-3973 Journal by Innovative Scientific Information & Services Network
RESEARCH ARTICLE BIOSCIENCE RESEARCH,201815(3):000-000 OPEN ACCESS Bambang
Kusmanadhi and Mohammad Setyo Poerwoko Environment Science Faculty of
Agricultur-Estate CropsJember University, Indonesia Plant Breeding Faculty of
Agriculture Jember University, Indonesia *Correspondence:
kusmanadhi.faperta@unej.ac.id Accepted: 00 jun.2018 Published online: 00 July.

2018 Allinputsintoagro-ecosystems can be expressed in terms of energy which is a key input in production processes.Many environmental issues are associated to the production, transformation and useofenergy. **Improvements in energy efficiency** will leadto more environment-friendly production systems.The objective softhe study are to developan effective frame work tocarry outenergy accounting operation in rice farming and to assess energy use of the existing rice production systems.This paper compares the energy use of 24 group paddy producer sintwo districts in East Java Province.The energy-ratio(out pu energy toinput energy ratio),denotedby GJ,offarmers in crop production systems is indices that can definethe efficiency and sustainability of farms.

Keywords: rice farming,energy efficiency,energy INTRODUCTION Impact of agro chemical inputs on environment and green house gase missions of rice farming is a major environmental challenge of agriculturein Indonesia. Every year the country produces rice on more than **13 million hectares of** harvest edagricultural and mostly in Java Island (Indonesian Statistic ,2012).These vast farming areas,that are largely conventional systems,have been long history in contributing to The environmental deterioration (Suzuki et al.,1980;Bachelet and Neue,1993;World Bank, 1994;Lumbanraja et al., 1998; Yuwono, 1998; Las et al., 2006).

All inputs to perform various operations for crop production can be expressed in terms of energy (Ozkan, 2004; Alam et al., 2005; Nassiri and Singh, 2009). However, many environmental issues are associated to the production, transformation and use of energy (Dincer, 2002). Effects of increasing the consumption of fossil based energy on agriculture are of growing concern. Agriculture is responsible for about 5% of the total global energy consumption (Stout, 1990; Pinstrup-Andersen, 1999). Two decades later, energy for the world food sector shares for around 30 percent (FAO, 2012).

Many studies have shown that fossil energy input causes the release of carbon dioxide and nitrogen oxide from agricultural fields (Dyer and Desjardin, 2003; Robertson and Grace, 2004; Tzilivakis et al., 2005; Syvasalo et al., 2006). For this reason, reducing the energy derived from fossil fuels has important implications for decreasing environmental pollution.

This may lead to the application of best management practices through energy efficiency (Kaltsas et al., 2007; Franzese et al., 2009; Kavargiris et al., 2009). Odum (2007) defined efficiency of energy transformation as the energy output (energy stored) divided by the energy input. In earlier reference, Spedding (1981) defined efficiency in biological term, so-called 'logaleficy' as Kusmanadhi and Poerwoko Input Output Ratio...

Bioscience Research, 2018 volume 15(3): 000-000 2 output over input where the outputs and inputs are measured in physical or biological units. Furthermore, in a wider view, biological efficiency is defined as the efficiency of a biological process or processes. Hence, we can assess the efficiencies of combined processes including a complicated combination such as agricultural ecosystem.

Input and output of energy are two important factors for determining the energetic and ecological efficiency of crop production (Rathke and Diepenbrock, 2006). Energy intensity and energy output/input ratio are integrative indicators of the environmental effects of crop production (Hulsbergen et al., 2001). For this reason, improvements in energy efficiency will lead to more environment-friendly production systems (Gundogmus and Bayramoglu, 2006). Accordingly, efficient energy use is one of the most important conditions for a sustainable agriculture.

Within an agricultural region, many physical, chemical and biological properties directly related to the production system exhibit spatial variability, even at small distances. Such variation implies that different levels of input factors will result in varying output (Rilwani and Ikhuoria, 2006; Bojaca et al., 2012). The variability of a farming system can be exploited to characterize farmers in terms of their energy efficiency (Tabar et al., 2010).

Such characterization can indicate pathways to optimize the energy efficiency of the system as a whole. Considerable studies have been conducted in different countries on energy use in agriculture. Through comparative studies, energy analysis has also been used to assess the efficiency of different production systems such as conventional, organic, and integrated farming (Daalgard et al., 2001; Deike et al., 2008; Michos, 2011; Bojaca et al., 2012).

On a global scale, the input of energy for the crop production differs to a large extent. In some traditional low-input farming systems, e.g. in large areas of Africa, the energy input on arable land is low (Ghaorm 1978) whereas in some modern high-input farming systems in Western Europe and USA can exceed 20 Gha⁻¹ (entel et al., 1983; Schroll, 1994; Hulsbergen et al., 2001).

