



Total Factor Productivity Growth and Changing Cost Structure of Sugarcane in Gujarat, India

Upasana D. Bhopala ^{a++*}, M. G. Dhandhalya ^{a#}
and H. B. Parmar ^{at}

^a Department of Agricultural Economics, CoA, JAU, Junagadh, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author UDB performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author MGD designed the study, guided the author UDB in research and writing the manuscript. Author HBP helped in reviewing the literature, helped in data collection. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2023/v41i122327

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/111189>

Original Research Article

Received: 17/10/2023
Accepted: 22/12/2023
Published: 26/12/2023

ABSTRACT

Aims:

1. To estimate the growth of input, output indices and total factor productivity of sugarcane in Gujarat
2. To estimate the changing cost structure of sugarcane

Place and Duration of Study: Department of Agricultural Economics, Junagadh Agricultural University (between June 2018 and July 2020).

Methodology: This paper has estimated the growth in total factor productivity of sugarcane crop using Tornqvist Theil index and growth trends in cost structure of sugarcane crop in Gujarat.

⁺⁺ Ph. D.;

[#] Associate Research Scientist;

[†] P. G. Student;

^{*}Corresponding author: E-mail: upasanabhopala@gmail.com;

Results: The results showed that the growth rate of TFP indices of sugarcane planted crop and ratoon crop were negative about -0.86 and -0.31 per cent per annum, respectively. Negative TFP growth resulted due to a relatively faster rate of total input growth than total output growth. In the total cost of cultivation of sugarcane, the cost share of human labour, irrigation and miscellaneous in Gujarat has shown an increasing trend. While, rental value of land showing declining trend.

Conclusion: Study suggested that technological gains have not been experienced in this crop. Needs concentrated efforts to bridge extension gap and further research to evolve concrete strains, resistant to pest and diseases which reduce the real cost of production.

Keywords: Sugarcane; ratoon; planted; cost structure; TFP.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum* L.) occupies very prominent position on the agricultural map of India. It provides employment to over a million people directly or indirectly besides contributing significantly to the national exchequer. The cultivation of sugarcane in India dates back to the Vedic period. Sugarcane is one of the most important commercial as well as industrial crop as the cane is supplied to sugar industries, where various products are produced from its juice. Sugar industry is such an industry located in rural areas which provides opportunities for the uplifting of rural masses. Today sugarcane is cultivated in 130 countries. India is the second largest producer of sugarcane after Brazil. Whereas, Gujarat accounts for about 3 per cent of India's production of sugarcane [1,2]. The major sugarcane growing districts in Gujarat are Surat, Navsari, Bharuch, Tapi, Valsad, Gir Somnath and Vadodara, which together contributes to about 99.57 per cent and 99.64 per cent of total area and total production of sugarcane, respectively. Presently, in India nearly 60 lakh farmers have been cultivating sugarcane in the vast area of around 50 lakh ha and a large number of agricultural labours are involved in cane production activities. More than 5 lakh workers, mostly from rural areas, are engaged in sugar industry [3].

"The government has allocated a significant proportion of its resources to agricultural research in the state. Total factor productivity (TFP) is measured as the rate of index of total output to index of total inputs and encompasses the impact of technical change as well as change in the level of all inputs. Thus, TFP trends indicate whether production growth is taking place in a cost effective and sustainable manner or not". Dhandhalya et. al, [4]. "A number of factors such as research, extension, human capital, intensity of cultivation, balanced use of fertilizers, infrastructural facilities, health of

natural resources, climate, etc influence the TFP. As an input to public investment decisions, it is useful to understand the relative importance of these yield-enhancing factors in determining productivity growth". Chand et. al, [5]. Therefore, it is impressive to look at current research efforts and their accuracy in order to address emerging regional research needs. Therefore, the present study was undertaken to analyse the decadal shift in sugarcane area, production and productivity, change in cost structure and to estimate the growth of total factor productivity of sugarcane in Gujarat. In summary, a study on TFP growth of sugarcane in Gujarat can have wide-ranging applications, benefiting farmers, policymakers, researchers, and other stakeholders involved in the sugarcane industry. Additionally, the study informs investment decisions, identifies research and development needs, and contributes to the overall efficiency and sustainability of the sugarcane sector.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study covers Gujarat state, located on the Western coast part of India, which has one third of the coastline of the country and one of the major sugarcane growing state in India. This study is based on secondary data on input, output and prices of sugarcane crop collected from Department of Agricultural Economics, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh and area, production and yield from other public sources. The analysis of TFP was carried out for the period from 1990-91 to 2018-19. This period is divided into four periods i.e. Period-I (1990-91 to 1999-00), Period-II (2000-2001 to 2009-10), Period-III (2010-11 to 2018-19) and overall Period-IV (1990-91 to 2018-19).

