



The Evaluation of wheat losses harvesting in two conventional combine (John Deere 1165, 955) in Iran

Asadullah Mirasi ^{*1}, Mohammad Amin Asoodar ², Mousarreza samadi ³, Ehsan Kamran ⁴

¹Department of farm machinery, Faculty of Biosystems Engineering, Islamic Azad University, Lordegan Branch, Shahrecord, Iran.

²Department of Agricultural Machinery Engineering, Khuzestan Ramin Agriculture and Natural Resources University, Ahwaz, Khuzestan, Iran.

³Ph.D. Candidate in post-harvest, Department of Agricultural Machinery Engineering, University of Tabriz, Iran.

⁴Department of farm machinery, Faculty of Agriculture, Islamic Azad University, Ilam Branch, Ilam, Iran.

*Corresponding author: asadmirasi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Wheat is one of the most important food staff in consumption pattern of each country. More than 50 percent of energy is provided by bread in the developing countries. The aim of this study was measuring wheat losses during pre-harvest and harvest stages in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari province of Iran in year 2013. Wheat losses at harvest stages were measured to wheat varieties in 2 levels of Omid and Alvand were chosen and Combine types in 2 levels: JD 955 and JD 1165 while were chosen. The data analyzed using and means were compared using SAS Software's and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests were. The results showed that higher amount of losses were in the Omid variety and JD 955 with totally 6.83 % (307.4 kg ha⁻¹) that 10.5 % of them attributed on the cleaning, 34 % on Header, 16.5 % on Drum, 21 % on impurity and 18% broken grain losses. The lowest losses related to JD 1165 and Alvand variety with 3.97 % (178.66 kg ha⁻¹) that 10 % of them attributed on the cleaning, 38 % on Header, 13 % on Drum , 22 % on impurity and 17% broken grain losses. Also, average pre-harvest losses amount was in all fields the study 24.5 kg ha⁻¹ that 9.8 % of total losses represent the measured total losses Alvand 20.5 kg ha⁻¹ and the variety of Omid 28.5 kg ha⁻¹ respectively.

Keywords: Omid, Alvand, Header, Broken Grain, Cleaning, Total

INTRODUCTION

Wheat is the most prominent nutrition material in our food consumption. In fact, more than 50 percent of each Iranian nutrition material is provided by different kinds of breads. Fars province is the first producer of wheat in country, in addition to adjustable weather leader farmers, producer's effects; research finding and using the latest scientific results has a significant role in production. The under cultivation area of wheat in country in the year of 2005-2006 was estimated about 6.88 million hectare, and Khorasan

province with 9.4% of whole area wheat cultivation has the most area. Fars province and eastern Azarbaijan province with 8.5 and 6.4 % of whole wheat yield has the second and third place in country. However, in this year Fars province had second place in level but with 14.9 % of wheat production has had the first place while Khorasan and Golestan provinces with 8.2 and 6.4% has second and third place.

In Iran, most available combines in the agricultural mechanization branch is combine 955, of which the number is 10489 (Chegini, 2007). The country's increasing need for small and cheap combines with high performance is the most important major problems in cereals harvest that has been on Iran's fields (Anon, 2004; Chegini, 2006). On the other hand, the internal components frazzle of combine and supplying them is the major problem of this combine. Another common important point about using this combine in Iran is combine immigration from south to north and from east to west for harvesting crops. This issue, due to delay of harvesting, has been causing much loss (Behrozi et al., 1994; Chegini, 2006).

Rahimi & Khosravani (2003) survey from Fars province resulted average loss of wheat harvesting stage in Fars province was 4.81% of production. The maximum amount of loss related combine loss was 68% and after it the amount was for natural loss, sieve loss, drums loss then quality loss. Asghari Meydani (2003) investigated 2 types of combines (Class, John Deer) in two times of harvesting in time of 15 days on two kinds of dry land wheat. The results have indicated second time, means harvesting with delay comparing to first time has more loss while it increase about 9 kg h⁻¹ for each day.

Yavari and Poordad (2003) in a survey randomly investigated 61 combines (John Deer 955). According to finding in Kermanshah province there was an average 105.42 kg ha⁻¹ equal to 7.2% of loss resulted from harvesting. That was decreased to 29.06 kg ha⁻¹ equal to 3.31 % because of technical and agricultural points. Mansouri & Minaei (2003) investigated the effects of combine parameters on wheat loss in combine of John Deer. In this study the effects of combine ground speed, drum speed the distance between drum and concave and fan speed on loss amount were investigated. The results show with increasing ground speed cutting edge loss will increase dramatically.

