IPB University
Bogor Indonesia

AESAP 2021

"The Role of Agricultural and Biosystem Engineering to provide and manage Food, Land, Water and Bioenergy to achieve Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) toward Industry 4.0"

The 4th International Conference on Agricultural Engineering for Sustainable Agricultural Production

11-12 OCTOBER 2021

- 08.00-17.00 Jakarta Time (GMT +7)
- ONLINE CONFERENCE
- Zoom hosted by Departement of Mechanical and Biosystem Engineering, IPB University, Bogor – Indonesia

Speakers

Welcome Speech
Prof. Arif Satria
Rector of IPB University

Welcome Speech
Dr. Tri Joko Santoso
Head of IIBCRI

Dr. Sam Herodian
IPB University - Indonesia
Agriculture Mechanization for Agriculture Production in Indonesia

Prof. Emiritus Mikio Umeda
Advisor to Yanmar Agribusiness Co., Ltd
Present Status of Agriculture Mechanization for Agriculture Production in Japan

Dr. Dares Kittiyopas
President Agricultural Engineers Association - Thailand
Agricultural and Bioproduction Machinery in Thailand

Dr. Rossana Marie c. Amongo
University of the Philippines Los Baños - Philippine
Agricultural and Bioproduction Machinery in Pihiliphine

Dr. Dadan Kusdiana
Directorate general of new, renewable and conservation energy - Indonesia
Renewable Energy Policy in Indonesia

Assoc. Prof. Muhammad Aziz
The University of Tokyo
Biomass System and Process Integration Engineering for Bioenergy Generation

Prof. Ryozo Noguchi
University of Tsukuba Jepang
Microalgae Biomass Prospect for Renewable Energy Generation: Indonesia and Japan

Prof. Yukihiko Matsumura
Hiroshima University, Japan
Biomass Gasification in Near- and Supercritical Water

Prof. Kudang Boro Seminar,
IPB University - Indonesia
PreciPalm: Precision Palm Oil Using Remote Sensing Technology for Fertilizer

Asif Aunillah, M.Sc
IIBCRI - Indonesia
Biofuel Production (from Land to Biofuel production)

Prof. Herry Suhardiyanto
IPB University - Indonesia
Greenhouse and Plant Factory Prospect in Indonesia

Dr. Arora Amarpreet Singh
Sherpa Space Inc - Korea
SMART Production in Plant Factory in Industrial Scale

registration: ipb.link/aesap-2021

TMB Departemen Teknik Mesin dan Biosistem
Fakultas Teknologi Pertanian IPB University

PERTETA BOGOR CHAPTER

Balittri
Balai Penelitian Tanaman Industri dan Penyegar

YARI IPB
Yanmar Research Institute - IPB

ZOOM Meeting ID: 947 8834 9857 | Passcode: 853902

Organized by:
Departemen of Mechanical and Biosystem Engineering, Faculty of Agricultural Technology, IPB University
Indonesian Society of Agricultural Engineers (ISAE), Bogor Chapter.
Indonesian Industrial and Beverage Crops Research Institute, Ministry of Agriculture - Republic of Indonesia

BUKTI KORESPONDENSI IOP

The 4th International Conference on Agriculture Engineering for Sustainable Agricultural Production

Judul : Performance Comparison of The Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields

- ➢ SUBMIT (21 September 2022)
- ➢ REVISI 1 (22 Januari 2022)
- ➢ REVISI 2 (27 Maret 2022)
- ➢ ACCEPTED PAPER (26 Mei 2022)
- ➢ TERBIT DI IOP (27 Juni 2022)

Daftar Lampiran

AESAP 2021 submission 96 update

1 pesan

AESAP 2021 <aesap2021@easychair.org>   1 September 2021 10.20
Kepada: Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>

Dear authors,

we acknowledge that we received new files for your AESAP 2021
submission. The information about this update is shown below.

  Number: 96
  Authors: Mareli Telaumbanua, Witaningsih Witaningsih, Agus Haryanto, Budianto Lanya, Siti Suharyatun and Febryan Kusuma Wisnu
  Title: Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields
  Uploaded by: Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>
  Updates:
    paper, version 2 (8544 bytes)

To access the new version of your submission you should log in to
the AESAP 2021 EasyChair page.

Submission 96 | AESAP 2021 | Conference | News | EasyChair

My Submissions for AESAP 2021

Using the submission author environment you can view your submissions to AESAP 2021. New submissions or updates of your existing submissions are disabled.

To **view your existing submission** click on the corresponding "view" icon.

Additional information about submission to AESAP 2021 can be found at the AESAP 2021 Web page.

Questions about submissions can be sent to the conference contact email obiefarobie@gmail.com.

Please note that if you do nothing (not even click on the menu) for more than two hours, your session will expire and you will have to log in again.

#	Authors	Title	View	paper	Program
96	Mareli Telaumbanua, Witaningsih Witaningsih, Agus Haryanto, Budianto Lanya, Siti Suharyatun and Febryan Kusuma Wisnu	Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields			

AESAP 2021 Submission 96

Submission information updates are disabled.

For all questions related to processing your submission you should contact the conference organizers. Click here to see information about this conference.

Submission 96	
Title	Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields
Paper:	📂 (Feb 09, 18:06 GMT) (previous versions)
Author keywords	A Single Row Power Weeder Multi-Row Power Weeder Rice Plants Weeder Performance
Abstract	Weeding rice weeds is done to reduce and prevent the competition of nutrients absorption between weeds and rice plants. Weed control can be applied through various techniques, including pulling and piling the weeds into the soil. Weeds buried in the soil can be decomposed and become nutrients for rice plants. One application of technology used in weeding weeds is the use of single row power weeder (single engine) and multi-row power weeder (twin-engine). The research aimed to compare the performance in using a single row power weeder (single engine) and multi-row power weeder (twin-engine) in rice fields. The multi-row power weeder was designed by combining a single row power weeder. This research was conducted by testing the performance of the power weeder in rice fields in an area of 14 m x 4 m for each replication. The total area of land used was 560 m2 with five experimental replicates. Weeding activities were carried out on rice plants aged 30 DAP. The results showed a successive comparison between the performance of the single row power weeder (single engine) and the multi-row power weeder (twin-engine), such as the theoretical working capacity was 0.037 ha/hour and 0.054 ha/hour, effective working capacity was 11.11 minutes and 9.78 minutes, the efficiency of the weeder performance was 82.48% and 64.87%, fuel consumption was 1.07 liters/hour and 1.92 liters/hour, and the success rate of weeding was 64.41 % and 59.77 %. The calculation results of the plant damage levels were 15 plants and 31 plants, while the mudding index values were 75.26% and 77.62%. The results of this study showed that the advantages of using a single row power weeder were on the parameters of effective working capacity, weeding efficiency, fuel, weeding success, and low plant damage. The advantages of the multi-row power weeder were the parameters of theoretical working capacity, effective working capacity, and muddling index.
Submitted	Aug 31, 17:00 GMT
Last update	Sep 01, 03:42 GMT

Authors						
first name	last name	email	country	affiliation	Web page	corresponding?
Mareli	Telaumbanua	marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com	Indonesia	University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia		✓
Witaningsih	Witaningsih	witaningsih256@gmail.com	Indonesia	University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia		
Agus	Haryanto	agusharyid65@gmail.com	Indonesia	University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia		
Budianto	Lanya	blanya@yahoo.com	Indonesia	University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia		
Siti	Suharyatun	sitisuharyatun149@gmail.com	Indonesia	University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia		
Febryan Kusuma	Wisnu	febryankusumawisnu@gmail.com	Indonesia	University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia		

The 4th International Conference on
Agricultural Engineering for Sustainable Agriculture Production
Secretariat: Department of Mechanical and Biosystem Engineering IPB University
Darmaga Bogor PO BOX 220.phone/fax: +62-251-8623026 Bogor Indonesia
email: aesap@apps.ipb.ac.id, https://aesapconference.com/