In the present study also, the Tornqvist Theil index was used for computing the total output index, total input index and total factor productivity index. The Divisia index has two important attractive properties: It satisfies the

time reversal and factor reversal test for index numbers and it is a discrete of the components, so that aggregate could be obtained by the aggregation of sub-aggregates [6]. These indices were calculated as follows:

2.1 Total Output Index (TOI)

Total output indices were constructed using the Tornqvist Theil index approach as follows:

$$TOI_t / TOI_{t-1} = \pi_j (Q_{jt} / Q_{jt-1})^{(R_{jt} + R_{jt-1})/2}$$

2.2 Total Input Index (TII)

$$TII_t / TII_{t-1} = \pi_i (X_{it} / X_{it-1})^{(S_{it} + S_{it-1})/2}$$

where,

- Q_{jt} = Output of j^{th} crop in t^{th} year
- Q_{jt-1} = Output of j^{th} crop in $(t-1)^{\text{th}}$ year
- R_{jt} = Output share of j^{th} crop in total revenue in t^{th} year
- R_{jt-1} = Output share of j^{th} crop in total revenue in $(t-1)^{\text{th}}$ year
- X_{it} = Quantity of i^{th} input used in j^{th} crop in t^{th} year
- X_{it-1} = Quantity of i^{th} input used in j^{th} crop in $(t-1)^{\text{th}}$ year
- S_{it} = Share of input 'i' in total input cost in t^{th} year
- S_{it-1} = Share of input 'i' in total input cost in $(t-1)^{\text{th}}$ year

In the case of TFP for a single crop, revenue share refers to the share of main product and by-product in total revenue from the crop, while output includes main product and by-product. Thus, total output and input indices for sugarcane crop were prepared taking 1990-91 as the base year. The input data available only in value terms has been converted into quantity indices by dividing with its respective price indices. Input has been aggregated using their farm rental prices.

2.3 Total Factor Productivity Index (TFPI)

Total factor productivity index was computed as the ratio of total output index (TOI) to total input index (TII).

$$TFPI_t = (TOI_t / TII_t) \times 100$$

The estimation of input, output and TFP growth rates for any specified was done by fitting an exponential (or semi-log) trend equation to input, output and TFP indices, respectively.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Decadal Shift in Area, Production and Productivity of Sugarcane Crop

The analysis of sugarcane acreage, production, and productivity in Gujarat spans the period from 1969-70 to 2018-19. As illustrated in Table 1, the average cultivated area for sugarcane substantially increased from 0.42 lakh hectares in 1969-71 to 2.59 lakh hectares in 1999-01 (triennium average), but subsequently experienced a decline. Notably, the percentage change in sugarcane cultivation area over the last two decades was reported as negative. In terms of production, the average yield of sugarcane nearly tripled from 2.51 lakh tonnes in 1969-71 to 7.46 lakh tonnes in 1979-81 (triennium average), and continued to rise to 17.97 lakh tonnes in 1999-01. However, in the period of 2016-18, there was a sharp decline to 11.78 lakh tonnes.

The percentage change in sugarcane production over the last two decades exhibited a negative trend. Regarding sugarcane productivity, the average yield per hectare increased from 59.68 tonnes in 1969-71 to 75.88 tonnes in 1979-81, but subsequently declined until 2009-11. Notably, during the triennium average of 2016-18, there was a slight increase in the average productivity of sugarcane. The percentage change in sugarcane productivity was negative from 1979-81 to 2009-11. However, there has been a modest improvement in recent years, specifically during the triennium average of 2016-18.

The observed trend suggests a consistent decrease in both the area and production of sugarcane in Gujarat over the past two decades, with a stagnant or declining yield. One plausible explanation for this phenomenon could be the significant increase in labour and other input costs over the last decade. Consequently, the declining income of farmers may be contributing to the reduction in sugarcane cultivation areas. This reduction is likely a result of the fact that the productivity did not witness a substantial increase to offset the economic challenges faced by farmers.