Tavasoli and Minaei (2002) investigated effective factors on drum, separator and cleaner Performance and studied their effects on combine loss. The processing loss of combine (John Deer 955) manufactured by Iran-Arak Combine Company in 7 different levels of ground speed (from 1.3 to 3.5 km h⁻¹) for wheat harvesting was measured. Sheradian and Gulan (1991) carried out a study about harvesting hours and date influence on wheat loss in Pakistan. The results has indicated, the least loss was for the hours of 8-12 am while until 10 days after appropriate time, the loss was a little but after it because of harvesting delay, there is an increase in loss. In addition, grain moisture content in linear was decreased with a harvesting delay and resulted in grain loss.

Mohd (1997) investigated wheat loss during combine harvesting. They measured parameters like ground speed, drum speed, sieves openness rate, fan adjustment and grain moisture content. The results of their investigation pointed out among 55 studied combines no one adjusted like the others. The average of measured loss in first year was 9% while it was 12.7 in second year. The mentioned suitable moisture content for harvesting was about 9-14 %.

Masdari et al (2008) reported that the combine type and Wheat Variety with probability 61.2% showed a correlation between the types of combine harvesting wheat on mortality were influential. Khosravani and Rahimi (2003) reported that wheat, wheat harvest losses in the city and combines the correlation between they showed about 47% of total wheat losses, changes in the different fields of the elements combine, wheat and the city.

Materials and Methods

In this study, the effect of combine type and wheat variety on wheat loss during harvesting was investigated. This field study was performed in chaharmahal and bakhtiari province to evaluate wheat harvesting losses utilizing combine JD 955 and 1165. The adjustments were performed according to the combine operator manual. The farm yield was 4.5 ton ha⁻¹ and grain moisture content was 11-13% during experiments. Test was performed in a field about 5 hectare and combine ground speed according to crop density between 2.5- 3 km h⁻¹. For statistical analysis, there were used from statistical design of factorial in the completely randomized block design in 3 replications and Duncan test.

Different Wheat varieties in 2 levels of Omid and Alvand were chosen and Combine types in 2 levels: JD 955 and JD 1165 while were chosen. In each treatment following factors were measured and investigated: 1. Pre-harvest losses, 2. Header losses, 3. Drum losses, 4. Cleaning losses, 5. Broken Grain losses, 6. Impurity losses (straw and stubble) in the tank, 7. Total losses,

Results and Discussion

Pre-harvest losses

The average pre-harvest losses in all fields of study were 24.5 kg h⁻¹ which contains 9.8 % of total losses. The measured total losses for Alvand and Omid varieties were 20.5 kg h⁻¹ and 28.5 kg h⁻¹ respectively. Alvand variety losses were 16.3% lower than Omid variety, so this study illustrates importance of using resistant varieties against pre-harvest losses.

Header losses

Analyzing the variance of the effect different combine type and wheat variety on the losses in the combine Header is shown in Table 1. The effect of combine type and wheat variety and their interaction effect with probability level of 1 % are significant. The JD 955 combine with an average of 2.3 % losses (103.5 kg ha⁻¹) and JD 1165 combine with a mean of 1.85 % losses (83.4 kg ha⁻¹) were highest and lowest amounts allocated to header losses respectively. Also, the results showed that the average losses on the header losses for Alvand variety was 1.47 % (66.45 kg ha⁻¹) and the Omid variety was 1.74 % (78.3 kg ha⁻¹), respectively. Average header losses were 39.2 % of total, and it shows that most of the losses related to combine header.

Drum losses

Analyzing the variance of the effect different combines' type and wheat variety on the losses in the combine drum is shown in Table 2. The effects of combines' type and wheat variety with probability level of 1 % are significant. The highest amount of losses were in JD 955 with 0.76 % (34.6 kg ha⁻¹) and the lowest losses were in JD 1165 with 0.56 % (25.2 kg ha⁻¹), respectively. The average losses for drum unit of JD 1055 were 37 % lower than John Deere 955. The results showed that the average of drum losses were 0.21 % for Omid variety (9.45 kg ha⁻¹) and 0.15 % for Alvand variety (6.75 kg ha⁻¹) that were the highest and the lowest losses.

Cleaning Losses

Analyzing the variance of the effect combines type and wheat varieties on the losses in the combine cleaning is shown in Table 3. The effect of combines' type with probability level of 1 % is significant.

The JD 955 cleaning unit had the highest losses rate with 0.74 % (33.3 kg ha⁻¹) and the lowest losses related to JD 1165 with 0.51 % (22.96 kg ha⁻¹). So, JD 1165 cleaning unit losses were on average 38 percent lower than JD 955. The highest losses of cleaning unit related to Omid variety with 0.64 % (28.19 kg ha⁻¹) and the lowest losses amount related to Alvand variety with 0.43 % (19.35 kg ha⁻¹). So, Alvand variety losses were 19.9 % lower than Omid variety.