RECEIPT

RECEIPT TO			RECEIPT NO:	96

Name   :   Mareli Telaumbanua
Submission number   :   96
Title   :   Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields

No	Description	Unit	Unit Price (Rp)	Net Amount (Rp)	Status
1	Presentation fee	-	-	-	-
2	Publication fee	1	1.500.000	1.500.000	Paid
	GRAND TOTAL			1.500.000	

Remark :
Transver Via
Bank Name   :   PT Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero)
Bank Branch Address :   Jl. Ir. H. Juanda No. 52, Bogor – Indonesia
Bank Account   :   0003898023
Recipient Name   :   REKTOR IPB C/Q KS DOLLAR IPB
Recipient Address   :   Jl. Lingkar Kampus IPB Darmaga, Bogor – Indonesia
Account Currency   :   USD
SWIFT Code   :   BNNIDJABGR

Bogor, 6 October 2021

Supriyanto,
Chairman of AESAP 2021

Bukti Pembayaran Publikasi Aesap 2021

1 pesan

Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>　　　　　26 September 2021 23.32
Kepada: aesapconference@apps.ipb.ac.id

Transaksi Berhasil

Tanggal	26 Sep 2021 | 23:10:26 WIB
Nomor Referensi	429587145433
Sumber Dana	MARELI TELAUMBANUA 3020 **** **** 536
Jenis Transaksi	Transfer Bank Lain
Bank Tujuan	BANK BNI
Nomor Tujuan	3889948
Nama Tujuan	- REKTOR IPB CQ KS FATETA

Lihat Detail Transaksi ⌄

Nominal	Rp1.500.000
Biaya Admin	Rp6.500
Total	**Rp1.506.500**
Total	**Rp1.506.500**

Bukti Pembayaran Publikasi Aesap 2021
Mareli Telaumbanua, Witaningsing, Budidanto Lanya, Agus Haryanto dan Siti Suharyatun dengan judul : Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (*Single Engine*) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (*Twin-Engine*) in Rice Fields.
Terima kasih IPB

Payment Receipt of The 4th AESAP

1 pesan

AESAP- Conference <aesapconference@apps.ipb.ac.id>   9 Oktober 2021 10.11
Kepada: marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Mareli Telaumbanua

We have received your payment. Please kindly find the receipt of your payment in the attachment.

We are looking forward to meeting you at the conference.

Best Regards

📄 **96_Mareli Telaumbanua.pdf**
   810K

Copyright Transfer Agreement on a paper accepted by AESAP 2021

I, the first author of the paper described below, would like to transfer the copyright of the described paper below, to the Paper Committee of the 4th International Conference on Agricultural Engineering for Sustainable Agriculture Production (AESAP 2021), for the IOP publication.

I understand that the Paper Committee of the AESAP 2021 holds the right to make minor corrections and necessary modification without informing and getting approval of authors of this paper, as well as making appropriate correspondence to make the publication of Institute of Physics (IOP) Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science.

I acknowledge that transferring copyright does not exempt authors' duties to make revision works or necessary corrections on the paper. I will correct and revise my paper promptly if the requirements given by the Paper Committee of AESAP 2021.

I and all other co-authors of the paper agree that copyright is transferred to Paper Committee of the AESAP 2021, and understand that it will be transferred to IOP for publication, therefore no duplicate publication nor plagiarism of any parts of the paper as original findings be made.

This agreement is based upon the representative right of the first author of the paper, who represents the interests of other co-authors of the paper on behalf.

Name of the first author: Dr. Mareli Telaumbanua
Submission number : 96
Date: 14 March 2022
Signature:

AESAP 2021 submission 96 update

1 pesan

AESAP 2021 <aesap2021@easychair.org>   30 September 2021 23.54
Kepada: Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>

Dear authors,

we acknowledge that we received new files for your AESAP 2021
submission. The information about this update is shown below.

  Number: 96
  Authors: Mareli Telaumbanua, Witaningsih Witaningsih, Agus Haryanto, Budianto Lanya, Siti Suharyatun and Febryan
Kusuma Wisnu
  Title: Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row
Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields
  Uploaded by: Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>
  Updates:
    paper, version 3 (756786 bytes)

To access the new version of your submission you should log in to
the AESAP 2021 EasyChair page.

AESAP 2021 Complete Review Result-submission 96

2 pesan

AESAP 2021 <aesap2021@easychair.org>   22 Januari 2022 17.54
Kepada: Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. M. Telaumbanua,

Following the previous email on the acceptance of your full paper entitled "Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields" (Submission No. 96), these are the comments from the reviewers:

Result: Accepted by Scientific Committee of AESAP2021 (after revisions)

Comments and corrections:
- Content of manuscript within the scope of AESAP and the manuscript has been written according to scientific rules.
- Please state the novelty of this finding in the introduction section.
- Please change the unit of "hour" with "h", following international standard of scientific writing.
- It is recommended to remove the box outside the figure.
- Please remove the "CLOSING" statement.
- Please revise the conclusion in the paragraph, not in the sectional points.
- Suggestion can be merged with the conclusion part.
- Acknowledgement section can be placed after conclusion.
Please make sure you have performed the plagiarism check with a low %similarity result.
Please submit your revised full paper to Easychair by 10 February 2022.
As previously mentioned, please note that
the full paper submission to IOP can only undertake if:
a. The paper is presented at the AESAP 2021 parallel session
b. The paper is revised according the reviewers' instructions
c. The review and publication fee is paid (Please ignore it if you have already done so)

Please note that even though the paper has been accepted by Scientific Committee of AESAP2021, the final decision of acceptance of your full paper is on IOP: EES. After we receive the revised full paper, we will submit to the IOP: EES together with all accepted papers.
We look forward to receiving your revised full paper.
Should you have any questions please email: aesapconference@apps.ipb.ac.id
Thank you for your contribution.

Best regards,

AESAP 2021 Secretariat

Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>   10 Februari 2022 01.12
Kepada: AESAP 2021 <aesap2021@easychair.org>

Paper no 96 has been revised and sent to https://easychair.org/conferences/submission according to reviewer notes.

thank you committee.

Virus-free. www.avast.com

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields

M Telaumbanua[1*], Witaningsih[1], B Lanya[1], A Haryanto[1], S Suharyatun[1], F K Wisnu[1]

[1]Agricultural Engineering Departement, University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
E-mail: marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com

Abstract. Weeding rice weeds is done to reduce and prevent the competition of nutrients absorption between weeds/grass and rice plants. Weed control can be applied through various techniques, including pulling and piling the weeds into the soil. Weeds buried in the soil can be decomposed and become nutrients for rice plants. One application of technology used in weeding weeds is the use of single row power weeder (*single engine*) and multi-row power weeder (*twin-engine*). The research aimed to compare the performance in using a single row power weeder (*single engine*) and multi-row power weeder (*twin-engine*) in rice fields. The multi-row power weeder was designed by combining a single row power weeder. This research was conducted by testing the performance of the power weeder in rice fields in an area of 14 m x 4 m for each replication. The total area of land used was 560 m^2 with five experimental replicates. Weeding activities were carried out on rice plants aged 30 DAP. The results showed a successive comparison between the performance of the single row power weeder (*single engine*) and the multi-row power weeder (*twin-engine*), such as the theoretical working capacity was 0.037 ha/hour and 0.054 ha/hour, effective working capacity was 11.11 minutes and 9.78 minutes, the efficiency of the weeder performance was 82.48% and 64.87%, fuel consumption was 1.07 liters/hour and 1.92 liters/hour, and the success rate of weeding was 64.41 % and 59.77 %. The calculation results of the plant damage levels were 15 plants and 31 plants, while the mudding index values were 75.26% and 77.62%. The results of this study showed that the advantages of using a single row power weeder were on the parameters of effective working capacity, weeding efficiency, fuel, weeding success, and low plant damage. The advantages of the multi-row power weeder were the parameters of theoretical working capacity, effective working capacity, and muddling index.

