Original Research Article
ISSN: 3041-5322
Journal homepage: https://agriculture.researchfloor.org/

Energy budgeting and greenhouse gas emission under different cropping sequences in the North Western Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh, India

L. R. Meena[1*], Devendra Kumar[2], S. A. Kochewad[3] and Anjali[4]

[1]*Division of Cropping Systems and Resource Management, ICAR-Indian Institute of Farming Systems Research, Modipuram, Uttar Pradesh -250 110, India*
[2]*Division of Organic Agriculture Systems, ICAR-Indian Institute of Farming Systems Research, Modipuram, Uttar Pradesh -250 110, India*
[3]*School of Soil Stress Management (SSSM), ICAR- National Institute of Abiotic Stress Management, Malegam, Baramati, Pune, Maharashtra- 413 115, India*
[4]*Mahatma Gandhi Medical College and Hospital, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302033, India*

ABSTRACT

This study is meant to examine the energy requirement and energy input-output of different cropping sequences. The crucial objective is to conduct experiments to understand energy efficiency using inputs and outputs that were disbursed in cropping sequences. Hence, it is the need of the hour to identify the most remunerative and cost- effective cropping sequence with high-energy efficiency for UGP of India. This study was carried out at the research farm of ICAR-Indian Institute of Farming Systems Research, Modipuram, during 2017-2021. The divergent cropping sequences viz. sugarcane-ratoon-wheat (CS_1); rice-wheat-dhaincha (CS_2); pigeonpea + maize- chickpea-okra (CS_3); maize-berseem-black gram (CS_4); sorghum-mustard-green gram (CS_5), and Napier+cowpea/berseem (CS_6) were compared in reference to curtail higher energy inputs through selected alternate cropping sequences. The obtained energy values were calculated by multiplying the amount of inputs and outputs by using energy conversion factors. Maximum input energy consumed by sugarcane crop alone (33.14×10^3 MJ ha^{-1}). Results showed that irrigation, seed, fertilizers, and diesel required higher energy for the completion of cultural operations. However, higher input energy was used in irrigation followed by seed and fertilizers, respectively. In regard to percent energy intake through inputs, the highest energy spent was for irrigation (35.30 MJha^{-1}) and fertilizer (23.80 MJha^{-1}). The wheat equivalent yield was higher in sugarcane-ratoon-wheat (125.58tha^{-1}). Maximum output energy was with the above system (596.70×10^3MJha^{-1}). The highest net energy returns were counted with sugarcane-ratoon-wheat (549.37×10^3MJha^{-1}), energy ratio (12.60), and energy profitability (11.60). Indeed, energy efficiency was highest in the same system (1657.50) followed by maize-berseem-black gram (1421.96). Maximum output energy was with the above system (596.70×10^3MJ ha^{-1}). Highest net energy returns was counted with sugarcane-ratoon-wheat (549.37×10^3MJ ha^{-1}), energy ratio (12.60) and energy profitability (11.60). Indeed, energy efficiency was highest in the same system (1657.50) followed by maize-berseem-black gram (1421.96). The greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) was highest in case of cereal based cropping sequence (1304 kg CO2-e) followed by rice-wheat system (641 kg CO2-e). However, minimum GHG emission was ascertained under fodder based and pulses based-cropping sequence like Napier +cowpea/ berseem (33 kg CO2-e) and Pigeonpea+ maize- chickpea- okra than other cropping sequences. In nutshell, it is inferenced that improved energy efficiency suggests the adoption of alternate cropping sequences to reduce inputs energy without much loses of output energy and these systems shall be reduced greenhouse gas emissions from the agriculture fields.

Keywords: *Cropping sequence, energy input, energy output, net energy return, energy profitability, wheat equivalent yield*

Introduction

Energy inputs are crucial for crop production and the increased use of fossil fuel energy resources has become important to both developed and developing countries.

Citation: L. R. Meena*, Devendra Kumar, S. A. Kochewad and Anjali (2024). Energy budgeting and greenhouse gas emission under different cropping sequences in the North Western Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh, India.
Agriculture Archives: an International Journal. **21 to 29.**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.51470/AGRI.2024.3.3.21

Received on: September 20, 2024
Revised on: October 10, 2024
Accepted on: November 03, 2024

Corresponding author: **L. R. Meena**
E-mail: **laxamn.meena@icar.gov.in**

In India, energy use in agriculture has been increasing since the green revolution in the late sixties with increasing use of high-yielding varieties, synthetic fertilizers, agrochemicals, herbicides, machinery as well as diesel and electricity in farm operations leading to higher productivity. The era of low-priced energy is now ending and energy conservation has become more vital because rising cost of energy sources. Therefore, relation between crop production and energy use is very close. The energy inputs are inevitable features for fruitful crop growing in Indo-Gangetic Plains because high energy requires crops are be cultivated in the area such as sugarcane, rice, wheat, potato, and oilseed crops. The availability of power on the farm is required more and more for enhancing crop productivity and profitability. Energy is used in every form of input *viz*. labor, seed, fertilizer, irrigation, and insecticides for plant protection, machinery used for various operations, and farm machinery is directly linked with technological progress made in India. In the present years, a worldwide energy crisis prevailing due to fuel shortages and high prices of petroleum-based products. The energy crisis in a country like India had an adverse effect on economic growth.