Broken grain losses

Analyzing the variance of the effect combines type and wheat varieties on the losses in the combine Broken grain is shown in Table 4. The effects of combines' type and wheat varieties' with probability level of 1 % are significant. JD 1165 with an average of 0.83 % (42.49 kg ha⁻¹) and JD 955 with an average of 1.21 % (61.95 kg ha⁻¹) had the highest and the lowest percent of broken grain to the tank. Omid variety had the highest amount of breakage with 0.99 % (52.56 kg ha⁻¹), and the lowest broken grain related Alvand variety with 0.61 % (32.39 kg ha⁻¹).

Impurity losses (straw and stubble) in the tank

Analyzing the variance of the effect combines type and wheat variety on the losses in the combine impurity is shown in Table 5. The effects of combine type and wheat varieties with probability level of 5 % are significant. JD 955 with an average of 1.45 % (71.68 kg ha⁻¹) and JD 1165 with an average of 1.11 % (56.83 kg ha⁻¹) were the highest and the lowest levels of impurities in the tank, which were statistically divided into two groups and there was significant difference between 955 and 1165 JD. By changing the varieties the rates impurities in the grain tank increased so that the lowest rates impurities in the tank with 0.68 % (36.10 kg ha⁻¹) in Alvand variety and the highest average with 0.85 % (45.13 kg ha⁻¹) in Omid variety, that the varieties are statistically different in the two groups.

Total losses

Analyzing the variance of the effect combines type and wheat varieties on the losses in the combine is shown in Table 6. The effect of combines' type and wheat varieties and their interaction effect with probability level of 1 and 5% are significant. Combine effect average comparing in Figure 1 shows that by changing JD 955 to JD 1165 total losses were reduced and there were between significant difference combine levels. So, the lowest total losses with 4.86 % (218.7 kg ha⁻¹) in JD 1165 and that 10.5 % of this amount related to cleaning losses, 34 % of the header losses and 16.5 % for drum losses. The highest amount of total losses related to JD 955 with 6.46 % (290.6 kg h⁻¹), which 10 % for cleaning losses, 38 % for losses header losses, and 16.5 % for drum losses.

The lowest total losses related to Alvand variety with an average of 3.34 % (150.3 kg ha⁻¹) that 36 % for header losses, 11.3 % for cleaning losses and 13.1 % for drum losses. From figure 2 it can be seen that total losses were highest with an average of 4.43 % (199.35 kg ha⁻¹) was observed in the figure is the Omid of this amount, 37 % of the header losses, and 13.3 % of the cleaning losses and 11.2 % the drum loss. From figure 2 it can be seen that, interaction effects of wheat varieties and combines types shows that the highest losses related to JD 955 and Omid variety with 6.83 % (307.35 kg ha⁻¹) and the lowest losses related to JD 1165 and Alvand variety with 3.97 % (178.65 kg ha⁻¹). Also, there is a significant difference between all surfaces of JD combines and by total losses increase.

Conclusion

The highest total losses were happened on combine JD 955 with 6.46 % and the lowest one was on JD 1165 with 4.86 %.

The highest total losses was happened on JD 955 and Omid variety with 6.83 % and the lowest one was on % 1165 and Alvand variety with 3.97 %.

The highest total losses were occurred on Omid Wheat variety with 4.43 % and the lowest one was on Alvand variety with 3.34 %.