Introduction

Weeds are plants whose growth is not desired. Generally, weed growth is faster than cultivated plants. Weeding is a step to reduce the growth of weeds which are often referred to as nuisance plants. It aims to reduce and prevent competition for nutrients, water, oxygen in the soil, light between rice plants and weeds that grow together. In addition, the uncontrolled growth of weeds can cause the pest population in the crop cultivation area to increase. Some types of weeds are considered as nests or lures for some pests.

Control of weeds that grow simultaneously with rice plants can be carried out periodically. Some steps can be taken pulling out, removing, or submerging weeds into the soil [1]. Weeds that have been buried in the soil can be decomposed into nutrients that rice plants can absorb. Several

alternative ways can be done to weed weeds manually and mechanically. However, manual weeding is not optimal for use on land for plant cultivation which tends to be more comprehensive. Mechanical steps taken for weeding weeds are weeding using a power weeder that uses a fuel motor. The use of a power weeder is considered a step to improve work efficiency in the field because it can increase the effectiveness and performance of the weeding process [2]. Improving the performance of the weeding process has an impact on increasing labor productivity and rice production [3].

Generally, the power weeder found at the farm level is a single row power weeder using a single engine. However, using a single row power weeder is considered to be less fast than a double row. It becomes the basis for researchers to design a double row power weeder unit by utilizing a twin-engine power weeder to weed weeds in rice plants. This research objective was to obtain a performance comparison between the use of a power weeder single row using a single-engine and a multi-row power weeder using a twin-engine in weeding rice plants. The twin-engine power weeder is assembled through the incorporation of a single-engine power weeder. The novelty of this research is the design and performance testing of single row and multi-row weeder machines to improve farmer performance. In this study, the power weeder worked using a type 2 stroke engine, a cylinder volume of 30.5 cc for 1 unit of weeder. The multiple power weeder was designed to be sturdy and portable so that it could be disassembled. The advantage of the portable system on this multiple power weeder was that it made weeding distance easily adjusted between rice plants.

Several studies have been conducted before analyzing the performance of motorized weeding machines before and after modification [4]. In this study, modification of weeding equipment was able to increase the success of weeding by 78%. Another study was about modifications to motorized weeders for paddy fields [5]. Research on the technical and economic aspects of weeders in rain-fed rice fields has also been carried out [6]. A design for weeding systems in paddy fields has been carried out to support weeding operations in paddy fields [7]. In addition, noise and vibration research on the use of hand tractors has been carried out [8]. Excessive vibration and noise could cause high levels of fatigue and result in health problems. Research on improving work systems to reduce fatigue in doing work has also been done [9]. Another study is about the modification of gasrok for weeding. The use of gasrok has an impact on lower operating costs for farmers [10].

This research could be helpful as a reference on implementing a weeder (machine tool) to increase productivity in agriculture. In addition, this research was also helpful as a basis for further research for duplicating implements or suitable weeding discs using a single combustion engine. Through this research, we found a technology that weeding using a combustion engine using duplicated implements makes weeding more efficient and increases farmer productivity. The application of automation and control systems can be applied to the weeder, so that operational activities do not require manpower [11, 12]. This is certainly very helpful for the lack of labor in agriculture in various regions in Indonesia.

Material and Method

2.1. Places, Materials, and Equipment
The research was conducted at the Agricultural Power and Machineries Laboratory, Department of Agricultural Engineering, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Lampung. The tool testing was carried out in rice fields in Cipta Waras Village, Gedung Surian District, West Lampung Regency, Lampung Province, Indonesia. The tools used in this research were single-row power weeder, multi-row power weeder, stopwatch, ruler, meter, stake, rope, fuel in the form of gasoline mixed with oil with a ratio of 25:1, IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 application, camera, sound level meter, smartwatch, 100 cc tube, and stationery. The material used was rice weeds with a plant age of 30 days.

2.2. Stages of Research and Tool Testing

The research was conducted on two weeding tools, namely single row and multi-row power weeders. The power weeder used was a single groove power weeder with the brand Daun Mas type MH1R. Multi-row power weeders are two combined power weeder machines, one Daun Mas type MH1R type. The research stage started from the assembly of the implemented power weeder. Next was the making of an observation plot with an area of 14 x 4 m for each test. Then, the total population of rice plants was calculated in each observation plot. Furthermore, preparation of weeding equipment and weeder testing was carried out. The weeding pattern between the single-engine and double-engine weeders was comparable. Each row was weeded without any overlapping weeding between treatments. In testing the equipment, the data taken included working capacity (effective and theoretical), tool efficiency, the percentage of successful weeding, crop damage, mudding index, and fuel consumption.

The measurement of the theoretical working capacity can be carried out using the equation [13]:

$$KT = 0.36 \text{ x } V \text{ x } W \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots..(1)$$

Where:
  KT : Theoretical working capacity (ha/hour)
  V : Speed (m/sec)
  W : Tool working width (m)

The values of effective working capacity can be obtained by calculating the weeded land area divided by total time or used the equation below:

$$KE = \frac{A}{t} \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots..(2)$$

Where:
  KE : Effective working capacity (ha/hour)
  A : Land area (ha)
  t : Total operating time (hours)

The values of the tool efficiency can be obtained by comparing the effective working capacity to the theoretical working capacity, or using the equation:

$$E = \frac{KE}{KT} \text{ x } 100\% \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots..(3)$$

Where:
  E : Field efficiency (%)
  KE : Effective working capacity (ha/hour)
  KT : Theoretical working capacity (ha/hour)

Fuel consumption is calculated on both *power weeder* tools with the same treatments. *i.e.*, before weeding, the fuel is fully filled. Then, after it has operated, it will be fully filled again. Most fuels filled after operating were recorded as the amount of fuel used. The fuel discharge can be calculated by the equation [14]:

$$Q = \frac{Vol}{T} \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots... (4)$$

Where:
  Q : Fuel Discharge (liter/hour)
  Vol : Volume of fuel used (liter)
  T : The time used (hour)

A weeding success rate was carried out by measuring the total weight of weeds and the weight of the weeding weeds. The percentage of the weeding success rate can be measured by using the equation:

$$Gh = \left(\frac{Gt}{Gp}\right) \times 100\ \% \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(5)$$

Where:
    Gh   : Percentage of weeding weeds weight (%)
    Gt   : Weeding weeds weight (kg)
    Gp   : Total weight weeds (kg)

The percentage of crop damage was obtained by comparing the number of crop damage and the principal crops or using the equation [15]:

$$PKT = \frac{TR}{TP}\ x\ 100\ \% \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(6)$$

Where:
    PKT: Percentage of crop damage (%)
    TR   : Crop damage due to the operating tools (stem)
    TP   : The number of the principal crops (stem)

The calculation of the mudding index was carried out by taking the groundwater suspension from the mudding using a plastic tube that has a volume size of 100 cc on the mud's surface with the tube positioned horizontally in the mud. The two tube holes were tightly closed to prevent leakage. Then, it will be left for 48 hours. Thus, the soil in the tube fell and settled. The amount of soil volume in the tube will be recorded, and the mudding index can be calculated by using the following equation [16].

$$IP = \frac{Vs}{Vt}\ x\ 100\% \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(7)$$

Where:
    IP   : The mudding index (%)
    Vs   : Decreased soil volume
    Vt   : The total volume of suspension samples

2.3. Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted with the analysis method of the Independent T-Test at the real level using the IBM SPSS Statistics 22 application.

Results and Discussion

3.1. Design Results

The implemented power weeder design consisted of a single-row engine power weeder. A multi-row double-engine weeder was combined with two single-row single-engine weeder units. The joining used iron pipe material with a diameter of 5 cm and a pipe thickness of 2 mm. The combination of these two weeder units used three coupling points to strengthen during operation. The throttle lever has been adjusted proportionally so that the speeds between engines have the same RPM. The combination of these tools was in a portable design so that the weeding process used a double-engine weeder that can adjust to the spacing of plants in various land conditions (Figure 1).