3.2 Changing Cost Structure of Sugarcane Crop

The cost structure of sugarcane crop has changed with the advent of new technology, machinery and management practices. The

availability of inputs at affordable rates and their use determine crop productivity. Trends in cost structure of sugarcane represented in Table 2. It can be seen from table that the cost share of human labour in total cost of cultivation has showed increasing trend. Whereas, the percent cost share of bullock labour has increased between 1992-93 and 2002-03, then after it went on declining. The cost share of seed was remained between 11 to 12 per cent during the study period. The share of manures also remained around 5 per cent. The per cent cost share of fertilizers was 9.74 per cent in 1992-93, which was increased to 10.02 per cent in 2002-03 and in 2012-13, its share decreased to 6.6 per

cent. Whereas, share of irrigation in total cost of sugarcane cultivation has increased from 10.59 per cent in 2002-03 to 12.59 per cent in 2018-19. Share of miscellaneous cost showed the similar trend as irrigation. The per cent cost share of rental value of land showed declining trend over time. Inputs like human labour and rental value of owned land have accounted for about 50 per cent of total cost of sugarcane cultivation in Gujarat. Kannan [7] stated similar trends in cost structure of principal crops in Karnataka during 1982-83 to 2007-08 and stated similar results in cost share of seed, fertilizers and pesticides in total cost of cultivation of groundnut crop.

Table 1. Decadal shift in sugarcane acreage, production and productivity in Gujarat

Period	Particulars	Absolute change over previous decade	Percentage change over previous decade
Area (00' ha)			
1969-71	421	-	-
1979-81	988	567	134.68
1989-91	1631	643	65.08
1999-01	2595	964	59.10
2009-11	1941	-654	-25.20
2016-18	1686	-255	-13.40
Production (00' tone)			
1969-71	2506	-	-
1979-81	7464	4959	197.90
1989-91	11571	4107	55.02
1999-01	17972	6401	55.32
2009-11	13272	-4700	-26.15
2016-18	11783	-1489	-11.22
Productivity (tone/ha)			
1969-71	59.69	-	-
1979-81	75.88	16.20	27.15
1989-91	70.95	-4.93	-6.50
1999-01	69.33	-1.62	-2.28
2009-11	68.38	-0.95	-1.37
2016-18	70.07	1.69	2.47

Source: DAG, GoG, [10].

Table 2. Trends in cost structure of sugarcane crop in Gujarat (in per cent)

Items	TE 1992-93	TE 2002-03	TE 2012-13	TE 2018-19
Human Labour	21.90	28.82	32.03	34.71
Bullock Labour	1.84	3.55	2.95	0.97
Seed	12.08	11.11	11.32	11.36
Manure	4.52	4.56	5.03	4.28
Fertilizers	9.74	10.02	6.62	8.49
Irrigation	11.47	10.59	11.96	12.59
Insecticides/pesticides	0.26	0.67	0.59	0.63
Miscellaneous	11.52	8.23	10.25	14.34
Depreciation	0.37	0.47	0.35	0.20
Rental value of land	26.30	21.98	18.90	12.43
Total cost	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

3.3 Growth in Input, Output and TFP Indices of Sugarcane

Measurement of productivity is an important and necessary step to understand in context of agricultural economics. There are various measures such as labour productivity, capital productivity, etc. Among them total factor productivity is a comprehensive measure of productivity and has gained acceptance as such among government officers, policy makers, productivity specialists and economists.

The annual compound growth rates of total output indices and total input indices decreased at the rate of -0.34 per cent and -0.77 per cent per annum, respectively (Table 3). Whereas, the growth rate of TFP indices increased slightly at the rate of 0.43 per cent per annum. This indicates the stagnant growth of TFP for sugarcane in Gujarat. The reason for stagnant growth of sugarcane TFP in last three decades in Gujarat, might be that the state has achieved the higher productivity growth in 1970s and 1980s, but that could not be sustained later on due to

lack of proper agronomical practices and proper control of pests and diseases. Such type positive annual growth in TFP, it is not meaningful as it is associated with a negative input-output growth. Chand *et al.* [5] also reported negative input growth (-2.09%), negative output growth (-1.26%) and positive TFP growth (0.85%) for maize crop in Uttar Pradesh during 1975-76 to 2005-06. Kannan [7] also obtained similar slightly positive results regarding sugarcane TFP growth in Karnataka state and indicated that sugarcane production is input based with technology playing some role in it.