Therefore, there is a range of energy input and output relationships for the same crop based on the region and technological level. Various methods may be applied to calculate the energy use for crop production depending on the goal of the study. The methods presented in the literature vary in the spatial and temporal system boundaries chosen, in the fluxes of materials and energy considered, and in the energy equivalents assigned to these fluxes (Jones, 1989). A widely applied method is the energy input/output analysis. In this method, all agricultural inputs in production process are multiplied by conversion factors to approximate input and output energy (Hulsbergen et al.,

2001; Dallgaard et al., 2001; Muhammadi et al., 2008; Tabar et al., 2010). Once the inputs and outputs are transformed into energy units, indicators such as energy use efficiency, energy productivity, specific energy and net energy can be derived. Green (1978) argued that high agricultural productivity is energy demanding and energy efficient is associated with low productivity. This thesis is particularly true in the energy intensive modern agriculture system. However, it is not necessarily always the case in other systems. Craumer (1979) found that less energy intensive Old Order Amish farms in North America, including use of draft animals, lower energy inputs per unit of production more than the modern farms can accomplish without a lower overall productivity. In Java Island there are several alternative ways of rice farming with reduced inorganic agrochemicals that gave even higher yields compared to national average yield of conventional farming (Setyono, 2010; Anonymous, 2011).

However, in Indonesia, the use of inorganic fertilizer is estimated to continue to increase. By comparison, the total fertilizers for rice cropping in 2003 were 4.42 million tonnes and in 2006 reached 4.50 million tonnes (Las et al., 2006), whereas total

requirement of N, P 2O₅, and K 2O in 2015 is projected 6.9 million tonnes (Irawan et al,2013). In summary, improving the environmental performance of agricultural production can be traced through energy analysis.

This paper attempts to analyse the energy use efficiency of rice farming being practiced by farmers at the field level which is ultimately aimed to promote sustainable agriculture. Conceptual framework All living systems (organisms, populations, communities, and eco systems) can be considered as open thermodynamic systems that are not in thermodynamic equilibrium and that continuously utilize and convert energy.

Energy transfers and conversions in these systems strictly obey the first and second laws of thermodynamics (Odum, 1971; Zhou et al., 1996). Kusmanadhi and Poerwoko Input Output Ratio... Bioscience Research, 2018 volume 15(3): 000-000 3 Energy that enters a system either is stored, reflows out (Figure 1). Energy is constantly converted from one form to another by natural or human-controlled processes ruled by the laws of thermodynamics. The first law of thermodynamics (conservation of energy) states that energy can be neither created nor destroyed, although it can change form.

The second law (law of entropy) states that it is impossible to convert a given quantity of heat completely into work. Energy is always degraded in the conversion process and loses its ability to do work (Odum, 2007). The two laws may be resumed: although energy can be neither created nor destroyed, in any real process the availability of potential energy is lost.

In recent years, available potential energy (the amount of energy which can be extracted as useful work) has been called exergy. Hence, the laws of thermodynamics are the basis of all energy analysis of any production systems, including agricultural systems. The first law, also called energy balance principle, suggested that the energy of input (including any unpriced material from the environment) must exactly equal the energy of output (including the energy in the waste) for any transformation process. The flow of natural resources (materials/ mass/energy) taken from the environment goes to transformational processes (such as production, consumption, and recycling) is eventually returned to the environment as wastes and pollution (Ayres, 1998; Akao and Managi, 2007; Ebert and Welsch, 2007).

The first law is more concerned with the magnitude (quantity) of energy (Dincer et al., 2005). In this view, production is basically the transformation of materials into desired outputs. Due to the thermodynamic laws, this transformation can never be completed. Some residual unavoidably arises as a by-product or undesirable output. This residual is linked by the materials balance.

In regard to the second law, Odum (2007) explained that the potential energy, or available energy to carry out a process, is used up. It is degraded from a form of energy capable of driving phenomena to a form that is not capable of doing so. Dincer (2005) added that these conditions are concerned with the quality of energy, i.e. the quality of energy to cause change, degradation of energy during a process, entropy generation and the lost opportunities to do work.