Among the field crops, legumes and oilseeds involves having less energy requirements than other crops. Looking at crops like rice, wheat, maize, and sugarcane require higher energy inputs, mainly for their higher demands of irrigation and fertilizers coupled with cultural operations [27].The production of crops in a diversified manner with advanced yield targets cannot be achieved without the use of high-energy inputs. The increase in crop productivity also needed an additional supply of mechanical power along with an adequate supply of chemical energy[8].Hence, increasing additional cropping intensity over existing requires a higher supply of energy for inputs like labor, seed, fertilizers, irrigation, and farm implements for tillage, harvest, and threshing [43]. The production factors have encouraged an increase in energy inputs to maximize yields and minimize labor-intensive operations [32]. Hence, there is an urgent need to sustain the productivity of various crops in India through the inclusion of remunerative crops that are highly energy efficient. This can be possible by adding customary energy input i.e. human labor with substantial investments in farm machinery, irrigation, equipment, fertilizers, soil, and water conservation practices, etc. These inputs and methods represent various energies that need to be evaluated to ascertain their effectiveness and to know how to conserve them[44].Energy computing is necessary for the efficient management of scarce resources for improved crop production in the Indian scenario because the faster decline in natural resources and climate change are the major concerns. It would be better to ascertain a high energy efficient output system with low energy input requirement and that would be an economically viable and livelihood for the farmers of Uttar Pradesh in India. The greenhouse gas emissions (GHGE) are major contributors to climate change. Therefore, there is a need to select suitable crop and cropping sequences; these are lessening the production of greenhouse gases. Scientific management of available resources in the most judicious manner ensures food security protects the environment from sequestering GHGs and mitigates emissions to some extent. In high-intensified cropping systems pulses, oilseed, green manure crop dhaincha, and fodder crops should add to build up underground carbon, higher aerial biomass production results in the reduction in of GHG emissions through the addition of organic carbon in the soil [40].The farmyard manure (FYM) and vermicompost (VC) were used to meet the nutrient demand of the crops and cropping sequences. This is concurrent with the finding that the integration of sustainable crop practices and cropping systems could reduce energy use and thereby GHG emissions [4].The net greenhouse gas emission from the different cropping sequences varied due to the use of, organic manures (Farmyard manure, biofertilizers, and vermicompost) and crop residues, chemical fertilizers, pesticides, mechanical farm tools, and implements, and biofuel/fossil fuel (diesel/ petrol) operated machines were used under different cropping sequences. Whereas, biomass/farmyard manure and vermicompost incorporated into the soil served as a sink for carbon sequestration and aided in mitigating GHG emissions. Sequestration of carbon(C) in agricultural soil can be promoted with the application of organic manure, crop residues, and balanced nutrients as reported by [26].

Material and Methods

The purpose of this study was to determine the amount of energy ingested i.e. the amount of inputs and outputs used in different cropping sequences to make an economic analysis at ICAR-Indian Institute of Farming Systems Research, Modipuram, Uttar Pradesh for a period of 4 consecutive years (2017-18 to 2020-21). The experiment site (29° 43' N latitude and 77° 23' E longitude at an elevation of 237 m above mean sea level) is classified as semi-arid sub-tropical with monsoonal climate and sandy loam soil classified as Typicusforthents. During the experimental period, the site received total annual rainfalls of 730.3mm, 976.7mm, 824.3mm, and 897.5mm in 37, 44, 42, and 44 rainy days, respectively. More than 80% of rainfall was received through the southwest monsoon. The mean annual minimum and maximum temperatures ranged between 18.1 °C and 30.7 °C (2017-18), 17.4 °C and 30.5 °C (2018-19), 17.0 °C and 29.9 °C (2019-20) and 16.9 °C and 30.2 °C (2020-21). While the humidity stands at 72.7%, 72.7%, 74.2%, and 75.2% in respective years (Fig.1). The mean over a period of 4 years of sunshine hours were 6.3 and pan evaporation (mm) was higher (1575.45mm) than normal annual rainfall. The total soil organic carbon (TSOC) was 0.89% (CHNS analyzer). Available N (176.6kg/ha) was estimated by alkaline permanganate (KMnO4) method. Similarly, available soil P (29.3 kg/ha) was analyzed by [13] method and available soil K (194.7 kg/ha) was estimated by NH4OAc method.



Fig1: Annual average meteorological data recorded at Agromet Observatory, ICAR-IIFSR, Modipuram

Energy inputs estimations were based on the human labour requirement, use of different types of machinery and quantity of materials, energy calculation was computed though using of different input and output energy equivalents.

Manual energy (*Em*) was determined through using of following formula [12].

Em= 1.96Nm TmMJ

Where, Nm= Number of labour spent on a farm activity, Tm= useful time spent by a labour on a farm activity. h.

The energy coefficients used in the calculations are presented in Table1. The total manual labour was recorded in each operation with working hours, which was converted in man – hour. All other factors affecting manual energy were neglected. Mechanical energy input was evaluated by quantifying the amount of diesel fuel consumed during the tillage, sowing, threshing, and winnowing as prescribed methodology. The total time spent was also recorded during irrigation. Hence, for every farm operation, the diesel fuel energy input was determined by:

Ef= 56.31DMJ

Where, 56.31=unit energy value of diesel, MJ^{-1}; D = amount of diesel consumed, L.

Energy value for various input and output use in the experiments is given Table1.The total energy input for a given cropping system was calculated by adding the energy requirement for human labour, insecticides, seeds, irrigation, farm yard manure (FYM), Vermicompost (VC), fertilizers, and diesel, used in the individual cropping sequence .The energy output was calculated by accumulating the main products and by products produced from the different crops in cropping sequences.

Subtracting input energy from output energy derived the net returns of energy. The output: input ratio was worked out by dividing the total energy used for raising the crop in the unit area (Table2). The energy input and output were computed as Mega Joule (MJ) by using different formulae. The energy efficiency (EE) and specific energy (SE) were worked out as per [6].