Figure 1. (a) Single-row single-engine weeder and (b) Multi-row double-engine weeder

Tests on single and multiple power weeders were carried out at a spacing between 25 -30 cm. The distance was according to the spacing of rice in Indonesia and the width of the weeding wheel.

3.2. Theoretical Working Capacity

Theoretical working capacity was obtained from the calculation of the tool speed (m/s) multiplied by the working width of the tool (m). The tool's speed (m/s) was obtained from calculating the length of the track (m) divided by the operating time of the tool on one track. Based on the results of the measurements made by each tool were 0.69 m/s and 0.50 m/s. The results of the calculation of theoretical working capacity can be seen in Figure 2.


Figure 2. Theoretical working capacity of each weeder

Figure 2 shows that the theoretical working capacity of the single and double power weeder mechanical weeder was 0.062 ha/hour and 0.045 ha/hour, respectively. Each tool had a different theoretical working capacity value, with the theoretical working capacity value on a single power weeder being higher than that of the double power weeder. According to the results of research that has been done, it was influenced by the worker's physical condition, the level of ability, skill, and work habits of the operator [17]. Other factors that were also considered to affect the ability to work are land conditions (soil type, mud layer) and the value of weed density.

The theoretical work capacity data analysis utilized an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-test test are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of independent sample T-test of theoretical working capacity

Independent Samples Test			theoretical working capacity	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		0.005	
	Sig.		0.947	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		3.776	3.776
	Df		8	8
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.005	0.005
	Mean Difference		0.0168	0.0168
	Std. Error Difference		0.00445	0.00445
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	0.00654	0.00653
		Upper	0.02706	0.02706

Table 1 is the main table of the independent sample t-test analysis. It can be seen that the two-way (two-tailed) significance value was 0.005<0.05. Thus, there was a significant difference in point scores between the single power weeder group and the multiple power weeder groups.

3.3. Effective Working Capacity

Effective working capacity was the average value of the workability of a tool to complete its work or the average area of work per amount of time required. The value of effective working capacity is shown in Figure 3.


Figure 3. Effective working capacity of each weeder

The double power weeder owned the average value of the highest effective working capacity with a value of 0.035 ha/hour. In contrast, in the single power weeder, the average value of the effective working capacity was 0.030 ha/hour. The average effective working value was 0.0377 ha/hour related to the power weeder tool in previous studies [6]. Effective working capacity data analysis was carried out through an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-

way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-Test test are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of independent sample T-test of effective working capacity

Independent Samples Test				
			effective working capacity	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		3.036	
	Sig.		0.12	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		-1.64	-1.64
	Df		8	5.202
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.14	0.16
	Mean Difference		-0.0044	-0.0044
	Std. Error Difference		0.0027	0.0027
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-0.0106	-0.0112
		Upper	0.001788	0.002418

Based on Table 2, there was no significant difference between the value of the effective working capacity of the single power weeder and the double power weeder. It was evident from the significant two-way (two-tailed) values, namely 0.140 and 0.160, where both values were more significant than the alpha value of 0.05.

3.4. Weeding Tool Efficiency
The weeding tool's efficiency was influenced by the ability to work effectively and the ability to work theoretically. The total effective working ability was calculated by working time on flat ground, turning time, and resting time so that the effective working time tended to be more significant. The efficiency of each tool is shown in Figure 4.


Figure 4. The efficiency of the weeding tool.

The highest efficiency value was achieved by a double power weeder of 77.84%, while the efficiency value of a single power weeder was 49.49%. However, the value of weeding efficiency produced by the mechanical device has not yet reached its maximum value. The experimental images

used were narrow and limited, and the operator's ability to operate the tool was still limited. Table 3 showed an independent sample T-test analysis for the value of the efficiency of the weeding tool used an alpha of 5% (0.05).

Table 3. The results of the independent sample t-test of the weeding tool efficiency.

			The efficiency of the weeding tool	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		2	
	Sig.		0.195	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		-2.734	-2.734
	Df		8	4.828
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.026	0.043
	Mean Difference		-28.3534	-28.3534
	Std. Error Difference		10.371487	10.371487
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-52.270092	-55.302512
		Upper	-4.436708	-1.404288

The table showed a significant difference between the single power weeder and double power weeder groups because the two-way (two-tailed) significance values were 0.026 and 0.043, where both values were smaller than the alpha value, which was 0.05.

In addition, based on the descriptive value, it was evident that using a double power weeder had a more excellent efficiency value than a single power weeder.

3.5. Fuel Consumption

Consumption of fuel used in this research was the volume of fuel in the form of a mixture of gasoline and oil mixed with a ratio of 25: 1, which was used during the tool's operation in each observation plot. The amount of fuel volume was obtained by filling it thoroughly before weeding. Then after it was operated, each tool was filled again until it was complete. The amount of fuel filled after the operation was recorded as the amount of fuel used. Consumption of fuel use is presented in Figure 5.


Figure 5. Consumption of fuel use

The average amount of fuel consumed by the double power weeder was 1.92 liters/hour, while the single power weeder was 1.07 liters/hour. It was because there were two driving forces on the

double power weeder to use more fuel. Therefore, the amount of power weeder affected the fuel consumption used.

Analysis of fuel consumption data was carried out using an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-Test test are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of the Independent Sample T-Test of Fuel Consumption

Independent Samples Test				
			Fuel Consumption	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		2.548	
	Sig.		0.149	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		-3.17	-3.17
	Df		8	6.02
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.013	0.019
	Mean Difference		-0.85	-0.85
	Std. Error Difference		0.269	0.269
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-1.47	-1.51
		Upper	-0.23	-0.19

Based on Table 4, there were significant differences in fuel consumption value between single power weeder and double power weeder. It was evident from the two-way (two-tailed) significant values, namely 0.013 and 0.019, where both values were smaller than 0.05. In addition, based on the descriptive value, it was proven that using a double power weeder consumed more fuel.

3.6. Weeding Success Rate
The weeding success rate was obtained by calculating the percentage of weeds weeded in an observation plot. In this research, the number of weeds was calculated based on weed weights and the total weed weights. Data on the success rate of weeding is shown in Figure 6.


Figure 6. The success rate of weeding

The highest percentage of weeding success rate was achieved by a single power weeder of 64.41%, and the lowest value was obtained by a double power weeder of 59.77%. It was due to differences in weed density in each plot and the operator's ability to operate the weeding equipment. In the experimental plot of the single power weeder, the weed density was high enough that many weeds were easy to weed. In contrast, in the experimental plot of the double power weeder, the weeds grew quite far apart. In addition, the single power weeder was more straightforward to operate than the double power weeder. The double power weeder required two people to operate it because the tool's weight was quite heavy. Table 5 shows an independent sample T-test analysis for the value of the success rate of weeding equipment using an alpha of 5% (0.05).

Table 5. The results of the independent sample T-test of the success rate of the weeding tool

Independent Samples Test				
			The success rate of weeding	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		0.054	
	Sig.		0.823	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		0.59	0.59
	Df		8	6.936
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.571	0.574
	Mean Difference		4.636	4.636
	Std. Error Difference		7.855	7.855
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-13.479	-13.974
		Upper	22.751	23.246

Based on Table 5, there was no significant difference between the success rate of single power weeder and double power weeder. It was evident from the two-way (two-tailed) significant values, namely 0.571 and 0.574, where both values were more significant than the alpha value of 0.05.

3.7. Crop Damage Rate

The crop damage rate was obtained from the calculation of the percentage of the crop damage numbers due to the use of weeding equipment. Percentage of crop damage was obtained by comparing the number of crop damage to the number of principal crops. The percentage of crop damage is presented in Figure 7.