In order to integrate environmental concern in any production systems, several attempts have been made to adjust the standard technical and economic efficiency measures. Many authors describe the environmental effects caused by either abandoned or an environmentally detrimental input in production functions. For instance, nitrogen use in Dutch dairy farms (Reinhard and Thijssen, 2000), best management practices of agriculture in Canada (Ghazalian et al.,

2010), efficiency of American petroleum refineries (Mekaroonreung and Johnson, 2010). Based on the analysis, they found that input efficiency is a viable choice to reduce environmental impacts without affecting the productivity. Based on Figure 1, a conceptual framework on energy input and output in paddy rice farming system was developed (Figure 2). The operational assessment of energy inputs and output follows the model of energy flows in rice production systems (Figure 3). Energy is utilized in food production processes both off and on the farm. Figure 1.

A system of production, consumption, and recycle that has inflows and outflows (Adapted from: Odum, 2007). Kusmanadhi and Poerwoko Input Output Ratio... Bioscience Research, 2018 volume 15(3): 000-000 4 Figure 2. Conceptual framework of research on energy assessment in a paddy rice farming system Figure 3. Model of energy flows in the production of paddy rice crop Off the farm energy is used in the manufacture of agricultural equipments, construction of agricultural structures, fertilizers and pesticides. On the farm, energy is consumed during the process of crop production. It divides energy usage of rice production into eight broadly distinct processes, including seed bed preparation, tillage (land preparation), transplanting, fertilization, irrigation, weed and pest control, harvesting and postharvest handling. This enables both the total energy inputs and the energy usage in each production process to be assessed.

MATERIALS AND METHODS The study area consists of two regencies of East Java Provinces, i.e. Banyuwangi and Jember. The selected locations are consisted of three different zones, low land, moderate and upland. The two regencies are the main rice-bowl in East Java. There are rice farming systems that are managed conventionally and (semi) organically. Kusmanadhi and Poerwoko Input Output Ratio...

Bioscience Research, 2018 volume 15(3): 000-000 5 Sampling procedure Method of sampling was stratified random sampling. The first stage is intentionally select in the agencies based on the capacity to produce rice and the differences in agro-ecosystem, such as soil type, average of rain fall, and micro climate. The second stage is selecting farmer groups (a loose organization of farmers who have land in a neighborhood area) based on the list available at the local agricultural offices.

A planned questionnaire for groups was applied as instrument to investigate the total energy used in their cropping activities. Energy use efficiency The data used in the study were collected from 24 groups of conventional and organic rice farmers at the same number in the district of Jember and Banyuwangi, East Java, Indonesia. The study areas were representing three different regimes, low land, moderate, and upland zones.

The energy input/output analysis was carried out following the standard approach where the production inputs and yield were averaged in hectare for over the entire area at a set. Afterwards, average inputs and output were transformed into energy units according to the energy equivalents presented in Table 1. The energy content of the crop residues **retained on the field** was not considered.

Energy output and input is calculated and stated in giga-joule (GJ) per hectare (Hulsbergen et al., 2001; Dalgaard et al., 2001; Ozkan et al., 2004; Deike et al., 2008), for the entire sampled areas in one rice cropping season. Energy use assessment for the farming system was estimated through the energy use efficiency (EUE) according to the following formulas: $EUE = \frac{E_{output}}{E_{input}}$ **The inputs used in the calculation of agricultural energy use include human and machinery, diesel fuel, fertilizers, pesticides, straw, manure, and seeds. In order to make an energy analysis, it is necessary to consider the use of human and machinery in agricultural processes.** The age of Indonesian farmers is mostly about 40 years old (Ilham et al., 2007).

The working hour of agricultural workers are taken an average of 6 hours **of work a day** for men and 5 hours a day for women. The calculation of human or man power energy was based on **a Joint FAO/WHO/UNU Expert Consultation (2001) formula**. No animal energy was used within the groups. There is no precise way **to account for the** indirectly energy used in agricultural production.

This would be the energy that goes into the production of machinery, equipment, building and other non-land resources that contribute to food and fiber production over the long term and are normally treated as capital assets. **One of the most important** of these is farm machinery. The calculation of energy used for

tractor and plow based on formula given by Doering (1980 in Pimentel, 1980).

There are no energy data available for the application of bio-pesticides. Farmers used locally-made bio-pesticide. The calculation of bio-pesticide is based on the formula: $E_{\text{bio-pest}} = T \times CI$ Where, E is energy (Kcal); T is time required to make 1 litre bio-pesticide (hour); CI is average calorie intake of person (Kcal/hour). Here, CI is taken 2000 Kcal per-day (Indonesian Body of Statistic, 2012).

In order to be able to make the analysis, it is essential to consider energy sources, i.e. the amount of energy stored in the seed. Energy equivalent for seeds were taken to be equal to the energy equivalent of the product itself. Energy output was calculated by multiplying the production amount by its corresponding equivalent.