The methodologies for estimating GHG emitted from the activities, the data are based on the methodologies provided in the agriculture section of the IPCC 2006 and IPCC 1996 Revised Guidelines. Country-specific emission coefficient (Tier III) and IPCC default coefficient was applied to get the total emission from each crop and cropping sequences. The Indian Institute of Farming Systems, Research, Modipuram, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh using the IPCC guidelines designed emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs) was estimated from the various crops. The data were worked out based on the already available predicted value, fertilizer usage, machinery usage and chemical usage for different crops. The greenhouse gas emissions from different cropping sequences were converted into carbon dioxide equivalent for their comparison.

Emission = A × EF

Where,

Emission =Annual emission in units of kg of CO_2 eq. per farm

A = Activity data (kg of N used, liters of fuel used etc.)

EF-Emission

Factor = IPCC default emission factors or Country-specific emission factors.

Table 1. Equivalent coefficient for various input sources of energy used for energy calculation under different cropping sequences

Inputs	Unit	Energy equivalent (MJ unit^{-1})	References
Human labour			
Human labour (Male)	h	1.96	[10]
Human labour (Female)	h	1.57	[10]
Harvesting	h	1.96	[34]
Spraying	h	1.96	[29]
Transportation	kg	1.08	[28]
Water	m^3	1.02	[42]
Cultural practices	h	1.96	[34]
Machinery			
Sprayer	h	0.50	[20]
Tractor	h	64.80	[26]
Sickle	h	0.83	[20]
Farm machinery	kg	62.70	[41]
Electricity	KWH	11.93	[24]
Electric motor (Two horsepower)	kg	64.80	[8]
Machinery (All kind)	kg	68.40	[34]
Diesel	l	56.31	[5]
Chemical fertilizers			
Nitrogen(N)	kg	60.60	[39]
Phosphorus(P_2O_5)	kg	11.10	[39]
Potassium(K_2O)	kg	6.70	[8]
Zinc sulphate (ZnSo4)	kg	20.90	[34]
Plant protection			
Fungicide	kg	97	[45]
Herbicides	kg	288	[28]
Insecticide	kg	237	[45]
Organic fertilizers			
Manure/FYM	kg	0.30	[41]
Vermicompost	kg	0.50	[20]
Biofertilizers	kg	2.98	[17]
Sugarcane seed	kg	2.00	[34]
Seed cutting &stalk (sugarcane)	kg	1.20	[30]
Wheat seed	kg	14.70	[34]
Paddy seed	kg	14.70	[34]
Dhaincha seed	kg	14.70	[18]
Pigeonpea seed	kg	14.70	[33]
Maize seed	kg	14.70	[34]
Chickpea seed	kg	25.00	[38]
Lady finger (seed)	kg	25.60	[31]
Berseem seed	kg	10.00	[34]
Black gram seed	kg	13.96	[11]
Sorghum seed	kg	12.60	18)
Mustard seed	kg	25.00	[18]
Green gram seed	kg	14.70	[33]
Napier seed(cuttings)	kg	2.00	[34]
Cowpea seed	kg	14.70	[34]

Table 2. Equivalent coefficient for various outputs for energy calculation under different cropping sequences

Outputs	Unit	Energy equivalent (MJ unit^{-1})	References
Sugarcane	kg (harvested mass)	5.30	[18]
Sugarcane leaves and tops	kg (dry mass)	15.10	[35]
Wheat grain	kg	14.70	[34]
Wheat straw	kg	12.50	[22]
Paddy grain	kg	14.70	[14]
Paddy straw	kg	12.50	[34]
Dhaincha dry matter	kg	18.00	[18]
Pigeonpea seed	kg	14.70	[33]
Fuel wood (pigeon pea)	kg	12.50	[8]
Chickpea seed	kg	25.00	[38]
Chickpea by product	kg	12.50	[16]
Sorghum by product (dry matter basis)	kg	12.50	[9]
Sorghum (silage) fresh	kg	3.10	[3]
Lady finger (fruit)	kg	1.60	[18]
Lady finger dry biomass	kg	18.00	[7]
Maize grain	kg	14.70	[8]
Maize straw	kg	12.50	[22]
Berseem green fodder	kg	2.30	[18]
Black gram seed	kg	13.96	[11]
Black gram straw	kg	12.5	[8]
Sorghum(fodder)	kg(dry mass)	18.0	[18]
Sorghum (silage) fresh	kg	3.10	[3]
Mustard seed	kg	25.00	[18]
Mustard straw	kg	12.50	[18]
Green gram seed	kg	14.70	[33]
Green gram straw	kg	11.23	[36]
Napier	kg(dry mass)	18.00	[18]
Green fodder (Cowpea)	kg (fresh mass)	2.30	[15]

Results and Discussion

Energy input consumed in the cropping sequences: Details of the energy equivalent (conversion coefficient) of all inputs used in the different cropping sequences are shown in (Table 3). The relative amount of energy inputs in all cropping sequences involved 12.28% to 21.01 % for human labor (HL), 11.17% to 22.71% energy incurred in tractor/ diesel consumption, energy consumed in chemical fertilizers ranged between from13.86% to 21.74%, input energy in the form of pesticides used from 4.86% to 32.18%, energy inputs used in supplied of irrigations were diverse from 7.71% to 27.87% and it depends upon the water requirement of each crop and growing duration. Energy consumed for using farmyard manure (FYM) to grow crops was found at 8.68% to 26.08%, VC (Vermicompost) supplied in the crop production required energy value to the tune from 5.26% to 26.31% under various cropping sequences. The crucial energy input like seed was used in crop production and required the highest in sugarcane-ratoon-wheat sequence from 5.83% to 54.65% in sorghum-mustard- green gram when compared with other cropping sequences. Similarly[24] found that inputs energy differed with the cropping sequences due to varying energy coefficients, the highest was being in rice-wheat-dhaincha (R-W-D) system (39.52×10^{3}MJ ha^{-1}) and well ahead by sugarcane-ratoon wheat (S-R-W) system (37.33×10^{3}MJha^{-1}) and the lowest in Napier+cowpea/berseem cropping sequence(29.05×10^{3}MJha^{-1}). Energy consumption for irrigation (71.199MJha^{-1}), fertilizer (47.992MJha^{-1}), tractor/diesel (28.115MJha^{-1}) and seed (20.944MJha^{-1}) were the prime factors responsible for putting the crops and cropping sequences in the highest position in terms of total energy requirement for the production main and byproducts.