Figure 7. Percentage of Crop Damage

The highest level of crop damage resulting from a double power weeder was 5.46%, while the level of crop damage to a single power weeder was 2.71%. It was due to the lack of operator capability in operating the double power weeder because its heavyweight made it more challenging to control than other weeders. Data analysis on the level of crop damage was carried out utilizing an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-Test test are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Results of independent sample T-test on the crop damage rate

Independent Samples Test			The crop damage rate	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		0.261	
	Sig.		0.623	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		3.688	3.688
	Df		8	7.651
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.006	0.007
	Mean Difference		2.752	2.752
	Std. Error Difference		0.746279	0.746279
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	1.031	1.017
		Upper	4.473	4.487

Table 6 shows the results of the independent sample t-test analysis. It can be seen that the two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.006 and 0.007 where both values were smaller than the alpha value of 0.05, so there was a significant difference in point scores between the single power weeder and double power weeder groups.

3.8. Mudding Index
The mudding index in this study was obtained from calculating the volume of the soil suspension samples taken after the weeding process from each weeding tool. Figure 8 shows the mudding index value of each weeder.


Figure 8. The mudding index of each weeder

The use of a double power weeder provided the highest mudding index of 77.62% because it was done mechanically so that the sludge formation process was faster and better. The mudding index value close to 100% indicated that the mixing between water and mud improved. In comparison, the mudding percentage level was more than 50%, indicated that the mud value was concentrated, so it was suitable for rice growth [18]. A low percentage of the muds indicated that the soil was still watery, so it was not suitable for rice growth.

The mudding index data analysis was carried out through an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-Test test are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. The results of the independent sample T-test of the mudding index

Independent Samples Test				
			The mudding index	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		0.028	
	Sig.		0.872	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		-0.614	-0.614
	Df		8	7.995
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.556	0.556
	Mean Difference		-2.356	-2.356
	Std. Error Difference		-11.208	-11.208
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-11.208	-11.209
		Upper	6.496	6.497

Based on Table 7, there was no significant difference between the value of the mudding index on the single power weeder and the double power weeder. It was evident from the significant two-way (two-tailed) value of 0.556, where both values were more significant than the alpha value of 0.05.

Conclusion

The study results obtained that a single-row weeder implementation is more superior on the parameters of effective working capacity, weeding efficiency, fuel consumption, weeding success rate, the low damaged of rice plants. The advantages of implementing a multi-row weeder (twin-engine) in paddy fields are the theoretical working capacity parameters, effective working capacity, and the mudding index. The performance testing values in the single-row (single-engine) and multi-row (twin-engine) weeding implementations respectively includes the theoretical working capacity of 0.037 ha/hour and 0.054 ha/hour, the effective working capacity of 11.11 minutes and 9.78 minutes, the weeding performance efficiency of 82.48% and 64.87%, the fuel consumptions of 1.07 liters/hour and 1.92 liters/ hour, a weeding success rate of 64.41% and 59.77%, the mudding index values of 75.26% and 77.62%. The calculation results of crop damage rate are 15 and 31 plants.

References

[1] Lailiyah, W.N., Widaryanto, E., Wicaksono, K.P. 2014. Pengaruh Periode Penyiangan Gulma Terhadap Pertumbuhan dan Hasil Tanaman Kacang Panjang (*Vigna sesquipedalis* L.) Jurnal Produksi Tanaman, 2 (7), 606-612.

[2] Aldillah, R. 2016. Agricultural Mechanization and its Implications for Food and Production Acceleration in Indonesia. Forum Penelitian dan Agro Ekonomi 34 (2), 163-177.

[3] Hantoro, F.R.P., Prasetyo, E., Hermawan, A. 2020. The Impact of Utilizations of Agricultural Equipment and Machinery and Rice Production in Tegal Regency. Pangan, 29, (3), 171-180.

[4] Widiyawati, S., Tama, I.P., Sugiono, dan Tantrika, C.F.M. 2017. Perbandingan tingkat keberhasilan penyiangan tanaman padi berdasaran hasil modifikasi Power Weeder Tipe MC1R. Journal of Industrial Engineering Management. 2(1) 36 - 40.

[5] Pithantomo, B. 2007. Modifikasi dan uji fungsional penyiang bermotor (power weeder) tipe pisau cakar untuk tanaman padi sawah. (Skripsi). Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor. 65 hlm.

[6] Harnel dan Buharman. 2011. Kajian teknis dan ekonomis mesin penyiang (power weeder) padi di lahan sawah tadah hujan. Jurnal Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Teknologi Pertanian. 14(1): 1 – 10.

[7] Wijaya, A.K. dan Kasda. 2018. Perancangan dan pengujian sistem penggerak penyiang gulma. Jurnal MESA. 3(1): 23 - 31.

[8] Prabawa, S. 2009. Analisis kebisingan dan getaran mekanis pada traktor tangan. Agritech. 29(2):103 - 107.

[9] Marfuah, H.H. 2018. Perbaikan Sistem Kerja yang Ergonomis untuk Mengurangi Kelelahan dan Keluhan Muskuloskeletal dengan Pendekatan Ergonomi Partisipatori. Dinamika Teknik. 9(1): 1 - 8.

[10] Suryaningsih, Y. dan Surjadi, E. 2018. Upaya pengendalian gulma tanaman padi berbasis teknologi pada kelompok tani desa semiring. Jurnal Pengabdian. 2(1): 69-76.

[11] Telaumbanua, M., Triyono, S., Haryanto, A and Wisnu, F.K. 2019. Controlled Electrical Conductivity (Ec) of Tofu Wastewater as a Hydroponic Nutrition. Procedia Environmental Science, Engineering and Management. 6 (3) 452-463.

[12] Telaumbanua, M., Haryanto, A., Wisnu, F.K., Lanya, B. and Wiratama, W. 2021. Design of Insect Trap Automatic Control System For Cacao Plants. Procedia Environmental Science, Engineering and Management. 8 (1) 167-175.

[13] Santosa, Andasuryani dan Veronica, V. 2005. Kinerja traktor tangan untuk pengolahan tanah. Jurnal Teknologi Pertanian Andalas. 9(2):1 - 7.

[14] Wijaya, A.K. dan Kasda. 2018. Perancangan dan pengujian sistem penggerak penyiang gulma. Jurnal MESA. 3(1): 23 - 31.

[15] Harnel dan Buharman. 2011. Kajian teknis dan ekonomis mesin penyiang (power weeder) padi di lahan sawah tadah hujan. Jurnal Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Teknologi Pertanian. 14(1): 1 – 10.

[16] Pramuhadi, G., Daywin, F.J., Mandang, T., dan Haridjaja, O. 1999. Studi optimasi rasio kecepatan linier pisau rotari dan kecepatan maju traktor pada pelumpuran tanah pad1 sawah. Buletin Keteknikan Pertanian. 13(3):40 – 56.

[17] Sulistyosari, N. 2010. Kajian Pemilihan Alternatif Penyiangan Gulma Padi Sawah. (Skripsi). Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor. 118 hlm.

[18] Karimah, N., Sugandi, W.K., Thoriq, A., Yusuf, A. 2020. Analisis Efisiensi Kinerja pada Aktivitas Pengolahan Tanah Sawah secara Manual dan Mekanis. Jurnal Keteknikan Pertanian Tropis dan Biosistem. 8(1):1 – 13.

AESAP 2021 submission 96 update

1 pesan

AESAP 2021 <aesap2021@easychair.org>   10 Februari 2022 01.06
Kepada: Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>

Dear authors,

we acknowledge that we received new files for your AESAP 2021
submission. The information about this update is shown below.

  Number: 96
  Authors: Mareli Telaumbanua, Witaningsih Witaningsih, Agus Haryanto, Budianto Lanya, Siti Suharyatun and Febryan
Kusuma Wisnu
  Title: Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row
Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields
  Uploaded by: Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>
  Updates:
    paper, version 4 (752256 bytes)

To access the new version of your submission you should log in to
the AESAP 2021 EasyChair page.