RESULTS Energy analyses are made in agriculture in order to understand the role of direct and indirect energy inputs as production factors, to find measures for energy savings, and to improve energy efficiency. The performance evaluating indicators/parameters are presented in Table 2. In general view, it is evidenced that conventional farming system shows a higher output/input ratio. This means the conventional farmers can produce higher output per unit input.

In most publications, both smaller energy inputs and a higher energy use efficiency (higher output per unit input or less input per unit output) were reported for organic farming. The majority of these comparisons between organic and conventional farming were carried out at the farm level (Dalgaard et al., 2001; Gundogmus and Bayramoglu, 2006).

In this research, it was found that most farmers groups in upland are and organic farmers used straw and manure for their energy sources. A high quantity of straw and manure use, i.e. 5 and 2 tonnes ha⁻¹ respectively, contributed to high quantity of energy input. The use of straw and manure is of utmost importance in organic farming
Kusmanadhi and Poerwoko Input Output Ratio...

Bioscience Research, 2018 volume 15(3): 000-000 6 systems and in upland are a where the in organic fertilizers supply is generally limited. Table 1. Energy equivalent of inputs and outputs

Input Description	Energy equivalent	Reference
urea	59.83 MJ/kg	Lockeretz, 1980
nitrogen	61.50 MJ/kg	Lockeretz, 1980; Heichel, 1980; Rutgerand Grant, 1980
phosphorus(P ₂ O ₅)	12.55 MJ/kg	Pimenteland Burgess, 1980; Rutgerand Grant, 1980
potassium(K ₂ O)	6.69 MJ/kg	Pimenteland Burgess, 1980; Rutgerand Grant, 1980; Lockeretz, 1980; Heichel, 1980
seed	14.64 MJ/kg	Stout, 1979; M.S. Alameetal, 2005; N.S. et al.,

2006 Chauhan dieselfuel 39.58 MJ/L Huslbergenetal. 2001; Deikeetal. 2008 pesticide 120 MJ/L Nassiriand Singh, 2009; Chauhan et al., 2006 bio-pesticide 0.84 MJ/L Based on calculation tractor 24.90 MJ/ha Calculationbased on Doering, 1980 sprayer 0.04 MJ/ha Calculationbased on Doering, 1980 C-organic 41.84 MJ/kg Salonen et al.,1976 male labour 1.03 MJ/hr Calculationbased on FAO,2001 female labour 0.84 MJ/hr Calculationbased on FAO,2001 Table 2.

Input	Output	Ratio	O/I
jlcg-1	25.83	114.64	4.44
jlcg-2	26.45	116.05	4.39
jmog-1	24.19	103.83	4.29
jmog-2	24.72	104.17	4.21
juog-1	142.75	151.21	1.06
juog-2	91.13	95.40	1.05
jlog-1	60.44	131.35	2.17
jlog-2	54.15	107.31	1.98
jmog-1	53.45	98.11	1.83
jmog-2	52.37	98.32	1.88
juog-1	160.03	86.29	0.54
juog-2	155.62	86.32	0.55
blcg-1	19.11	98.44	5.15
blcg-2	21.44	108.23	5.05
bmcg-1	15.88	94.38	5.94
bmcg-2	19.09	94.04	4.93
bucg-1	85.92	85.42	0.99
bucg-2	88.44	86.12	0.97
blog-1	52.52	100.96	1.92
blog-2	48.83	102.52	2.10
bmog-1	55.05	88.38	1.60
bmog-2	42.18	88.03	2.09
buog-1	148.17	83.36	0.57
buog-2	148.55	85.49	0.57

Note: j:Jember I :lowlandzone c:conventional b:Banyuwangi m:moderatezone o:organic u: uplandzone g: group The higher application rates of strawand manureled to higher energy input, thus, lowerin the output/input ratio (Graph 1 and 2).

It is assumed that therisk of harmful environ- mental effects is lower with organic than with conventional farming methods, though not necessarilyso (Hansen et al., 2001). When comparing and assessing different farming Kusmanadhi and Poerwoko Input Output Ratio... Bioscience Research, 2018 volume 15(3): 000-000 7 systems in regard to terms of their performance not only energy use efficiency.

The in tensity of agro chemical use should be considered since possible contaminations of soil, water, and air,as well as the endangerment residues remaining on food(Deike et al., 2008). Thus, long-term comparison of cropping systems comprising different management of energy sources as inputs such as presented in this study is in dispensable. Graph1.Input-output energy usein conventional rice cropping based on zone (per-ha) Graph2.Input-output energy usein organic rice cropping based on zone (per-ha) CONCLUSION Energy consumption perunitland area and the amount of energy needed for the production of one unit of product or one unit of energy output are fundamental indicators to assess the environmental effects of crop production.