Table 3. Mean (of four years) inputs requirements of the individual crops grown during (Pooled mean 2017-18 and 2020-21)

Cropping system	Human labour(h)	Tractor (h) and diesel(l)	Fertilizers (kg)	Pesticide (l)	Irrigation (m^3)	Farm yard manure (kg)	VC (kg)	Seed (kg)	Total input energy ($\times10^3$ MJ ha^{-1})
Sugarcane – ratoon-wheat									
Sugarcane	0.947	2.804	6.055	0.306	11.280	1.500	0.375	9.877	33.14
Wheat	0.595	2.104	4.381	0.102	3.570	1.500	0.375	1.570	14.19
Rice- wheat-dhaincha									
Rice	0.893	1.166	3.502	0.204	13.260	-	-	1.445	20.47
Wheat	0.478	1.264	4.208	0.306	5.130	1.500	0.375	1.570	14.83
Dhaincha	0.089	0.896	1.545	-	1.457	-	-	0.234	4.22
Pigeonpea+ maize- chickpea- okra									
Pigeonpea+ maize	0.392	2.104	1.790	0.051	3.315	0.750	0.375	0.294	9.07
Chickpea	0.392	1.309	2.006	0.051	1.632	0.750	0.625	0.960	7.72
Okra	0.047	2.974	3.530	0.600	3.825	1.500	0.625	0.512	13.61
Maize- berseem –black gram									
Maize	0.549	2.127	4.503	0.204	1.785	0.750	0.625	0.360	10.90
Berseem	0.580	1.515	1.073	0.002	1.028	1.500	0.625	0.750	16.32
Black gram	0.533	0.791	1.078	0.255	2.678	1.500	0.625	0.349	7.80
Sorghum- mustard- green gram									
Sorghum	0.392	1.734	2.780	0.004	4.250	1.500	0.625	0.756	12.04
Mustard	0.298	2.449	3.146	0.102	1.786	1.500	0.625	0.100	10.00
Green gram	0.219	1.735	0.873	-	2.678	1.500	0.625	0.367	7.99
Napier + cowpea / berseem									
Napier+ Cowpea/ Berseem	0.941	3.143	7.522	-	13.525	1.500	0.625	1.800	29.05

System-wise input energy requirement: Energy inputs consumed in different cropping sequences as reported in Table 4. The computation of energy-linked inputs that were used for the crop production revealed that the total energy inputs were highest in the case of the sugarcane-ratoon-wheat(S-R-W) system because of this cropping pattern has the maximum demand of all inputs (47769MJha^{-1} year^{-1}) when comparison was made with other cropping sequences and the next cropping sequence which needed bulk energy inputs was rice-wheat-dhaincha(R-W-D) i.e. (39522 MJ ha^{-1} year^{-1}). Despite this, the least input energy was spent in maize-berseem- black gram (25785MJha^{-1} year^{-1}).The reason for the declined in inputs use energy was a selection of crops like berseem, and black gram as compared to high demanding energy inputs crops like sugarcane, rice, wheat and maize. Among the energy inputs, irrigation, fertilizers, and tractor/diesel are having primary importance for output production. The total input energy was highest spent towards irrigations (35.43%), fertilizers (23.89%), tractor/ diesel (14.00%) and seed (10.42%), respectively. In fact, irrigation input energy is required highest for the crop production because some crops have been involved in sequences they have high demands of irrigation than others. The cost of energy input of different crops and cropping sequences can be reduced by the selection of apposite sequences. The total annual energy inputs for the cropping sequences ranged from about 47769 MJha^{-1} yea^{-1} sugarcane-ratoon- wheat (S-R-W) to 25785MJha^{-1} year^{-1}in maize- berseem- black gram (M-B-BG). It is generally, pragmatic that short span crops like legumes and oilseeds have lowest demand for energy inputs than other crops *viz*. sugarcane, rice, maize, wheat etc.[41] described that wheat required more energy than other crops.

Table 4. System wise input energy and total energy consumed in the different cropping sequences (MJha^{-1})

Cropping sequence	Human energy (MJ ha^{-1})	Tractor/ Diesel energy (MJ ha^{-1})	Seed energy (MJ ha^{-1})	Fertilizer energy (MJ ha^{-1})	Pesticides Energy (MJ ha^{-1})	Irrigation energy (MJ ha^{-1})	FYM energy (MJ ha^{-1})	VC (MJ ha^{-1})	Total energy consumed (MJ ha^{-1})
S-R-W	1542	4908	11447	10436	408	14778	3500	750	47769
R-W-D	1460	3326	3249	9255	510	19847	1500	375	39522
P+M-C-O	831	6387	1766	7326	702	8772	3000	1625	30409
M-B-BG	1662	4433	1459	6654	461	5491	3750	1875	25785
S-M-GG	909	5918	1223	6799	106	8714	3625	1875	29169
N+C+B	941	3143	1800	7522	-	13525	625	625	28172

***Note:**S-R-W(Sugarcane-ratoon-wheat); R-W-D(Rice-wheat-dhaincha);P+M-C-O (Pigeonpea + maize-chickpea-okra);M-B-BG(Maize- berseem-black gram);S-M-GG(Sorghum-mustard- green gram);N+C+B (Napier+ cowpea/berseem)*