Publication IOP AESAP 2021 _ No 96

1 pesan

Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>   17 Maret 2022 20.27
Kepada: aesapconference@apps.ipb.ac.id

I apologize for the delay in requesting a file on March 7, 2022. The message I received, has been overwritten by new messages. I just read it this afternoon and immediately sent the file.

The following attachments are requested by AESAP.

Virus-free. www.avast.com

2 lampiran

📄 **Copyright transfer Agreement AESAP 2021_Mareli Telaumbanua.pdf**
32K

📄 **Revised AESAP_Submission No 96.pdf**
736K

Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields

M Telaumbanua[1*], Witaningsih[1], B Lanya[1], A Haryanto[1], S Suharyatun[1], F K Wisnu[1]

[1]Agricultural Engineering Departement, University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
E-mail: marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com

Abstract. Weeding rice weeds is done to reduce and prevent the competition of nutrients absorption between weeds/grass and rice plants. Weed control can be applied through various techniques, including pulling and piling the weeds into the soil. Weeds buried in the soil can be decomposed and become nutrients for rice plants. One application of technology used in weeding weeds is the use of single row power weeder (*single engine*) and multi-row power weeder (*twin-engine*). The research aimed to compare the performance in using a single row power weeder (*single engine*) and multi-row power weeder (*twin-engine*) in rice fields. The multi-row power weeder was designed by combining a single row power weeder. This research was conducted by testing the performance of the power weeder in rice fields in an area of 14 m x 4 m for each replication. The total area of land used was 560 m^2 with five experimental replicates. Weeding activities were carried out on rice plants aged 30 DAP. The results showed a successive comparison between the performance of the single row power weeder (*single engine*) and the multi-row power weeder (*twin-engine*), such as the theoretical working capacity was 0.037 ha/hour and 0.054 ha/hour, effective working capacity was 11.11 minutes and 9.78 minutes, the efficiency of the weeder performance was 82.48% and 64.87%, fuel consumption was 1.07 liters/hour and 1.92 liters/hour, and the success rate of weeding was 64.41 % and 59.77 %. The calculation results of the plant damage levels were 15 plants and 31 plants, while the mudding index values were 75.26% and 77.62%. The results of this study showed that the advantages of using a single row power weeder were on the parameters of effective working capacity, weeding efficiency, fuel, weeding success, and low plant damage. The advantages of the multi-row power weeder were the parameters of theoretical working capacity, effective working capacity, and muddling index.

Introduction

Weeds are plants whose growth is not desired. Generally, weed growth is faster than cultivated plants. Weeding is a step to reduce the growth of weeds which are often referred to as nuisance plants. It aims to reduce and prevent competition for nutrients, water, oxygen in the soil, light between rice plants and weeds that grow together. In addition, the uncontrolled growth of weeds can cause the pest population in the crop cultivation area to increase. Some types of weeds are considered as nests or lures for some pests.

Control of weeds that grow simultaneously with rice plants can be carried out periodically. Some steps can be taken pulling out, removing, or submerging weeds into the soil [1]. Weeds that have been buried in the soil can be decomposed into nutrients that rice plants can absorb. Several

alternative ways can be done to weed weeds manually and mechanically. However, manual weeding is not optimal for use on land for plant cultivation which tends to be more comprehensive. Mechanical steps taken for weeding weeds are weeding using a power weeder that uses a fuel motor. The use of a power weeder is considered a step to improve work efficiency in the field because it can increase the effectiveness and performance of the weeding process [2]. Improving the performance of the weeding process has an impact on increasing labor productivity and rice production [3].

Generally, the power weeder found at the farm level is a single row power weeder using a single engine. However, using a single row power weeder is considered to be less fast than a double row. It becomes the basis for researchers to design a double row power weeder unit by utilizing a twin-engine power weeder to weed weeds in rice plants. This research objective was to obtain a performance comparison between the use of a power weeder single row using a single-engine and a multi-row power weeder using a twin-engine in weeding rice plants. The twin-engine power weeder is assembled through the incorporation of a single-engine power weeder. The novelty of this research is the design and performance testing of single row and multi-row weeder machines to improve farmer performance. In this study, the power weeder worked using a type 2 stroke engine, a cylinder volume of 30.5 cc for 1 unit of weeder. The multiple power weeder was designed to be sturdy and portable so that it could be disassembled. The advantage of the portable system on this multiple power weeder was that it made weeding distance easily adjusted between rice plants.

Several studies have been conducted before analyzing the performance of motorized weeding machines before and after modification [4]. In this study, modification of weeding equipment was able to increase the success of weeding by 78%. Another study was about modifications to motorized weeders for paddy fields [5]. Research on the technical and economic aspects of weeders in rain-fed rice fields has also been carried out [6]. A design for weeding systems in paddy fields has been carried out to support weeding operations in paddy fields [7]. In addition, noise and vibration research on the use of hand tractors has been carried out [8]. Excessive vibration and noise could cause high levels of fatigue and result in health problems. Research on improving work systems to reduce fatigue in doing work has also been done [9]. Another study is about the modification of gasrok for weeding. The use of gasrok has an impact on lower operating costs for farmers [10].

This research could be helpful as a reference on implementing a weeder (machine tool) to increase productivity in agriculture. In addition, this research was also helpful as a basis for further research for duplicating implements or suitable weeding discs using a single combustion engine. Through this research, we found a technology that weeding using a combustion engine using duplicated implements makes weeding more efficient and increases farmer productivity. The application of automation and control systems can be applied to the weeder, so that operational activities do not require manpower [11, 12]. The application of the future weed control system can embed artificial intelligence to predict movement using artificial neural networks so as to reduce operator involvement in the field and reduce operational costs [13, 14]. This is certainly very helpful for the lack of labor in agriculture in various regions in Indonesia.

Material and Method

2.1. Places, Materials, and Equipment
The research was conducted at the Agricultural Power and Machineries Laboratory, Department of Agricultural Engineering, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Lampung. The tool testing was carried out in rice fields in Cipta Waras Village, Gedung Surian District, West Lampung Regency, Lampung Province, Indonesia. The tools used in this research were single-row power weeder, multi-row power weeder, stopwatch, ruler, meter, stake, rope, fuel in the form of gasoline mixed with oil with a ratio of 25:1, IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 application, camera, sound level meter, smartwatch, 100 cc tube, and stationery. The material used was rice weeds with a plant age of 30 days.

2.2. Stages of Research and Tool Testing

The research was conducted on two weeding tools, namely single row and multi-row power weeders. The power weeder used was a single groove power weeder with the brand Daun Mas type MH1R. Multi-row power weeders are two combined power weeder machines, one Daun Mas type MH1R type. The research stage started from the assembly of the implemented power weeder. Next was the making of an observation plot with an area of 14 x 4 m for each test. Then, the total population of rice plants was calculated in each observation plot. Furthermore, preparation of weeding equipment and weeder testing was carried out. The weeding pattern between the single-engine and double-engine weeders was comparable. Each row was weeded without any overlapping weeding between treatments. In testing the equipment, the data taken included working capacity (effective and theoretical), tool efficiency, the percentage of successful weeding, crop damage, mudding index, and fuel consumption.

