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ABSTRACT

Turkey’s highest sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) cultivation area is the Konya basin where is located in the Middle Anatolia region. Therefore, sugar beet has socio-economic importance in this region. However, the area faces water scarcity due to less amount of precipitation and high evapotranspiration. Moreover, irrigation is a prerequisite for sugar beet cultivation. Therefore, irrigation management is a vital topic for the area. The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations Penman-Monteith (FAO 56 PM) equation for estimating reference evapotranspiration (ETo) requires various meteorological data. Unfortunately, it is not possible to easily reach all these input data. Hence, FAO56 proposes another method called Hargreaves-Samani (HS). In this study, due to limited meteorological data, the HS method is used for estimating ETo in the Konya basin. For this area, there is a big ambiguity about crop evapotranspiration (ETc) and the net irrigation requirement (NIR) for sugar beet crop. This study estimates long-term (1986-2015) sugar beet evapotranspiration and net irrigation requirement to give a better idea for sugar beet irrigation management in the Konya basin. Results show that long-term annual sugar beet ETc reaches between 657 mm and 917 mm in the growing season. NIR ranges from 614 mm to 886 mm in the aforesaid basin.

Introduction

The Konya basin, Middle Anatolia region, is one of the most important agricultural and agro-industrial regions in Turkey. The climate of the area is typically semi-arid with cold and snowy winters and very hot and dry summers, where the average annual rainfall ranges from 280 to 500 mm. The Konya basin has almost 3 million hectares of agricultural area. Sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) is the vital commercial crop in this area being the largest producer of Turkey. Sugar beet production is about 35% of total production in Turkey with 115,000 ha sugar beet growing area (Topak et al., 2011). This crop has remarkably high water demand (Fabeiro et al., 2003) and the water consumption is between 900 and 1200 mm during the growth period (Dunham, 1993; Hills et al., 1990). The biggest problem in the basin is water loss due to high evapotranspiration. Another problem is that the basin faces water shortage due to a lack of water resources and a low amount of precipitation. Thus, the appropriate management of irrigation becomes inevitable for the crop growth - yield as well as the preservation of water resources. As a result, water becomes a limiting factor in terms of crop development and production in the region.

Reference evapotranspiration (ETo) plays a key role parameter for agricultural and hydrological studies as well as climatological. It is important to estimate accurate results for irrigation scheduling, irrigation and drainage design, crop...
production, managing water resources and environmental assessment (Sharma 1985; Jensen et al., 1990). Many empirical methods for ETo estimation are available but they cannot be applied under different conditions before being used in local conditions (Pruitt and Doorenbos 1977). Moreover, there is not a single applicable ETo method to apply all areas and periods. The choice of suitable method depends on many factors such as climate conditions, availability of data needed, cost, time and difficulties of the method for use. The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations Penman-Monteith (FAO 56 PM) equation has defined as a standard method for estimating reference evapotranspiration (Allen et al., 1998). This method has good results in many different climates without testing in any local calibration because it has already been calibrated and validated worldwide by using lysimeter measures. The FAO 56 PM equation requires accurate weather data, e.g. air temperature, relative humidity, solar radiation, and wind speed. However, all these input data are not possible to reach even in developed countries because of the limited meteorological stations and also collected data present wide gaps and incorrect measurements. Moreover, the instruments are time-consuming to use and has high cost of setting automated weather stations that collect meteorological data (Valiantzas 2013). Therefore, these methods give a limitation to collect meteorological variables. Allen et al., (1998) suggested another equation called Hargreaves - Samani (HS) equation (Hargreaves and Samani 1985) when sufficient weather data are not available to estimate FAO 56 PM. The HS equation needs only daily average, maximum and minimum air temperature and extraterrestrial radiation. Several studies indicated that the HS equation provides accurate estimates of reference evapotranspiration (Todorovic et al., 2013; Sabziparvar and Tabari 2010; Rahimi Khoob, 2008; Berti et al., 2014; Valiantzas 2018).