Wheat equivalent yield: The pooled analysis data indicated that the annual wheat equivalent yield of sugarcane-ratoon-wheat (S-R-W) sequence was significantly higher than rest of the crop rotations (Table 5). Since the sugarcane have the higher yield potential and market value than other crops which were included in different cropping sequences. The divergent crops were grown among the different cropping sequences, so that the main and byproducts yields of all crops were converted into wheat equivalent yield (WEY t ha^{-1}) on the basis of prevailing market price of each commodity. Similar results were also reported by [2] [37] in cropping sequences. The wheat grain prices were comparable parameter with other farm produces and their market worth in order to take the wheat values equivalent to other crops produces at par because productivity and market values were different among themselves. The wheat equivalent yield (WEY t/ha) was highest with sugarcane-ratoon-wheat cropping sequence (125.58t ha^{-1}year^{-1}) followed by Pigeonpea-chickpea-okra (29.02 t ha^{-1} year^{-1}) and minimum wheat equivalent yield (WEY) was estimated with Napier + cowpea+ berseem (2.47tha^{-1} year^{-1}). This might be due to under this cropping sequence consisted mainly by fodder crops rather than valuable crops. The equivalent wheat yield is governed by quantity of produce and its prevailing price and combined effect of these two ultimately led to maximum equivalent yield. This finding corroborates the observations of [23].

Table 5. Details of outputs as main and by-products and wheat equivalent yield and energy returns from the different cropping sequences in western Upper Gangetic Plains of India

Cropping sequences	*Kharif*	rabi	Summer	Energy Equivalent (×10^3 MJ ha^{-1} year^{-1})	*Kharif*	rabi	Summer	Energy Equivalent (×10^3 MJ ha^{-1} year^{-1})	WEY (t ha^{-1})	Total Energy Equivalent (×10^3 MJ ha^{-1} year^{-1})
Sugarcane-ratoon-wheat										
Main product (kg)					*Byproducts (kg)*					
Sugarcane	-	-	760000	402.80	-	-	11400	34.42	118.95	437.23
Wheat	-	4944	-	72.68		6944	-	86.80	6.63	159.47
Rice-wheat-dhaincha										
Rice	5667	-	-	81.83	7667	-	-	95.83	7.05	177.66
Wheat	-	4556	-	66.97	-	5639	-	70.49	6.18	137.46
Dhaincha	-	-	2916	52.49	-	-	-		2.16	52.49
Pigeonpea- chickpea- okra										
Pigeonpea	1389	-	-	20.42	8544	-		106.80	5.38	127.22
Chickpea	-	2500	-	62.50		3222	-	40.27	6.65	102.77
Okra	-	-	12667	20.26	-		1658	29.84	16.99	50.10
Maize- berseem- black gram										
Maize	7028	-		103.31	5961			74.51	7.73	177.82
Berseem	-	68000	-	156.40	-	-			9.07	156.40
Black gram	-	-	889	12.41	1847	-		23.08	2.96	35.49
Sorghum- mustard- green gram										
Sorghum	48000	-	-	148.80	-	-			4.26	148.80
Mustard		3089	-	77.22	-	4161	-	52.01	7.73	129.23
Green gram	-	-	867	12.74	-	-	2561	28.76	4.02	41.50
Napier+ cowpea/ berseem										
Napier+ cowpea/ berseem	6208	5760	6560	333.50	-	-	-		2.47	333.50
								SEm ±	16.28	
								CD (*P*=0.05)	39.88	

Energy outputs of cropping sequences: The total output energy was highest in sugarcane-ratoon-wheat cropping sequence (597.70 GJ ha^{-1} year^{-1}) followed by rice-wheat-dhaincha (463.44GJha^{-1} year^{-1}), maize- berseem- black gram (369.71GJha^{-1} year^{-1}) and Napier + berseem/cowpea (333.50 GJ/ha) as detailed in Fig.2. The lowest energy output was shared by sorghum - mustard- green gram (319.53GJha^{-1} year^{-1}) and pigeonpea+ maize- chickpea- okra (280.09GJha^{-1} year^{-1}). However, the main output energy from the different cropping sequences has paid more than their byproduct's outcome energy. The perceptible output energy wasproduced where sugarcane, rice, wheat, maize, and mustard crops were composed with other crops in the cropping sequences. The total energy production from the different crops and cropping systems varied from 25.25% to 11.85%. However, maximum total energy output was contributed by the sugarcane-ratoon- wheat sequence (4 years) as compared to other cropping sequences. The main season of production of high energy output from this system was due to greater potential of sugarcane alone than remaining crops which were included in the various configurations.



Fig.2:Cropping systems adopted in Upper Gangetic Plains of India

Energy input-output relationship: The total inputs and outputs energy of different cropping sequences were varied depending up on the crops involved and the practices used (Table 6). However, resource inputs energy was disbursed highest in sugarcane- ratoon- wheat (47.33-×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}) as compared to rest of the systems. The minimum input energy was used in Napier+cowpea/ berseem (29.05-×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}) sequence because demands of the chemical fertilizers, irrigation, tractor/ diesel and seed were smaller than other cropping sequences. Apart from these, there were no use of insecticides and pesticides in case of fodder crops leading to decline in input energy consumption. Besides, during *Kharif* season requirement of irrigation was meagre and nutrients requirement of Napier hybrid bajra was met through intercropping of legumes (cowpea and berseem) concurrently in *Kharif* and *rabi* seasons. Similarly, output energy was generated highly in sugarcane-ratoon- wheat cropping sequence and followed by maize- berseem- black gram(369.71×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}), rice-wheat- dhaincha (367.61×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}) and Napier + cowpea/ berseem(333.50×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}). The lowest output energy was given by Pigeonpea + maize- chickpea- ladyfinger (okra) crop sequence (280.09-×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}).