The measurement of the theoretical working capacity can be carried out using the equation [15]:

$$KT = 0.36 \text{ x } V \text{ x } W$$ …………………………………………..(1)

Where:
    KT   : Theoretical working capacity (ha/hour)
    V   : Speed (m/sec)
    W   : Tool working width (m)

The values of effective working capacity can be obtained by calculating the weeded land area divided by total time or used the equation below:

$$KE = \frac{A}{t}$$...(2)

Where:
    KE   : Effective working capacity (ha/hour)
    A   : Land area (ha)
    t   : Total operating time (hours)

The values of the tool efficiency can be obtained by comparing the effective working capacity to the theoretical working capacity, or using the equation:

$$E = \frac{KE}{KT} \text{ x } 100\%$$..(3)

Where:
    E   : Field efficiency (%)
    KE   : Effective working capacity (ha/hour)
    KT   : Theoretical working capacity (ha/hour)

Fuel consumption is calculated on both *power weeder* tools with the same treatments. *i.e.*, before weeding, the fuel is fully filled. Then, after it has operated, it will be fully filled again. Most fuels filled after operating were recorded as the amount of fuel used. The fuel discharge can be calculated by the equation [16]:

$$Q = \frac{Vol}{T}$$ …………………………………….…………..… (4)

Where:
    Q   : Fuel Discharge (liter/hour)
    Vol : Volume of fuel used (liter)
    T   : The time used (hour)

A weeding success rate was carried out by measuring the total weight of weeds and the weight of the weeding weeds. The percentage of the weeding success rate can be measured by using the equation:

$$Gh = \left(\frac{Gt}{Gp}\right) \times 100 \text{ \%}\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(5)$$

Where:

Gh   : Percentage of weeding weeds weight (%)
Gt   : Weeding weeds weight (kg)
Gp   : Total weight weeds (kg)

The percentage of crop damage was obtained by comparing the number of crop damage and the principal crops or using the equation [17]:

$$PKT = \frac{\text{TR}}{\text{TP}} \text{ x } 100 \text{ \%}\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(6)$$

Where:

PKT: Percentage of crop damage (%)
TR   : Crop damage due to the operating tools (stem)
TP   : The number of the principal crops (stem)

The calculation of the mudding index was carried out by taking the groundwater suspension from the mudding using a plastic tube that has a volume size of 100 cc on the mud's surface with the tube positioned horizontally in the mud. The two tube holes were tightly closed to prevent leakage. Then, it will be left for 48 hours. Thus, the soil in the tube fell and settled. The amount of soil volume in the tube will be recorded, and the mudding index can be calculated by using the following equation [18].

$$IP = \frac{\text{Vs}}{\text{Vt}} \text{ x } 100\%\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(7)$$

Where:

IP   : The mudding index (%)
Vs   : Decreased soil volume
Vt   : The total volume of suspension samples

2.3. Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted with the analysis method of the Independent T-Test at the real level using the IBM SPSS Statistics 22 application.

Results and Discussion

3.1. Design Results

The implemented power weeder design consisted of a single-row engine power weeder. A multi-row double-engine weeder was combined with two single-row single-engine weeder units. The joining used iron pipe material with a diameter of 5 cm and a pipe thickness of 2 mm. The combination of these two weeder units used three coupling points to strengthen during operation. The throttle lever has been adjusted proportionally so that the speeds between engines have the same RPM. The combination of these tools was in a portable design so that the weeding process used a double-engine weeder that can adjust to the spacing of plants in various land conditions (Figure 1).

Figure 1. (a) Single-row single-engine weeder and (b) Multi-row double-engine weeder

Tests on single and multiple power weeders were carried out at a spacing between 25 -30 cm. The distance was according to the spacing of rice in Indonesia and the width of the weeding wheel.

3.2. Theoretical Working Capacity

Theoretical working capacity was obtained from the calculation of the tool speed (m/s) multiplied by the working width of the tool (m). The tool's speed (m/s) was obtained from calculating the length of the track (m) divided by the operating time of the tool on one track. Based on the results of the measurements made by each tool were 0.69 m/s and 0.50 m/s. The results of the calculation of theoretical working capacity can be seen in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Theoretical working capacity of each weeder

Figure 2 shows that the theoretical working capacity of the single and double power weeder mechanical weeder was 0.062 ha/hour and 0.045 ha/hour, respectively. Each tool had a different theoretical working capacity value, with the theoretical working capacity value on a single power weeder being higher than that of the double power weeder. According to the results of research that has been done, it was influenced by the worker's physical condition, the level of ability, skill, and work habits of the operator [19]. Other factors that were also considered to affect the ability to work are land conditions (soil type, mud layer) and the value of weed density.

31

The theoretical work capacity data analysis utilized an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-test test are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of independent sample T-test of theoretical working capacity

Independent Samples Test				
			theoretical working capacity	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		0.005	
	Sig.		0.947	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		3.776	3.776
	Df		8	8
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.005	0.005
	Mean Difference		0.0168	0.0168
	Std. Error Difference		0.00445	0.00445
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	0.00654	0.00653
		Upper	0.02706	0.02706

Table 1 is the main table of the independent sample t-test analysis. It can be seen that the two-way (two-tailed) significance value was 0.005<0.05. Thus, there was a significant difference in point scores between the single power weeder group and the multiple power weeder groups.

3.3. Effective Working Capacity
Effective working capacity was the average value of the workability of a tool to complete its work or the average area of work per amount of time required. The value of effective working capacity is shown in Figure 3.


Figure 3. Effective working capacity of each weeder

The double power weeder owned the average value of the highest effective working capacity with a value of 0.035 ha/hour. In contrast, in the single power weeder, the average value of the effective working capacity was 0.030 ha/hour. The average effective working value was 0.0377 ha/hour related to the power weeder tool in previous studies [6]. Effective working capacity data analysis was carried out through an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-

way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-Test test are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of independent sample T-test of effective working capacity

Independent Samples Test			effective working capacity	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		3.036	
	Sig.		0.12	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		-1.64	-1.64
	Df		8	5.202
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.14	0.16
	Mean Difference		-0.0044	-0.0044
	Std. Error Difference		0.0027	0.0027
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-0.0106	-0.0112
		Upper	0.001788	0.002418

Based on Table 2, there was no significant difference between the value of the effective working capacity of the single power weeder and the double power weeder. It was evident from the significant two-way (two-tailed) values, namely 0.140 and 0.160, where both values were more significant than the alpha value of 0.05.

3.4. Weeding Tool Efficiency

The weeding tool's efficiency was influenced by the ability to work effectively and the ability to work theoretically. The total effective working ability was calculated by working time on flat ground, turning time, and resting time so that the effective working time tended to be more significant. The efficiency of each tool is shown in Figure 4.


Figure 4. The efficiency of the weeding tool.

The highest efficiency value was achieved by a double power weeder of 77.84%, while the efficiency value of a single power weeder was 49.49%. However, the value of weeding efficiency produced by the mechanical device has not yet reached its maximum value. The experimental images

used were narrow and limited, and the operator's ability to operate the tool was still limited. Table 3 showed an independent sample T-test analysis for the value of the efficiency of the weeding tool used an alpha of 5% (0.05).

Table 3. The results of the independent sample t-test of the weeding tool efficiency.

Independent Samples Test				
			The efficiency of the weeding tool	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		2	
	Sig.		0.195	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		-2.734	-2.734
	Df		8	4.828
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.026	0.043
	Mean Difference		-28.3534	-28.3534
	Std. Error Difference		10.371487	10.371487
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-52.270092	-55.302512
		Upper	-4.436708	-1.404288

The table showed a significant difference between the single power weeder and double power weeder groups because the two-way (two-tailed) significance values were 0.026 and 0.043, where both values were smaller than the alpha value, which was 0.05.

In addition, based on the descriptive value, it was evident that using a double power weeder had a more excellent efficiency value than a single power weeder.

3.5. Fuel Consumption

Consumption of fuel used in this research was the volume of fuel in the form of a mixture of gasoline and oil mixed with a ratio of 25: 1, which was used during the tool's operation in each observation plot. The amount of fuel volume was obtained by filling it thoroughly before weeding. Then after it was operated, each tool was filled again until it was complete. The amount of fuel filled after the operation was recorded as the amount of fuel used. Consumption of fuel use is presented in Figure 5.


Figure 5. Consumption of fuel use

The average amount of fuel consumed by the double power weeder was 1.92 liters/hour, while the single power weeder was 1.07 liters/hour. It was because there were two driving forces on the

double power weeder to use more fuel. Therefore, the amount of power weeder affected the fuel consumption used.