The principle of crop water requirement calculation depends on ETo and crop coefficient (Kc) values. These values are limited by meteorological and crop physiological conditions. Estimation of crop water requirement on different crops and locations have also been reported in several previous studies. (Tan, 2018; Guo et al., 2015).

According to many studies, there is a good knowledge effect of different irrigation regimes on sugar beet in Middle Anatolia (Topak et al., 2011; Kiymaz and Ertek 2015; Uçan and Gencoğlan 2004). However, there is large uncertainty about the temporal and spatial variation impacts through the Konya basin. Crop evapotranspiration (ETc) and net irrigation requirement (NIR) are particularly ambiguous for sugar beet cultivation in the area. Therefore, the objective of this study focuses on sugar beet crop evapotranspiration and irrigation requirements in the Konya basin of the Anatolia region of Turkey and demonstrates the water requirement of sugar beet that fluctuates over the years.

### Materials and Methods

#### Climatic Data

The meteorological data sets used for this study correspond to the period from 1986-2015, all being provided by the European Commission MARS database (Micale and Genovese 2004). This network is composed of 74 meteorological stations, but only 25 of these daily maximum and minimum temperatures were used in the present study since only these subset stations are available in the sugar beet plantation area. Locations of the 25 meteorological stations are given in Table 1 and Figure 1 Site elevations range from 919 to 1774 m above mean sea level; Longitude, from 31° 04’ 48” W to 33° 46’ 48” W; and latitude; from 37° 17’ 24” N to 39° 18’ 36” N. In Table 1, the annual average values of meteorological stations are reported. The average annual precipitation ranged from 291 to 490 mm; average annual temperature, from 10 to 12 ºC. The starting date of the growing season was selected on the 12th of April and the harvesting date of the growing season was selected on the 8th of October (Topak et al., 2011).

![Figure 1. Spatial distribution of the 25 meteorological stations used in the analysis. Numbers represent station codes which are in Table 1](image)

Table 1. Summary of weather station site characteristics used in the study

| Station Code | Latitude (°) | Longitude (°) | Altitude (m) | Taverage (ºC) | Rainfall (mm year⁻¹) |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|
| a            | 37.29        | 31.77         | 1774         | 12            | 296                 |
| b            | 37.55        | 31.58         | 1205         | 11            | 490                 |
| c            | 37.50        | 31.84         | 1149         | 11            | 312                 |
| d            | 37.37        | 32.38         | 1107         | 12            | 291                 |
| e            | 37.81        | 31.68         | 1170         | 11            | 313                 |
| f            | 37.59        | 32.46         | 1098         | 12            | 311                 |
| g            | 37.52        | 32.73         | 1030         | 12            | 311                 |
| h            | 38.00        | 31.71         | 1362         | 10            | 340                 |
| i            | 37.87        | 32.26         | 1431         | 10            | 312                 |
| j            | 37.74        | 32.80         | 1003         | 12            | 311                 |
| k            | 37.60        | 33.35         | 1000         | 12            | 292                 |
| l            | 37.95        | 32.88         | 1009         | 12            | 313                 |
Table 1 continued

| Station Code | Latitude (°) | Longitude (°) | Altitude (m) | Taverage (°C) | Rainfall (mm year⁻¹) |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|
| m            | 37.89        | 33.15         | 1060         | 12            | 308                 |
| n            | 38.24        | 32.68         | 997          | 12            | 309                 |
| o            | 38.17        | 32.95         | 1047         | 12            | 315                 |
| p            | 38.10        | 33.23         | 1022         | 12            | 309                 |
| q            | 37.96        | 33.78         | 1090         | 12            | 311                 |
| r            | 38.32        | 33.31         | 965          | 12            | 129                 |
| s            | 38.67        | 32.83         | 1030         | 12            | 291                 |
| t            | 38.59        | 33.09         | 936          | 12            | 296                 |
| u            | 38.49        | 33.35         | 942          | 12            | 310                 |
| v            | 38.95        | 32.63         | 1089         | 11            | 297                 |
| w            | 38.88        | 32.91         | 963          | 12            | 335                 |
| x            | 38.84        | 33.09         | 919          | 12            | 333                 |
| y            | 39.04        | 33.23         | 955          | 12            | 335                 |