The net energy was highest in sugarcane-ratoon-wheat (549.37×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}) and thereafter in maize- berseem- black gram (334.67×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}) and rice-wheat- dhaincha (328.09×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}). The system net energy was minimum under pigeonpea+ maize- chickpea-okra (249.77×10^3MJha^{-1} year^{-1}). This might be due to these crops are highly exhausted towards required inputs and lesser responsive to output energy led to less net energy in the system. The output energy was declined to the tune of 61.39%, 62.31 and 78.92% with maize-berseem- black gram, rice-wheat- dhaincha and Napier + cowpea/ berseem cropping sequences over to sugarcane-ratoon – wheat. Similarly, system net energy returns was declined in the tune of 64.15 %, 67.44 %, 80.44%, 89.77% and 119.95% with maize-berseem- black gram, rice- wheat-dhaincha, Napier + cowpea/berseem, sorghums-mustard-green gram and Pigeonpea+ maize- chickpea- okra cropping sequences over sugarcane-ratoon-wheat system. Similar results were also reported by [1] [42]. The output- input ratio was highest in sugarcane-ratoon-wheat system (12.60) and closely followed by Napier + cowpea/ berseem(11.48), sorghums-mustard- green gram(10.68), maize- berseem- black gram(10.55) and lowest output-input ration was in pigeonpea + maize- chickpea- okra(8.23) and rice-wheat- dhaincha(8.30). The energy profitability was computed by system net energy returns and system input energy consumed. Numerically, maximum energy profitability was accounted with sugarcane-ratoon-wheat (11.60) followed by Napier+ cowpea/berseem (10.48) and sorghum-mustard- green gram (9.63). The least energy profitability was in pigeonpea+ maize-chickpea-ladyfinger (8.23). The sugarcane- ratoon- wheat and maize-berseem- black gram systems were more efficient (1657.50 and 1421.96) than other cropping sequences due to high output energy and longest crop duration resulting in maximum times land occupied by the combination of crops and cropping sequences. Similar, results were earlier reported by [21] in various cropping sequences.

Table 6. System wise total inputs energy, total outputs energy and net energy return of different cropping sequences (Data pooled over 4 years)

Cropping sequence	System input energy (×103MJ ha^{-1} year^{-1})	System output energy (×103MJ ha^{-1} year^{-1})	System net energy returns (×103MJ ha^{-1} year^{-1})	Energy ratio	Energy profitability	Energy output efficiency
CS1:Sugarcane-ratoon -wheat	47.33	596.70	549.37	12.60	11.60	1657.50
CS2:Rice-wheat-dhaincha	39.52	367.61	328.09	9.30	8.30	1225.36
CS3:Pigeonpea+ maize- chickpea- ladyfinger okra)	30.32	280.09	249.77	9.23	8.23	856.54
CS4:Maize- berseem- black gram	35.04	369.71	334.67	10.55	9.55	1421.96
CS5:Sorghum- mustard- green gram	30.04	319.53	289.49	10.63	9.63	1125.10
CS6:Napier+ cowpea+ berseem	29.05	333.50	304.45	11.48	10.48	913.69

Assessment of greenhouse gas emission from different cropping sequences

The result exposed that under different cropping sequences, the rice-wheat system had produced the highest GHGs (1304 kg CO_2-e from 1800 m^2 area) among cropping sequences. Another important cropping sequence was sugarcane-ratoon-wheat (641 kg CO_2-e from 3500 m^2 area) which was responsible for higher emission of GHGs (641 kg CO_2-e from 1800 m^2 area). However, lower CO_2-e emission was valued from 400m^2 area where perennial fodder component hybrid bajra Napier planted in cropping sequences (33kg CO_2-e) which contributed up to 1% of the total GHGs emission). This might be due to the minimum use of chemical fertilizers and other inputs in fodder-based cropping sequence and the demand of plant nutrients by Napier grass was fulfilled through intercropping of cowpea and berseem in respective seasons (*Kharif* and rabi) seasons (Table 7). Among the cropping sequences, the contribution of greenhouse emissions by individual crops varied from 1% (Napier+cowpea/berseem) to 44% (rice). However, three major crops, namely rice, wheat and sugarcane were extremely responsible for the increasing production of global warming gases (CH4, CO2, CO, NH3 and N2O) Out of the 13 crops, three crops were found to highly responsible for the greenhouse gases emitted in terms of quantity (75%) whilst remaining 9 crops had emitted only (25%) of the total greenhouse gases in this study(Fig 3).

This might be because they have produced more carbon and higher carbon sequestration. They are legumes and pulses crops in the cropping sequences and other crops where cereals result in less carbon sequestration into the soil and higher demand for chemical inputs. From South Africa reported that Production of cereal crops accounts for 68% of national total field crops' GHG emissions followed by other field crops (14%), legumes and oilseeds (11%) and vegetables (7%). Cultivations of maize, wheat and sugarcane result in highest commodity emissions.