The finding showed thatthe energyusein conventional farming systems more efficient with regard to energy require-ments, where as the output in put ratio is higher compare to organicone. Based on zone,farmers in lowland and moderate are as are more efficient compare to farmers in upland areas.However, there is no significantly different in output between the whole systems. Kusmanadhi and Poerwoko Input Output Ratio...

Bioscience Research, 2018 volume 15(3): 000-000 8 CONFLICT OF INTEREST This study was conducted without any conflict of interest. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT Thank you for the expenses incurred for "ia Bran" research from DP2M. AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS Bambang Kusmanadhi Environmental Science Program as whole. Moh. Setyo Poerwoko designed his plant breeding program as a whole Copyrights: © 2017 @ author (s).

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

REFERENCES Adhikari, C.B. and Bjondal, T.(2012). Analysis of technical efficiency using SDF and DEA models: evidence from Nepalese agriculture. Applied Economics,44:3297-3308. Adimihardja,A.(2006).Strategy for maintaining the multifunctionality of agriculture in Indonesia. Agric. Res and Dev. J., 25(3):99-105. Alam, M.S.,Alam, M.R., and Islam, K.K.(2005). Energy Flow in Agriculture: Bangladesh. American Journal of Environmental Sciences, 1(3): 213-220, 2005. Anonymous. (2011).

Application of System of Rice Intensification (SRI) organic, increased rice production. Press release.Gajah Mada University.Indonesia. Retrieved in: http://www.ugm.ac.id/index.php?page=rilis&a_rtikel=2845 Bachelet, D. And Neue,H.U.(1993). Methane mission from wet lands rice in Asia. Chemosphere, 26(1-4):219-237. Bojacá, C.R., Casilimas,H.A., Gil, R., and Schrevens, E. (2012). Extending the input/output energy balance methodology in agriculture through cluster analysis. N- Energy47:465-470. Chauhan, N.S.,

Pratap K.J. Mohapatra, P.K.J., and Pandey,K.P.(2006).Improving energy productivity in paddy production through benchmarking: An application of data envelopment analysis. Energy Conversion and Management, 47:1063 – 1085. Craumer, P.R.(1979). Farm productivity and energy efficiency in Amish and modern dairying. Agriculture and Environment, 4:281- 299. Dallgaard, T.,Halberg,N.,

and Porter, J.R.(2001). A model for fossil energy use in Danish agriculture used to compare organic and conventional farming.Agriculture, Eco systems and Environment, 87:51-65. Deike, S., Pallutt,B., Christen, O. (2008). Investigations on the energy efficiency of organic and integrated farming with specific emphasis on pesticide use intensity.Europ.J. Agronomy, 28:461 – 470. Dincer,I.(2002).

The role of exergy in energy policy making. *Energy Policy*, 30:137-149.

Doering III, O.C. (1980). Accounting for energy in farm machinery and buildings. In Pimentel (Ed.). *Handbook of energy utilization in agriculture*. CRC Press Inc. Boca Raton, Florida.

Dyer, J.A., Desjardin, R.L. (2003). Simulated farm field work, energy consumption and related greenhouse gas emissions in Canada. *Biosyst. Eng.* 85(4), 503 – 513. Ebert, U., and Welsch, H. (2007).

Environmental emissions and production economics: Implications of the materials balance. *Amer. J. Agron. Econ.* 89(2):287-293. FAO. (2001). Human energy requirement. Report of a Joint FAO/WHO/UNU Expert Consultation. Rome, Italy. FAO. (2012). *Energy-Smart Food at FAO: An Overview*. Food and Agriculture Organization. Rome, Italy. 71p. Franzese, P.P., Rydberg, T., Russo, G.F., Ulgiati, S. (2009). Sustainable biomass production: a comparison between gross energy requirement and energy synthesis methods. *Ecol.*

Indicat., 9:959 – 970. Ghazalian, P.L., Larue, B., and West, G.E. (2010). Best Management Practices and the Production of Good and Bad Outputs. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 58:283 – 302. Giampietro, M. (1991). Energy efficiency: assessing the interaction between humans and their environment. *Ecological Economics*, 4:117-144. Green, M.B. (1978). *Eating Oil*. Energy use in food production. Boulder Colorado. Westview Press. 205p. Gundogmus, E., Bayramoglu, Z. (2006). Energy input use on organic farming: a comparative Kusmanadhi and Poerwoko Input Output Ratio...