**Methodology**

The main methodological steps include: (a) selecting meteorological stations that sugar beet planted (b) calculation of ET₀; (c) estimation of sugar beet ETₖ and NIR.

The cultivation area of sugar beet which planted between 2010 and 2017 years was provided by Konya Şeker industry and trade inc. (Konya, Turkey). The company recorded farmers who planted sugar beet. The area which marked in the map that got from the company was determined and then the most suitable meteorological stations were selected.

The reference evapotranspiration (ET₀) was calculated by the Hargreaves - Samani (HS) equation minimum temperature (Tₘᵦᵢᵦ) and extraterrestrial radiation (Rₑ) for the estimation of ET₀ (mm day⁻¹). The equation can be written as: (Todorovic et al., 2013):

\[
ET₀ = 0.0023 \frac{Ra}{T} \sqrt{(T_{max} - T_{min})(T + 17.8)}
\]

The coefficient 0.0023 is an empirical coefficient, Rₑ is the extraterrestrial radiation (mm day⁻¹) calculated according to Allen et al. (1998) and λ is the latent heat of vaporization (MJ kg⁻¹) for the mean air temperature T (°C) given as:

\[
\lambda = 2.501 - 0.00236 T
\]

Sugar beet evapotranspiration (ETₖ), which seasonal sum corresponds to the crop water requirements, was calculated using the single crop coefficient Kc approach:

\[
ETₖ = Kc ET₀
\]

Kc values suggested by Allen et al. (1998). The Kc values for the initial, mid- and end-season growth of sugar beet are 0.35, 1.2 and 0.7.

Net irrigation water requirements (NIR), i.e., the quantity of water necessary for crop evapotranspiration more than effective precipitation (Pₑᵣₚ), were calculated through a simplified balance between ET₀ and Pₑᵣₚ as:

\[
NIR = Kc ET₀ - Pₑᵣₚ = ETₖ - Pₑᵣₚ
\]

Pₑᵣₚ was computed as 80% of total precipitation (Tanasijevic et al., 2014)

**Results and Discussion**

The long-term seasonal ETₖ and NIR were computed for all available stations in the sugar beet plantation area in the Konya basin. However, there is a lack of previous research concerning the long-term estimation of ET₀ and NIR for the sugar beet in the region. Table 2 shows useful information about 30 years of the maximum, minimum, mean and standard deviation of ET₀, ETₖ and NIR values in all districts.

Table 2. Some information about 30 years of maximum (max), minimum (min), mean (mean) and standard deviation (std) of annual ET₀ (mm year⁻¹), ETₖ (mm season⁻¹) and NIR (mm season⁻¹) in Konya basin