The decade wise results of input indices, output indices and TFP indices of sugarcane are also presented in Table 4. The annual compound growth rates of output indices were -1.10, 0.43 and -1.39 per cent, total input indices were -1.42, 0.19 and 0.41 per cent during 1990-91 to 1999-00, 2000-01 to 2009-10 and 2010-11 to 2018-19, respectively. Whereas, the annual growth rates of TFP indices were 0.32, 0.23 and -1.79 per cent during 1990-91 to 1999-00, 2000-01 to 2009-10 and 2010-11 to 2018-19, respectively.

Table 3. Annual growth rates in input use, output, TFP and real cost of production (RCP) for sugarcane crop in Gujarat: 1990-91 to 2018-19 (in per cent)

Period	Input growth	Output growth	TFP growth	RCP growth	Share of TFP in output growth	Yield growth (CGR)
Based on single year values						
1990-91 to 1999-00	-1.42	-1.10	0.32	1.96	-	-0.32
2000-01 to 2009-10	0.19	0.43	0.23	0.23	54.39	0.44
2010-11 to 2018-19	0.41	-1.39	-1.79	4.91	-	0.22
1990-91 to 2018-19	-0.77	-0.34	0.43	0.96	-	-0.09
Based on 3 years average values						
1990-91 to 1999-00	-1.55	-1.14	0.42	1.62	-	-0.36
2000-01 to 2009-10	0.19	0.58	0.38	0.14	66.35	0.43
2010-11 to 2018-19	0.22	-1.58	-1.80	5.23	-	0.49
1990-91 to 2018-19	-0.87	-0.36	0.51	0.81	-	-0.17

Table 4. Annual growth rates in input use, output, TFP and real cost of production (RCP) for sugarcane ratoon and planted crop in Gujarat: 1990-91 to 2018-19 (in per cent)

Period	Input growth	Output growth	TFP growth	RCP growth	Share of TFP in output growth
Sugarcane ratoon crop					
2000-01 to 2009-10	0.28	1.21	0.93	-0.41	77.01
2010-11 to 2018-19	0.31	-1.19	-1.50	4.37	-
1990-91 to 2018-19	0.37	0.06	-0.31	2.71	-
Sugarcane planted crop					
2000-01 to 2009-10	0.12	0.43	0.31	0.53	72.37
2010-11 to 2018-19	0.15	-0.92	-1.07	4.22	-
1990-91 to 2018-19	0.73	-0.14	-0.86	3.02	-

During 1990s though sugarcane output indices showed negative growth, but the input indices also noticed more negative growth as compared to output indices. Hence, the TFP growth remained slightly positive. This indicates that, there is an effect of technology on sugarcane productivity, but not up to the mark that bring more improvement in yield level, which results in higher growth of TFP. Besides, during 2000s, the input, output and TFP growth found positive, but stagnant (*i.e.* <0.5%). This indicated that the sugarcane output growth has been mainly input-based, which may not be sustained in future in the absence of input-saving varieties and technologies. In the current decade of 2010s, the sugarcane input use growth has surpassed the output growth, resulted in moderately negative growth in TFP (-1.79%). This is a sign of non-sustainability of sugarcane production in the Gujarat state. Many high yielding varieties of sugarcane *viz.*, Gujarat sugarcane-2 (CoN-95134) in 2000, Gujarat sugarcane-4 (CoN-03131) in 2005, Gujarat sugarcane-5 in 2007, Gujarat sugarcane-7 in 2011, released for farmers' cultivation could not able to augment the sugarcane yield in the state.

The TFP of sugarcane was also calculated by taking three yearly moving average of input, output and TFP indices. The results revealed almost same for calculation based on single year values or the three year moving average values in all periods (Table 3).

The contribution of TFP to output growth of sugarcane in Gujarat revealed nearly 54 per cent, only during 2000s. In 1990s and 2010s, the TFP growth are not meaningful, as the rate of decrease in input indices was higher than the rate of output indices.