Bioscience Research, 2018 volume 15(3): 000-000. 9 analysis of organic versus conventional farming in Turkey. *J. Agron.* 5(1):16 – 22. Hansen, B., Alrøe, H.F., Kristensen, E.S. (2001). Approaches to assess the environmental impact of organic farming with particular regard to Denmark. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 83:11 – 26. Hulsbergen, K.J., Feil, B., Biermann, S., Ratkhe, G.W., Kalk, W.D., and Diepenbrock, W. (1991).

A method of energy balancing in crop production and its application in a long-term fertilizer trial. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 86:303-321. Heichel, G.H. (1980). Assessing the fossil energy costs of propagating agricultural crops. In Pimentel (Ed.). *Handbook of energy utilization in agriculture*. CRC Press Inc. Boca Raton, Florida. Irawan, Setyorini, D., and Rochayati, S. (2013). *Proyeksi Kebutuhan Pupuk Sektor Pertanian melalui Pendekatan Sistem Dinamis*. Balai Penelitian Tanah. Badan Litbang Pertanian. Kementerian Pertanian. Jones, M.R. (1989). Analysis of the use of energy in agriculture: approaches and problems. *Agric. Syst.*,

29:339 – 355. Kaltsas, A.M., Mamolos, A.P., Tsatsarelis, C.A., Nanos, G.D., Kalburtji,

K.L.(2007). Energy budget in organic and conventional olive groves. *Agric.Ecosyst. Environ.* 122:243 – 251. Kavargiris, S.E., Mamolos, A.P., Tsatsarelis, C.A., Nikolaidou, A.E., Kalburtji, K.L. (2009). Energy rousesutizatoin organ and conventional vineyards: energy flow, green house gas emissions and biofuel production. *Biomass Bioenergy*, 33:1239 – 1250. Las, I.,

Subayono, K., andSetiyanto, A.P. (2006). Issue and Environmental Management in Agricultural Revitalization. *Journal of Agricultural Research and Development*, 25(30):106-114. Lepetit, I.P., Vermersch, D., and Weaver, R.D.(7). ue' virn -ment externalities:DEA evidence forFrench agriculture. *Applied Economics*, 29:331-338. Lockeretz, W. (1980). Energy inputs fornitro- gen,phosphorus, and potash fertilizers. In Pimentel (Ed.). *Handbook of energy utilization in agriculture*. CRC PressInc.BocaRaton, Florida.

Lumbanraja, J., Nugroho, S.G., Niswati, A., Ardjasa, W.S., Subadiyasa, N., Arya, N., Haraguchi, H., and Kimura, N. 1998. Methaneemis-sion from Indonesian rice with special references to the effects of yearly and seasonal variations, rice variety, soilty peand water management. *Hydrol. Process*, 12:2057-2072. Makaroonreung, M., Johnson, A.L. (2010). Estimatin g the efficiency of American petroleum refineries under varyin gas sumptions of the disposability of bad outputs. *International Journal of Energy Secto rManagement*, 4(3):356-398. Michos, M.M., Mamolos, A. P., Menexe, G.C., Tsatsarelis, C.A., Tsirakoglou, V.M., Kalburtji, K.L. (2012).

Energy inputs, out puts and green house gas emissions in organic, integra- tedand conventional peach orchards. *Ecological Indicators*, 13:2 – 28. Moutinho, L. and Rita, P. (2006). Editorial: Data Envelopment Analysis. *Journal of Travel&Tourism Marketing*, 21(4):1-2. Muhammadi, A., Tabatabaeefar, A., Shahin, S., Rafiee, S., and Keyhani, A. (2008). Energy use and economical analysisof potato production inIran acasestudy: Ardabil- province. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 49:3566-3570.

Nassiri, S.M., Singh, S. (2009). Studyon energy use efficiency for paddy crop using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) techni- que. *Applied Energy*, 86:1320-1325 Odum, E.P. (1971). *Fundamental of Ecology*. Third Edition. W.B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia. 574p. Odum, H.T. (2007). *Environment, Power, and Society for the Twenty-First Century*. Columbia University Press. New York. 418p. Pimentel, D., and Burgess, M. (1980).

Energy inputs in corn production. In Pimentel (Ed.). *Handbook of energy utilization in agriculture*. CRC Press Inc. Boca Raton, Florida. Pinstrup- Andersen, P. (1999). *Towards Ecologically Sustainable World Food Production*, vol.22. UNEP Industry and Environment, United Nations Environment Program, Paris, pp.10 – 13. Ramanathan, R.

(2003). An Introduction to Data Envelopment Analysis: A Tool for Performance Measurement. Sage Publications, New Delhi. Rathke, G.W., and Diepenbrock, W. (2006).