| Station Code | ET₀ max | ET₀ min | ET₀ mean | ET₀ std | NIR max | NIR min | NIR mean | NIR std | NIR rad |
|--------------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|
| 1            | 778     | 657     | 725      | 28      | 760     | 614     | 691      | 33      |
| 2            | 844     | 745     | 795      | 24      | 802     | 698     | 749      | 29      |
| 3            | 863     | 751     | 804      | 26      | 843     | 703     | 767      | 32      |
| 4            | 869     | 754     | 809      | 32      | 849     | 708     | 777      | 39      |
| 5            | 849     | 748     | 796      | 24      | 818     | 700     | 759      | 31      |
| 6            | 868     | 755     | 801      | 27      | 844     | 709     | 764      | 32      |
| 7            | 877     | 764     | 810      | 27      | 853     | 717     | 773      | 32      |
| 8            | 823     | 708     | 768      | 27      | 803     | 662     | 730      | 37      |
| 9            | 819     | 708     | 757      | 29      | 786     | 660     | 721      | 34      |
| 10           | 880     | 763     | 810      | 27      | 855     | 713     | 773      | 33      |
| 11           | 896     | 745     | 821      | 41      | 867     | 699     | 789      | 46      |
| 12           | 888     | 758     | 813      | 31      | 855     | 708     | 775      | 36      |
| 13           | 890     | 751     | 816      | 38      | 866     | 690     | 779      | 43      |
| 14           | 875     | 758     | 811      | 29      | 842     | 708     | 774      | 34      |
| 15           | 868     | 751     | 806      | 29      | 836     | 697     | 768      | 34      |
| 16           | 877     | 755     | 810      | 30      | 845     | 693     | 772      | 35      |
| 17           | 873     | 728     | 808      | 35      | 840     | 666     | 773      | 41      |
| 18           | 872     | 763     | 814      | 29      | 849     | 696     | 776      | 35      |
| 19           | 897     | 753     | 816      | 35      | 868     | 696     | 779      | 40      |
| 20           | 911     | 765     | 830      | 35      | 882     | 698     | 791      | 41      |
| 21           | 886     | 752     | 817      | 27      | 851     | 686     | 777      | 34      |
| 22           | 850     | 744     | 790      | 28      | 831     | 678     | 752      | 35      |
| 23           | 906     | 760     | 818      | 40      | 875     | 655     | 771      | 52      |
| 24           | 917     | 758     | 826      | 42      | 886     | 654     | 780      | 54      |
| 25           | 872     | 749     | 809      | 27      | 851     | 650     | 762      | 40      |
Equation (1) was used to estimate reference ET which is derived using 30 years (1986-2015) of daily temperature data. The reference ET of 11 stations were previously studied by Yamaç (2018). Figure 2 shows the long-term annual ETc of the Konya basin. ETc calculated by Equation 3. The day length of sugar beet ETc showed a growing season. The area demonstrated increasing trends in ETc which was related to reference ET. ETc ranged between 657 mm in 1997 (Figure 2a) and 917 mm in 2010 (Figure 2x) for 30 years sugar beet plantation area in the Konya basin. The lowest ETc that given in Figure 2a also showed the lowest ETo values calculated for the study area. In Figure 2q a sharp decline demonstrated in the years of 1992, 1993 and 1994. Figure 2x showed a sharp increase in the year of 2005, 2006 and 2007. Topak et al. (2011) found that seasonal evapotranspiration for sugar beet varied between 374.5 and 1036 mm depending on different water regimes. Katerji and Mastrolli (2009) indicated that sugar beet crop evapotranspiration ranged from 731 (clay) to 836 mm (loam) according to different soil textures under Mediterranean conditions. Fabeiro et al. (2003) reported that seasonal evapotranspiration of sugar beet varied between 690 and 897 mm depending on irrigation regimes under drip irrigation applications in Spain conditions. Under different irrigation applications, sugar beet crop evapotranspiration obtained by Barbanti et al. (2007). Their values ranged between 1262 (full irrigation) to 567 mm (deficit irrigation) in Cadriano. Yildirim (1990) indicated that evapotranspiration for sugar beet was 865 mm under full irrigation regimes in Ankara conditions. According to Uçan and Gençoğlan (2004), the evapotranspiration of sugar beet under different irrigation level was between 450 mm (the most water applied) and 1000 mm (the least water applied) in a semiarid region.