The Table 3 further revealed that the real cost of production of sugarcane increased at the rate of 1.96 per cent per annum in 1990s and was stagnant in 2000s. But, in 2010s, the RCP was increased at the higher rate of about 4.91 per cent per annum, as the TFP revealed negative growth indicating that technology has not contributed in production growth.

Also there are two types of planting techniques for sugarcane has been followed in Gujarat (i) planted crop and (ii) ratoon crop. But the separate data on both the planting systems have been available from 2000-01, onwards. Hence, the TFP of both these systems were also calculated separately and discussed in next further section.

3.4 Growth in Input, Output and TFP Indices of Sugarcane Ratoon and Planted Crop

Ratooning is an ancient method of propagation in sugarcane in which subterranean buds on the stubble give rise to a new crop stand, which is usually referred to as the 'ratoon' crop as opposed to 'planted crop', which is raised from seeds or seedlings. The growth of output, input and the total factor productivity of sugarcane ratoon crop and sugarcane planted crop were calculated for the period from 2000-01 to 2018-19 for which data are available. This period further divided into two sub-periods *viz.*, Period I (2000-01 to 2009-10) and Period II (2010-11 to 2018-19) and results are presented in Table 4.

The annual compound growth rates of total output indices and total input indices of sugarcane ratoon crop increased at the rate of 0.06 and 0.37 per cent, respectively. Whereas, the growth rate of TFP indices of sugarcane ratoon crop reported negative about -0.31 per cent per annum. Negative TFP growth resulted due to relatively faster rate of total input growth than total output growth.

The decade wise results of input indices, output indices and TFP of sugarcane ratoon crop are also presented in Table 3. The annual compound growth rates of total output indices of sugarcane ratoon crop were 1.21 per cent and -1.19 per cent during the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 and 2010-11 to 2018-19, respectively. While, the annual compound growth rates of total input indices of sugarcane ratoon crop were 0.28 and 0.31 per cent during the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 and 2010-11 to 2018-19, respectively. The annual growth rates of TFP indices of sugarcane ratoon crop were 0.93 per cent and -1.50 per cent during the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 and 2010-11 to 2018-19, respectively. During 2000s, the sugarcane ratoon crop responded TFP growth of about 0.93 per cent per annum, though it's a low growth, but reveals slight improvement over the stagnant growth. However, in later period from 2010s, it turned into negative TFP growth of about -1.50 per cent per annum, indicating the non-sustainability of sugarcane ratoon crop production system.

In case of sugarcane planted crop, the annual compound growth rates of total output indices decreased at the rate of -0.14 per cent and annual compound rates of total input indices increased at the rate of 0.73 per cent. Whereas,

the growth rate of TFP indices of sugarcane planted crop was negative about -0.86 per cent per annum. Negative TFP growth resulted due to a relatively faster rate of total input growth than total output growth. Gupta and Badal [8] also studied the Total factor productivity growth of sugarcane in Uttar Pradesh: Parametric and non-parametric analysis. The results indicated the robustness of the methodology used, the TFP has witnessed a negative growth for the overall period as well.

The decade wise results of input indices, output indices and TFP of sugarcane planted crop are also presented in Table 4. The annual compound growth rates of total output indices of sugarcane planted crop were 0.43 per cent and -0.92 per cent during the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 and 2010-11 to 2018-19, respectively. While, the annual compound growth rates of total input indices of sugarcane planted crop were 0.12 and 0.15 per cent during the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 and 2010-11 to 2018-19, respectively. The annual growth rate of TFP indices of sugarcane planted crop were 0.31 per cent and -1.07 per cent during the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 and 2010-11 to 2018-19, respectively. This also revealed the stagnant growth of sugarcane planted crop in the Gujarat state indicating the new varieties developed and released for cultivation did not reached to the farmers' field. The case may be that farmers did not like it worthwhile to plant the new seeds or not followed the proper agronomical and pests and disease management practices, resulted in low yields. Rohini et al. [9] also reported stagnant growth of TFP for fennel and garlic crops in Gujarat.

The Table 4 further revealed the contribution of TFP to output growth of sugarcane ratoon and planted crop in Gujarat revealed nearly 77 and 72 per cent during 2000s, respectively. Besides, due to low TFP growth the real cost of production was increase nearly 3 per cent per annum in both the systems of planting indicates non-sustainability of sugarcane in Gujarat.