Energy balance of winteroil seed rape (*Brassica napus* L.) cropping as related to nitrogen supply and preceding crop. *Eur. J. Agron.*, 24:35 – 44. Refsgaard, K., Halberg, N., Kristensen, E.S. (1998). Energy utilization in crop and dairy production in organic and conventional livestock production systems. *Agric. Syst.*, 57(4), 599 – 630. Reinhard, S., Thijssen, G., (2000).

Nitrogen efficiency of Dutch dairy farms: a shadow cost system approach. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 27, 167 – 186.

Rilwani, M.L. and I. A. Ikhuoria. (2006). Precision farming with geoinformatics: a new paradigm for agricultural production in a developing country. *Transaction in GIS*, 10(2):177-197.

Robertson, G.P., E.A. Paul, R.R. Harwood. (2000). Greenhouse Gases in Intensive Agriculture: Contributions of Individual Gases to the Radiative Forcing of the Atmosphere. *Science*, 289:1922-1925. Robertson, G.P.

and Grace, P.R. (2004). Greenhouse gas fluxes in tropical and temperate agriculture: the need for a full-cost accounting of global warming potentials. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 6:51 – 63. Rutgel, J.N., and Grant, W.R. (1980). Energy use in rice production. In Pimentel (Ed.). *Handbook of energy utilization in agriculture*. CRC Press Inc. Boca Raton, Florida. Salonen, K., Sarvala, J., Hakala, I., and Viljanen, M.L. (1976).

The relation of energy and organic carbon in aquatic invertebrates. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 21(5):724-730. Setyono, A.B. (2010). Break through in organic rice production using SRI method. Retrieved in:

<http://wongtaniku.wordpress.com/2010/08/31/1670/> Syvasalo, E.,

Regina, K., Turtola, E., Lemola, R., Esala, M. (2006). Fluxes of nitrous oxide and methane, and nitrogen leaching from organically and conventionally cultivated sandy soil in western Finland.

Agriculture, Stout, B.A. (1990). *Handbook of Energy for World Agriculture*. Elsevier Applied Science, London/New York. Suzuki, S., Djuangshi, N., Hyodo, K., and

Soemarwoto, O. (1980). Cadmium, Copper, and Zinc in Rice Produced in Java. *Arch. Env.*

Contam. Toxicol., 9:437-449. Tabar, I.B., Keyhani, A., and Rafiee, S. (2010). Energy balance in Ir'sagrom (1990-2006). *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 14: 849 – 855.

Tilman, D., Cassman, K.G., Matson, P.A., Naylor, P., Polasky, S. (2002). Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. *Nature*, 418: 671-677.

Tzilivakis, J., Warner, D. J., May, M., Lewis, K. A., Jagga rd, K. (2005). An assessment of the energy inputs and green house gas missions in sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*) production in the UK. *Agric. Syst.*, 85:101 – 119 World Bank. 1994. *Indonesia: Sustaining Development*. The World Bank. Washington, D.C. 216 p. Yuwono, A. S. 1998. Methane emissions from ricefield and peat soil and contribution of Indonesia to global warming. *Agric. Engin. Bull.*, 12(2):48-53. Zhou, J., Ma, S., and Hinman, G. W. (1996).

Ecological exergy analysis: a new method for ecological energetics research. *Ecological Modelling*, 84:291-303 113:342 – 348 *Ecosystems and Environment*, Wassmann, R., Neue, H. U., Lantin, R. S., Buendia, L. V., and Rennenberg, H. Characterization of methane emissions from rice fields in Asia. (2000). Comparison among field sites in five countries. *Nutrient Cycling in Agro eco systems*, 58(1):1-12.

INTERNET SOURCES:

<1% -
https://www.academia.edu/34835230/GC-MS_analysis_of_phytocomponents_in_methanolic_extracts_of_leaf-derived_callus_of_Justicia_gendarussa_Burm.f
<1% -
https://mafiadoc.com/cover-prosiding-inafor-2013cdr_5988ff631723ddcb690d6699.html
<1% - <https://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/01/11/monetizing-the-effects-of-carbon/>
<1% -
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/223640378_Long-term_productivity_and_environmental_effects_of_arable_farming_as_affected_by_crop_rotation_soil_tillage_intensity_and_strategy_of_pesticide_use_A_case-study_of_two_long-term_field_experiments_in_
<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X11001324>
<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1161030105000432>
<1% - https://www.researchgate.net/scientific-contributions/71939077_B_Feil
1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1161030107001232>
<1% - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2854826/>
1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S036054421200730X>
<1% -
<http://www.energy.gov.za/files/policies/energyPlanning/Draft-2012-Integrated-Energy-Planning-Report-an-Executive-Summary.pdf>
<1% - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2738880/>
<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195925518303846>
<1% -
https://www.academia.edu/14303522/In_search_of_traditional_farm_wisdom_for_a_more