Figure 2. Spatial distribution of crop evapotranspiration between 1985 and 2015. Crop evapotranspiration (mm season\(^{-1}\)) on the Y-axis and years on the X-axis. Straight line indicates trends of ETc.
The estimation of NIR demonstrated the growing season of sugar beet in the Konya basin (Figure 3). The calculation of NIR obtained by Equation (4). The sugar beet seasonal NIR showed a range from 614 mm in 1997 to 886 mm in 2007. The results of NIR was difficult to compare with previous studies because NIR value is a gap in literature for sugar beet. However, there are some possibilities to make a comparison. Guo et al. (2015) found that the mean net irrigation requirement in the Kaidu-kongqi river basin in China reached 861 mm between 1985 – 2009 years. Rodrigues et al (2003) reported that the average value of the NIR was 826 mm. However, they found that NIR value was 989 mm in very high (drought) climate demand conditions.

According to some limitations, this study needs some improvement in future studies. These are (i) limited meteorological data was used in this study. Therefore, it is required more meteorological data. (ii) this study needs different ETo models to make the comparison to find out the most suitable for the region (iii) it is a necessity to direct measurement of ETo for choosing the appropriate model for each meteorological station.

Conclusion

In this study, a simplified method was employed for the estimation of water requirements in the Konya basin. Accordingly, these results show increasing trends in ETo, ETc, and NIR. This increase implies that future water requirements could rise for sugar beet cultivation in the region. Therefore, controlled and regulated irrigation management and modern irrigation techniques should be developed and monitored in the near future.

The findings of this study are focused on the last 30 years of behaving of sugar beet water requirement in the Konya basin.
basin. However, the results given here are not enough to address a solution for water management. These results need a link to into a complex framework including bio-physical, socio-economic and policy issues. The analysis presented here does not consider other cultivation parameters of the sugar beet in an area. Other cultivation parameters need to be analyzed in the long-term to give a better idea for sugar beet production. After all, this is the first study to estimate water and irrigation requirements in the long term in the Konya basin with all aforesaid uncertainties. This preliminary study can be extended to other sugar beet planting areas for further studies to generate the basis of decision support systems for sugar beet crop management.

Future studies are needed to focus on: (i) the estimation of ETo with different models (ii) the detection of water availability in the region (iii) the analysis of future water and irrigation requirement using Global Circulation Models with different emission scenarios (iv) the consideration of weather and crop parameters in the region (v) the adaptation of new technologies and methods for better agricultural production and water management.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Konya Şeker industry and trade inc. staff for their collaboration.

References

Allen, R. G., Pereira, L. S., Raes, D., & Smith, M. (1998). Crop evapotranspiration: guidelines for computing crop water requirements. FAO irrigation and drainage paper no. 56, Rome, Italy. Accessed 01 November 2018

Barbanti, L., Monti, A., & Venturi, G. (2007). Nitrogen dynamics and fertilizer use efficiency in leaves of different ages of sugar beet (Beta vulgaris) at variable water regimes. Annals of Applied Biology 150: 197-205

Berti, A., Tardivo, G., Chiaudani, A., Rech, F., & Borin, M. (2014). Assessing reference evapotranspiration by the Hargreaves method in north-eastern Italy. Agricultural Water Management 140: 20-25

Dunham, R. J. (1993). Water use and irrigation. In: D A Cooke and R K Scott (Eds), The sugar beet crop science into practice, Chapman and Hall, London, pp. 279-309

Fabeiro, C., Santa Olalla, M., Lopez, R., & Dominguez, A., (2003). Production and quality of sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) cultivated under controlled deficit irrigation condition in semi-arid climate. Agricultural Water Management, 62: 215-227

Guo, B., Li, W., Guo, J., & Chen, C. (2015). Risk assessment of regional irrigation water demand and supply in an arid inland river basin of northwestern China. Sustainability 7: 12958-12973

Hargreaves, G. H., & Samani, Z. A. (1985). Reference crop evapotranspiration from ambient air temperature. In: Winter meeting–American Society of Agricultural Engineers: the world food situation–now and year 2007. ASAE, St. Joseph, Chicago