References

- Asghari Meydani, J., Rahim Zadeh, R. and Eskandari, A. (2003). Points around Applied Strategy to Reduce Wheat Waists on Harvesting. Papers on First Nati Conf of Assessing Agri Crops Waists. Agri Faculty of Tarbiat Modaress University. Tehran. 1-10.
- Behrooz Lar, M., Hasanpoor, H., Sadeqnezhad, R. and Khosravani, M. (1994). National Research on Losses of Grain Combines. Ministry of Agriculture. 17-25.
- Chegini, G.R. (2006). Rebuilding of worn out combine. Iran combine corporation (ICCO), Contract Report, Arak, Iran. 25-31.
- Chegini, G.R. (2007). Technical and economic study of stripper-header for cereal harvesting in Iran fields. Iran combine corporation (ICCO), Arak, Iran. 12-19.
- Deere, A.J. (2004). 995 evaluation report. Iranian Agricultural Machinery Testing Group. Agricultural Mechanization Broadcasting Center. Ministry of Agriculture. 1-7.
- Dillon, J., Hardaker, L. and Brian, J. (1993). Farm Management Research for Small Farmer Development. FAO Farm Systems Management Series. FAO. No.6:302-325.
- Mansouri, H. and Minaei, S. (2003). Assessment of Machine Parameters Effect on Wheat Loss in Combine JD 955. First Nati Conf of Assessing Agri Crops Waists. Agri Faculty of Tarbiat Modaress University. Tehran. 24-28.
- Masdari, A., Edallat, M.H., Khalili, M.G. and Kalantari, H. (2008). Harvesting wheat losses and anticipated data analysis to model imaginary variables. Papers on Fifth Nati Conf of Agri Machinery Engineering and Mechanization. Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. Mashhad. 1-7.
- Mohd, A.A., Omar, A.R., Mutasim, E.A., Mamou, I.D. (1997). On Farm Evaluation Combine Harvester Losses in the Geezer She in the Sudan. JAMA. 28(2): 23-25.
- Mostofi, M.R. (2008). Investigation and technical comparison of new and conventional Wheat combines performance to improve and modification. 10th Inter Congr on Mechanization and Energy in Agri, 14-17 October 2008-Antalia-Turkey. 1-12.
- Mostofi, M.R. (2011). Investigation and technical comparison of new and conventional wheat combines performance to improve and modification. Agri Engineering Inter: CIGR J. Vol.13.No.1510. 31-33.
- Rahimi, H.A. and Khosravani, A. (2003). Assessment of Decreasing Wheat Losses Methods on Harvesting Stages in Fars Province. Papers on First Nati Conf of Assessing Agri Crops Waists. Agri Faculty of Tarbiat Modaress University. Tehran. 45-51.
- Sheraddin, B. and Ghulan, J. (1991). Influence of Timing and Date of Harvest on Wheat Grain Losses. J. AMA. 22 (2): 56- 62.
- Sing, K.N., Mishra, T.N., Pathak, D.K., Singh, B. and Reddy, P. (1991). Optimum Replacement Time of Combine Harvesters. J. AMA. (4): 37- 41.
- Tavasoli, A. and Minaei, S. (2002). Assessment of Processing Loss on John Deer Combine and Its Ground Speed. Papers on Second Nati Congr of Agri Machinery and Mechanization. Nov. 2002. Karaj. Iran. 76-79.

- Yavari, A. and Poordad, S. (2003). Assessment of Waist Rate on Different Sections of Combine in Wheat Harvesting on Kermanshah Province. Papers on First Nati Conf of Assessing Agri Crops Waists. Agri Faculty of Tarbiat Modaress University. Tehran. 44-49.

Table (1): Analyzing of variance for Combines type and Wheat varieties on header losses

Changes resources	Degree of freedom	Mean square	F probability
Replication	2	0.42	1.39 ^{ns}
Combine (C)	1	4.52	15.07**
Wheat (W)	1	2.06	9.87**
W*C	1	1.77	5.87*
Error	8	0.30	-

** , * , ns not statistically significant at 1% and 5% respectively, and the difference shows.

Table (2): Analyzing of variance for Combine type and Wheat varieties on Drum losses

Changes resources	Degree of freedom	Mean square	F probability
Replication	2	0.78	15.6 ^{ns}
Combine (C)	1	2.52	50.4**
Wheat (W)	1	1.86	37.2**
W*C	1	0.32	6.4 ^{ns}
Error	8	0.05	-

** , * , ns not statistically significant at 1% and 5% respectively, and the difference shows.

Table (3): Analyzing of variance for Combine type and Wheat varieties on cleaning losses

Changes resources	Degree of freedom	Mean square	F probability
Replication	2	0.32	1.06 ^{ns}
Combine (C)	1	1.42	4.73 ^{**}
Wheat (W)	1	0.74	2.46 ^{ns}
W*C	1	0.27	0.9 ^{ns}
Error	8	0.3	-

** , * , ns not statistically significant at 1% and 5% respectively, and the difference shows.

Table (4): Analyzing of variance for Combine type and Wheat variety on broken grain losses

Changes resources	Degree of freedom	Mean square	F probability
Replication	2	0.115	6.05 ^{ns}
Combine (C)	1	1.035	54.47 ^{**}
Wheat (W)	1	0.019	25.63 ^{**}
W*C	1	1.25	4.62 ^{ns}
Error	8	0.22	-

** , * , ns not statistically significant at 1% and 5% respectively, and the difference shows.

Table (5): Analyzing of variance for Combine type and Wheat variety on impurity losses

Changes resources	Degree of freedom	Mean square	F probability
Replication	2	0.14	4.66 ^{ns}
Combine (C)	1	2.91	97.01*
Wheat (W)	1	1.14	38.13*
W*C	1	0.12	4.07 ^{ns}
Error	8	0.03	-

** , * , ns not statistically significant at 1% and 5% respectively, and the difference shows.

Table (6): Analyzing of variance for Combine type and Wheat variety on total losses

Changes resources	Degree of freedom	Mean square	F probability
Replication	2	1.15	1.26 ^{ns}
Combine (C)	1	13.97	15.35**
Wheat (W)	1	8.14	8.94**
W*C	1	5.12	5.62**
Error	8	0.91	-

** , * , ns not statistically significant at 1% and 5% respectively, and the difference shows.




Figure 1: The effect of combines' type and wheat varieties in total losses




Figure 2: Interaction effect of wheat varieties and combines type on total losses