4. CONCLUSION

The study has used farm-level data collected from Department of Agricultural Economics, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh and analyzed using Tornqvist Theil index for constructing aggregate output and aggregate input of the crop. The cost share of human labour in total cost of cultivation of sugarcane in Gujarat has showed increasing trend. It's share was

increased from 21.90 per cent in 1992-93 to 34.71 per cent in 2018-19. Besides, the share of irrigation and miscellaneous have also shown increasing trend, whereas, the share of rental value of land in total cost has been noticed decreasing.

The investigation revealed that, the growth of total input and total output indices of sugarcane in Gujarat decreased at the rate of -0.77 and -0.34 per cent per annum during 1990-91 to 2018-19, respectively. Whereas, TFP indices increased slightly at the rate of 0.43 per cent per annum. But, such type of positive growth is not meaningful as it is associated with negative input-output growth. In case of decade-wise results, only during 2000s, the input, output and TFP indices growth were found positive, but it was stagnant (*i. e.* < 0.5%) indicating mainly input-based output growth, might not sustained in future, in absence of input saving varieties and technologies. Also, the sugarcane ratoon and planted crop system by and large revealed similar results regarding TFP growth rates.

This is a sign of non-sustainability of sugarcane production in the Gujarat state. Many high yielding varieties of sugarcane viz., Gujarat sugarcane-2 (CoN-95134) in 2000, Gujarat sugarcane-4 (CoN-03131) in 2005, Gujarat sugarcane-5 in 2007, Gujarat sugarcane-7 in 2011, released for farmers' cultivation could not able to augment the sugarcane yield in the state. This implies that the research and extension efforts should be the priority to enhance productivity gains in sugarcane production in the state. This can be achieved by the efficient use of inputs along with development of new varieties and transfer of technology to farmers. However, the trends in cost structure of sugarcane crop in Gujarat indicates inputs like human labour and rental value of owned land have accounted for about 50 per cent of total cost of sugarcane cultivation in Gujarat in which human labour showing the increasing trend and rental value of owned land showing the declining trend over time.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Bulagi M, Kaseeram I. Productivity and Efficiency Change of Small-Scale

- Sugarcane Growers in Amatikulu and its Policy-Related Sources, South Africa. *J Hum Ecol.* 2020 Jan 1;69(1-3):1-9.
2. Danelon AF, Spolador HF, Bergtold JS. The role of productivity and efficiency gains in the sugar-ethanol industry to reduce land expansion for sugarcane fields in Brazil. *Energy Policy.* 2023 Jan 1;172:113327
 3. Plaisier C, Van Rijn F, Van der Ende H, Koster T. Towards a sustainable sugarcane industry in India. Wageningen Economic Research Report 2017;051:112. Accessed 8, June 2020. Available: www.wur.eu/economic-research,
 4. Dhandhalya MG, Tarpara VD, Swaminathan B, Chavda H. Total factor productivity growth of cumin crop in Gujarat: Measurement and determinants. *International Research Journal of Agricultural Economics and Statistics.* 2019;10(1):68-74.
 5. Chand R, Kumar P, Kumar S. Total factor productivity and contribution of research investment to agricultural growth in India. Policy Paper No. 25, National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research, New Delhi; 2011.
 6. Kumar P, Mittal S, Hossain M. Agricultural growth accounting and total factor productivity in South Asia: A review and policy implications, *Agric. Econ. Res. Rev.* 2008;21(2):145-172.
 7. Kannan E. Total factor productivity growth and its determinants in Karnataka agriculture. Working paper 265, The Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore, India; 2011.
 8. Gupta S, Badal PS. Total factor productivity growth of sugarcane in Uttar Pradesh: Parametric and non-parametric analysis. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry.* 2021;Sp10(1):134-137.
 9. Rohini AV, Khunt KA, Dhandhalya MG. and Thanki, P. M. Growth and total factor productivity change of fennel in Gujarat. *Trends in Biosciences.* 2018;11(32):3675-3679.
 10. DAG. Directorate of Agriculture, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar. 2020. Accessed 12 August 2020. Available:www.dag.gujarat.gov.in,

© 2023 Bhopala et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/111189>