Hills, F. J., Winter, S. R., & Henderson, D. W. (1990). Sugar beet. In: Stewart B A and Nielsen D R (Eds), Irrigation of Agriculture Crops. Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp. 795-810

Jensen, M. E., Burman, R. D., & Allen, R. G. (1990). Evapotranspiration and Irrigation Water Requirements. 1st ed. New York, ASCE

Katerji, N., & Mastrorilli, M. (2009). The effect of soil texture on the water use efficiency of irrigated crops: results of a multi-year experiment carried out in the Mediterranean region. European Journal of Agronomy 30: 95-100

Kiymaz, S., & Ertek, A. (2015). Water use and yield of sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) under drip irrigation at different water regimes. Agricultural Water Management 158: 225-234

Micale, F., & Genovese, G. (2004). Meteorological data Collection, processing and analysis. Methodology of the MARS Crop Yield Forecasting System, vol. 1. Italy: European Communities, pp. 100

Rahimi Khoob, A. (2008). Comparative study of Hargreaves’s and artificial neural network’s methodologies in estimating reference evapotranspiration in a semiarid environment. Irrigation Science 26(3): 253-259

Rodrigues, P. N., Machado, T., Pereira, L. S., Teixeira, J. L., El Amami, H., & Zaïri, A. (2003). Coping with droughts: feasibility of deficit irrigation of summer crops in Alentejo, Portugal. Accessed 05 November 2018

Pruitt, W. O., & Doorenbos, J. (1977). Empirical Calibration, a Requisite for Evapotranspiration Formulæ Based on Daily or Longer Mean Climatic Data. Presented at International Round table Conference on Evapotranspiration. International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage, Budapest, Hungary, pp. 20

Sabziparvar, A. A. & Tabari, H. (2010). Regional estimation of reference evapotranspiration in arid and semi-arid regions. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, 136 (10): 724-731

Sharma, M. L., (1985). Estimating evapotranspiration. In: Hillel D (Eds), Advances in Irrigation, vol. 3. Academic Press, London

Tan, M., (2018). Mismatch between crop water requirements and irrigation in Helhe River Basin, Northwestern China. Irrigation Science

Tanasijevic, L., Todorovic, M., Pereira, L. S., Pizzigalli, C., & Lionello, P., (2014). Impacts of climate change on olive crop evapotranspiration and irrigation requirements in the Mediterranean region. Agricultural Water Management 144: 54-68

Topak, R., Süheri, S., & Acar, B., (2011). Effect of different drip irrigation regimes on sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) yield, quality and water use efficiency in Middle Anatolian, Turkey. Irrigation Science 29: 163-172

Todorovic, M., Karic, B., & Pereira, L. S., (2013). Reference evapotranspiration estimate with limited weather data across a range of Mediterranean climates. Journal of Hydrology 481: 166-176
Uçan, K., & Gencoğlan, C., (2004). The effect of water deficit on yield and yield components of sugar beet. Turkish Journal of Agriculture and Forestry 28: 163-172

Valiantzas, J. D., (2013). Simplified forms for the standardized FAO-56 Penman-Monteith reference evapotranspiration using limited weather data. Journal of Hydrology 505: 13-23

Valiantzas, J. D., (2018). Temperature-and humidity-based simplified Penman’s ETo formulae. Comparisons with temperature-based Hargreaves-Samani and other methodologies. Agricultural Water Management 208: 326-334

Yamaç, S. S., (2018). Estimation of long-term reference evapotranspiration using limited weather data in sugar beet plantation area from Middle Anatolian, Turkey. Suleyman Demre University Journal of Faculty of Agriculture, 1. International Agricultural Structure and Irrigation Congress Special Issue, 160-165.

Yildirim, O., (1990). Sugar beet yields response to surface drip and subsurface irrigation methods. University of Ankara, Publications of Faculty of Agriculture: 1174, scientific research reports: 648, pp. 16