Fig 3. Contribution of CO2-e by different cropping sequences

Table 7. Net GHG emission (CO2-e in kg) under different cropping sequences

Area allocated under different cropping sequences (m^2) and (%)	Cropping sequences	CO2-e (Kg)
3500m^2(33.65%)	Sugarcane-ratoon-wheat	641
1800m2(17.33%)	Rice-wheat	1308
1800m2(17.33%)	Maize- chickpea- okra	232
1100m2 (10.57%)	Maize- berseem- black gram	203
1800m2(17.33%)	Sorghum- mustard – green gram	126
400m2(3.84)	Napier+ cowpea/ berseem	33

Note: Total area under different cropping sequences was 1.04ha

Conclusion

The outcome revealed that energy consumption for irrigation (71.199MJ ha^{-1}), fertilizer(47.992MJ ha^{-1}), tractor/diesel (28.115MJ ha^{-1}),and seed (20.944MJ ha^{-1}) were the prime factors responsible for putting the crops and cropping sequences in the highest position in terms of total energy requirement for the main and byproducts of sugarcane-ratoon- wheat cropping sequence. The crucial input like seed used in sugarcane required 54.65% energy alone as compared to other energy inputs. However, the highest input energy was used in the sugarcane-ratoon-wheat cropping sequence (47.33×10^3MJ ha^{-1}) followed by rice- wheat – dhaincha (39.52×10^3MJ ha^{-1}). The total output energy (597.70 GJ ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$) and net energy returns (463.44 GJ ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$) were highest with this sequence. Similarly, energy output efficiency (1657.50), output-input ratio (12.60), and wheat equivalent yield (125.58t ha^{-1}) were highest under the same system. However, it would be better to ascertain a high energy efficient output system with low energy input requirement that could be an economically viable and livelihood for the farmers of the Upper Gangetic Plains of India.

Acknowledgement

Authors are thankful to Director, ICAR-Indian Institute of Farming Systems Research, Modipuram, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh for providing the necessary infrastructural facilities for accomplishment this project.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funding agency had no role in designing of this study or interpretation of data or in the writing of the manuscript, or in taking the decision to publish the results.

References

1. AfzaliniaSadegh, KarimiAbdolhamid.2020. Barley Cultivars and Seed Rates Effects on Energy and Water Productivity of Green Fodder Production under Hydroponic Condition. Indian Journal of Agricultural Research, 54(6): 792-796.

2. AnishetraSandesha, Kalaghatagi S.B. 2021.Evaluation of Sesame (Sesamumindicum L.) Based Intercropping Systems with Millets by Varying Row Proportions under Dry Condition. Indian Journal of Agricultural Research, 55(4): 501-504.

3. Bazaluk, O., Havrysh,V., Fedorchuk, M.,Nitsenko, V.2021. Energy Assessment of sorghum cultivation in Southern Ukraine. Agriculture, 11: 695.

4. Camargo, G.G.T., Ryan, M. R. and Richard, T.L.2013. Energy use and greenhouse gas emissions from crop production using the farm energy analysis tool. Biosciences, 63 (4):263-273.

5. Canakci,M. and Akinci, I.2003. Energy use patter analysis of greenhouse vegetables production. Energy, 31:1243-1256.

6. Dazhong, W.and Pimental, D. 1984. Energy flow through an organic farming ecosystem in China.Agriculture Ecosystem Environment.11:145-160.

7. Devasenapathy, P., Ramesh,T. and Gangwar, B. 2008. In: Efficiency indices for agriculture management research. New India Publishing Agency, New Delhi.

8. Devasenapathy,P., SenthilKumarG., and Shanmugam, P.M.2009. Energy management in crop production. Indian Journal of Agronom, 54(1):80-90.

9. Fisher, B.S., Nakicenovic, N., Alfsen, K., CorfeeMorlot, J., DE LA Chesnaye, F., Ch. Hourcade, J., Jiang, K., Kainuma, M.,LaRovere, E., Matysek,A., Rana, A., Riahi, K., Richels, R., Rose, S., van Vuuren, D. and Warren, R.2007.Energy utilization pattern for sustainable crop production in the Semi-Arid Vertisols of India. Issue related to mitigation in the long-term context. In Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change' (Eds. B.Metz, O.R. Davidson,P.R.Bosch , R. Dave and L.A.Meyer) pp.171-250.(CambridgeUniversityPress: Cambridge).

10. Ghosh,D., Brahmachari, K., Das,A., Hassan, M.M., Mukherjee, P.K., Sarkar, S., Dinda, N.K., Pramanik, B., Moulick,D., Maitra, S., Hossain, A. 2021. Assessment of energy budgeting and its indicator for sustainable nutrient and weed management in a rice-maize-green gram cropping system. Agronomy, 11(1):166.

11. Gopalan, C., Rama Sastri, B. and Balasubramanian, B.2006. Nutritional value of Indian Foods, National Institute of Nutrition. Indian Council of Medical Research: Hyderabad, India.

12. Gopalan, C., Shashtry, B.V.R., Balasubramaniam, S.C.1987.Nutritive value of Indian foods. Hyderabad: National Institute of Nutrition, ICMR.

13. Jackson, M.L.1973.Soil Chemical Analysis. Prentice hall of India Pvt. LTD.,New Delhi, 498:151-154.

14. Jackson, T.M., Khan, S.andHafee, M. 2010. A comparative analysis of water application and energy consumption at the irrigated field level. Agri Water Management, 97:1477-1485.

15. Lal,B., Rajput, . S., Tamhankar, M. B., Agrawal, I.and Sharma, M. S.2003. Energy use and output assessment of food-forage production systems. Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science, 189:57-62.

16. Mandal,K.G., Saha, K.P.,Ghose, P.K., Hati, K.M. and Bandyopadhyay.2002. Bioenergy and economic analysis of Soybean – based crop production system in Central India. Biomass and Bioenergy,23:337-345.

17. Mihov, M., Antonova, G., Masheva, S. and Yankova, V. 2012. Energy assessment of conventional and organic production of head cabbage. Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 18: 320–324.

18. Mittal, V.K., Mittal, J. P. and Dhawan, K.C.1985. Research digests on energy requirements in agricultural sector. Coordinating cell, AICRP on energy requirements in agricultural sector. Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana.

19. Mphethe Tonwane, Thandile Mdlambuzi, Mokhele Moeletsi, Mitsuru T suba.2016. Greenhouse gas emission from different crop production and management practices in South Africa. Environmental development, 19:23-35.