_sustainable_agriculture_A_study_of_Amish_farming_and_society

<1% - <https://www.123helpme.com/search.asp?text=production>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304380094001359>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279705260_The_International_Politics_of_the_21st_Century

<1% -

https://www.academia.edu/4726116/_Energy_as_Master_Resource_for_State_of_the_World_2013

<1% - <https://www.myodesie.com/wiki/index/returnEntry/id/2951>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544280901024>

<1% - <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=9100RP1V.TXT>

<1% - https://issuu.com/alaoupi/docs/archaeo_disasters_2018

<1% - <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/mas/article/download/5078/4240>

<1% - <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/toc/ijesm/4/3>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5132863_Energy_Consumption_in_US_Agriculture

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255656229_Variability_of_Selected_Soil_Properties_and_Their_Relationships_with_Soybean_Yield

<1% -

https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/Public/IN/329_Residue_and_Tillage_Management_No_Till.pdf

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320886497_Effects_of_Soil_Tillage_on_Energy_Use_in_Potato_Farming_in_Central_Anatolia_of_Turkey

<1% -

<http://www.ijpab.com/form/2018%20Volume%206,%20issue%202/IJPAB-2018-6-2-304-310.pdf>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148103001356>

<1% -

https://www.academia.edu/6160187/Sustainability_of_cattle_farming_using_analysis_approach_of_Structural_Equation_Modeling_a_study_on_dry_land_of_Tanah_Laut_Regency_South_Kalimantan_Indonesia

<1% - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4278349/>

<1% - <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/~econ/ugcm/3ll3/fetter/capital.htm>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327174597_Carbon_footprint_and_energy_use_in_jute_and_allied_fibre_production

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hannu_Mikkola/publication/266166688_Energy_analysis_methodology_for_agricultural_field_crops_-_principles_and_needs_for_standardization/links/5678ff3008aebcdda0ed3cf8/Energy-analysis-methodology-for-agricultural-field-crops-principles-and-needs-for-standardization.pdf

<1% - <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/sv/2017/3186584/>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880917305595>

<1% - http://www.chinaagrisci.com/V2/En/appendix_pdf/2014-10-2299-Appendix.pdf

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330507025_Optimization_of_magnesium_fertilizer_for_radish_plant_to_obtain_best_yield_in_terms_of_its_both_quality_and_quantity_and_nutrient_uptake

<1% - <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11367-015-0980-x>

<1% - [https://www.isisn.org/BR15\(2\)2018/1213-1217-15\(2\)2018BR18-84.pdf](https://www.isisn.org/BR15(2)2018/1213-1217-15(2)2018BR18-84.pdf)

<1% -

<https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse>

<1% - <https://www.josre.org/>

<1% - <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00169/full>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233027392_Analyses_of_Technical_Efficiency_Using_SDF_and_DEA_Models_Evidence_from_Nepalese_Agriculture

<1% - <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10661-015-4516-4>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032116310449>

<1% - <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/24918>

<1% - <https://acta.mendelu.cz/65/1/0189/references/>

<1% - http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=IF0131_9460_FRA.doc

<1% -

https://www.academia.edu/10614071/Energy_inputs_outputs_and_greenhouse_gas_emissions_in_organic_integrated_and_conventional_peach_orchards

<1% -

<https://www.scribd.com/document/410379489/Cartografia-e-Ensino-Da-Geografia>

<1% - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4041714/>

<1% -

https://www.academia.edu/12796348/Effect_of_irrigation_and_nitrogen_fertilization_on_biomass_yield_and_efficiency_of_energy_use_in_crop_production_of_Miscanthus

<1% -

https://www.academia.edu/7919172/The_energy_efficiency_of_organic_agriculture_A_review

<1% - <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1576&context=jpt>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257176666_Energy_productivity_and_efficiency_of_maize_accounting_for_the_choice_of_growing_season_and_environmental_factors_An_empirical_analysis_from_Bangladesh

<1% - <https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss2/art32/main.html>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S036054421100243X>

<1% - <https://ideas.repec.org/f/c/phu263.html>

<1% - <http://www.kbs.msu.edu/robertson-publications/>

<1% - http://www.ephemeroptera-galactica.com/mfbib_st.php

<1% - https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-981-13-3272-2_2

<1% - <http://www.pnas.org/content/114/25/6450.full.pdf?with-ds=yes>

<1% - <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/015030/meta>

<1% - <https://link.springer.com/journal/10705/58/1>