20. Nassiri, S.M. and Singh, S. 2009. Study on energy use efficiency for paddy crop using data envelopment analysis (DEA) technique. Appl. Energy, 86 1320–1325.

21. Negi, S.C., Rana, S.S., Kumar, A., Subehia, S.K. and Sharma, S.K. 2016. Productivity and energy efficiency indices of diversified maize (*Zea mays*) - based cropping systems of Himachal Pradesh. Indian Journal of Agronomy, 61: 9-14.

22. Nisar, S., Benbi, D.K. and Toor, A.S.2021. Energy budgeting and carbon footprints of three tillage systems in maize-wheat sequence of northwestern Indo-Gangetic Plains. Energy 229, 12066.1.

23. Ozkan, B., Fert, C., andKaradeniz, C. F. 2007. Energy and cost analysis for greenhouse and open-field grape production. Energy, 32: 1500–1504.

24. Ozkan, B., Kurklu, A. and Akcaoz, H. 2004. An input–output energy analysis in greenhouse vegetable production: a case study for Antalya region of Turkey. Biomass and Bioenergy, 26: 89–95.

25. Ozkan, B., Akcaoz, H. and Karadeniz, F.2004. Energy requirement and economic analysis of citrus production in Turkey. Energy Conversion Manage, 45: 1821-1830.

26. Pathak, H., Mishra, J.P. and Mohapatra, T. 2022. Indian Agriculture after Independence. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi 110 001, pp 426.

27. Pathak,H. 2022. Impact, adaptation, and mitigation of climate change in Indian Agriculture. Environ Monit Assess, 1:195(1):52.

28. Pimentel, D. and Burgess, M. 1980. Energy inputs in corn production. Pimentel D (Ed). *Handbook of Energy Utilization in Agriculture*, pp 67–84. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

29. Ram, R.A.and Verma, A.K.2015.Energy, input, output and economic analysis in organic production of mango (*Mangifera indica*) cv. Dashehari. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 85(6):827-832.

30. Ricaud, R. 1980. Energy input and output for sugarcane in Louisiana, Pimentel, D. (Ed.), Handbook of Energy Utilization in Agriculture, Boca Raton, FL., CRC Press, pp: 135-136.

31. Roy, D.C., Ray, M., Sarkar, U. and Patra, B.C.2015. Bio-energy productivity and economics of rice (Oryzasartiva)- based cropping systems in coastal flood plain of West Bengal, India. International Journal of Bio-resource and stress management, 6(1):001-006.

32. Shah, F.and Wu, W. 2019. Soil and Crop Management Strategies to Ensure Higher Crop Productivity within Sustainable Environments. Sustainability. 11:1485.

33. Singh, M.K., Pal, S.K., Thakur, R. and Verma, U.N. 1997. Energy input-output relationship of cropping systems. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 67:262–264.

34. Singh, S. and Mittal, J. P. 1992. Energy in production agriculture. Mittal Publications, New Delhi, India, pp. 6-12.

35. Smithers, J. 2014. Review of sugarcane trash recovery systems for energy cogeneration in South Africa. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 32: 915–925.

36. Soni, P., Taewichit, C. and Salokhe, V. M. 2013. Energy consumption and CO2 emissions in rain-fed agricultural production systems of Northeast Thailand. Agricultural Systems, 116: 25 –36.

37. Sujathamma P., Nedunchezhiyan M. 2024. Evaluation of Sorghum based Intercropping Systems for Rainfed Vertisols . Indian Journal of Agricultural Research, 58(2): 290-294.

38. Thyagaraj, C.R.2012. Enhancing energy use efficiency through conservation agriculture. In ICAR sponsored training course on 'Conservation Agriculture Strategies for Resource Conservation and Mitigation of Climate Change' CRIDA Hyderabad, 24-30 September, pp: 229-240.

39. Toader, M. and Gheorghe, L.2014. Researches the efficacy of the technologic process of cereal straw briquetting. UPB Sci. Bull. D. Mech. Energy, 76: 239–246.

40. Toma, Y., Sari, N.N., Akamatsu, K., Oomori, S., Ngata, O., Nishimura, S., Purwanto, B. and Ueno, H.2019. Effects of green manure application and prolonging mid- season drainage on greenhouse gas emission from paddy fields in Ehime, Southwestern Japan. Agriculture, 9(2): 29-46.

41. Tuti, M. D., Vedprakash, B. M., Pandey, R., Bhattacharyya, D., Mahanta, J. K., Bisht, M. K., Mina, B. L., Kumar, N., Bhatt, J. C. and Srivastva, A. K. 2012. Energy budgeting of colocasia-based cropping systems in the Indian sub-Himalayas. Energy, 45: 986–93.

42. Venkat Regatti, Mohan Sai S., Rahaman S., Vinayak M., Babu Hari B., Reddy Rami K.V.S. 2024. Energy Assessment of Manual Transplanting Rice and Dry Direct Seeding Rice Production Systems in Combined Nalgonda District, Telangana. Indian Journal of Agricultural Research, 58(1): 95-100.

43. Verma, S.R. 2006. Impact of Agricultural Mechanization on Production, Productivity, Cropping Intensity, Income Generation and Employment of Labour: Status of Farm Mechanization in India. Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, 133-153.Generation and Employment of Labour: Status of Farm Mechanization in India. Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, 133-153.

44. Walia, S.S., Gill, R.S., Aulakh, C.S. and Kaur, Mandeep.2014. Energy efficient indices of alternate cropping systems of North West India. Indian Journal of Agronomy, 59 (3):359-63.

45. West,T.O.and Marland, G.2002. A synthesis of carbon sequestration, carbon emission and net carbon flux in agriculture: Comparing tillage practices in the United States. Ecosystems and Environment, 91:217-232.