Analysis of fuel consumption data was carried out using an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-Test test are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of the Independent Sample T-Test of Fuel Consumption

Independent Samples Test				
			Fuel Consumption	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		2.548	
	Sig.		0.149	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		-3.17	-3.17
	Df		8	6.02
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.013	0.019
	Mean Difference		-0.85	-0.85
	Std. Error Difference		0.269	0.269
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-1.47	-1.51
		Upper	-0.23	-0.19

Based on Table 4, there were significant differences in fuel consumption value between single power weeder and double power weeder. It was evident from the two-way (two-tailed) significant values, namely 0.013 and 0.019, where both values were smaller than 0.05. In addition, based on the descriptive value, it was proven that using a double power weeder consumed more fuel.

3.6. Weeding Success Rate
The weeding success rate was obtained by calculating the percentage of weeds weeded in an observation plot. In this research, the number of weeds was calculated based on weed weights and the total weed weights. Data on the success rate of weeding is shown in Figure 6.


Figure 6. The success rate of weeding

The highest percentage of weeding success rate was achieved by a single power weeder of 64.41%, and the lowest value was obtained by a double power weeder of 59.77%. It was due to differences in weed density in each plot and the operator's ability to operate the weeding equipment. In the experimental plot of the single power weeder, the weed density was high enough that many weeds were easy to weed. In contrast, in the experimental plot of the double power weeder, the weeds grew quite far apart. In addition, the single power weeder was more straightforward to operate than the double power weeder. The double power weeder required two people to operate it because the tool's weight was quite heavy. Table 5 shows an independent sample T-test analysis for the value of the success rate of weeding equipment using an alpha of 5% (0.05).

Table 5. The results of the independent sample T-test of the success rate of the weeding tool

Independent Samples Test				
			The success rate of weeding	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		0.054	
	Sig.		0.823	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		0.59	0.59
	Df		8	6.936
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.571	0.574
	Mean Difference		4.636	4.636
	Std. Error Difference		7.855	7.855
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-13.479	-13.974
		Upper	22.751	23.246

Based on Table 5, there was no significant difference between the success rate of single power weeder and double power weeder. It was evident from the two-way (two-tailed) significant values, namely 0.571 and 0.574, where both values were more significant than the alpha value of 0.05.

3.7. Crop Damage Rate

The crop damage rate was obtained from the calculation of the percentage of the crop damage numbers due to the use of weeding equipment. Percentage of crop damage was obtained by comparing the number of crop damage to the number of principal crops. The percentage of crop damage is presented in Figure 7.


Figure 7. Percentage of Crop Damage

The highest level of crop damage resulting from a double power weeder was 5.46%, while the level of crop damage to a single power weeder was 2.71%. It was due to the lack of operator capability in operating the double power weeder because its heavyweight made it more challenging to control than other weeders. Data analysis on the level of crop damage was carried out utilizing an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-Test test are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Results of independent sample T-test on the crop damage rate

Independent Samples Test				
			The crop damage rate	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		0.261	
	Sig.		0.623	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		3.688	3.688
	Df		8	7.651
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.006	0.007
	Mean Difference		2.752	2.752
	Std. Error Difference		0.746279	0.746279
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	1.031	1.017
		Upper	4.473	4.487

Table 6 shows the results of the independent sample t-test analysis. It can be seen that the two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.006 and 0.007 where both values were smaller than the alpha value of 0.05, so there was a significant difference in point scores between the single power weeder and double power weeder groups.

3.8. Mudding Index
The mudding index in this study was obtained from calculating the volume of the soil suspension samples taken after the weeding process from each weeding tool. Figure 8 shows the mudding index value of each weeder.


Figure 8. The mudding index of each weeder

The use of a double power weeder provided the highest mudding index of 77.62% because it was done mechanically so that the sludge formation process was faster and better. The mudding index value close to 100% indicated that the mixing between water and mud improved. In comparison, the mudding percentage level was more than 50%, indicated that the mud value was concentrated, so it was suitable for rice growth [20]. A low percentage of the muds indicated that the soil was still watery, so it was not suitable for rice growth.

The mudding index data analysis was carried out through an independent sample T-test on the SPSS application with a two-way (two-tailed) significance value of 0.000 <0.05. The results of the Independent Sample T-Test test are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. The results of the independent sample T-test of the mudding index

Independent Samples Test				
			The mudding index	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		0.028	
	Sig.		0.872	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		-0.614	-0.614
	Df		8	7.995
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.556	0.556
	Mean Difference		-2.356	-2.356
	Std. Error Difference		-11.208	-11.208
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-11.208	-11.209
		Upper	6.496	6.497

Based on Table 7, there was no significant difference between the value of the mudding index on the single power weeder and the double power weeder. It was evident from the significant two-way (two-tailed) value of 0.556, where both values were more significant than the alpha value of 0.05.

Conclusion

The study results obtained that a single-row weeder implementation is more superior on the parameters of effective working capacity, weeding efficiency, fuel consumption, weeding success rate, the low damaged of rice plants. The advantages of implementing a multi-row weeder (twin-engine) in paddy fields are the theoretical working capacity parameters, effective working capacity, and the mudding index. The performance testing values in the single-row (single-engine) and multi-row (twin-engine) weeding implementations respectively includes the theoretical working capacity of 0.037 ha/hour and 0.054 ha/hour, the effective working capacity of 11.11 minutes and 9.78 minutes, the weeding performance efficiency of 82.48% and 64.87%, the fuel consumptions of 1.07 liters/hour and 1.92 liters/ hour, a weeding success rate of 64.41% and 59.77%, the mudding index values of 75.26% and 77.62%. The calculation results of crop damage rate are 15 and 31 plants.

References

[1] Lailiyah, W.N., Widaryanto, E., Wicaksono, K.P. 2014. Pengaruh Periode Penyiangan Gulma Terhadap Pertumbuhan dan Hasil Tanaman Kacang Panjang (*Vigna sesquipedalis* L.) Jurnal Produksi Tanaman, 2 (7), 606-612.

[2] Aldillah, R. 2016. Agricultural Mechanization and its Implications for Food and Production Acceleration in Indonesia. Forum Penelitian dan Agro Ekonomi 34 (2), 163-177.

[3] Hantoro, F.R.P., Prasetyo, E., Hermawan, A. 2020. The Impact of Utilizations of Agricultural Equipment and Machinery and Rice Production in Tegal Regency. Pangan, 29, (3), 171-180.

[4] Widiyawati, S., Tama, I.P., Sugiono, dan Tantrika, C.F.M. 2017. Perbandingan tingkat keberhasilan penyiangan tanaman padi berdasaran hasil modifikasi Power Weeder Tipe MC1R. Journal of Industrial Engineering Management. 2(1) 36 - 40.

[5] Pithantomo, B. 2007. Modifikasi dan uji fungsional penyiang bermotor (power weeder) tipe pisau cakar untuk tanaman padi sawah. (Skripsi). Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor. 65 hlm.

[6] Harnel dan Buharman. 2011. Kajian teknis dan ekonomis mesin penyiang (power weeder) padi di lahan sawah tadah hujan. Jurnal Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Teknologi Pertanian. 14(1): 1 – 10.

[7] Wijaya, A.K. dan Kasda. 2018. Perancangan dan pengujian sistem penggerak penyiang gulma. Jurnal MESA. 3(1): 23 - 31.

[8] Prabawa, S. 2009. Analisis kebisingan dan getaran mekanis pada traktor tangan. Agritech. 29(2):103 - 107.

[9] Marfuah, H.H. 2018. Perbaikan Sistem Kerja yang Ergonomis untuk Mengurangi Kelelahan dan Keluhan Muskuloskeletal dengan Pendekatan Ergonomi Partisipatori. Dinamika Teknik. 9(1): 1 - 8.

[10] Suryaningsih, Y. dan Surjadi, E. 2018. Upaya pengendalian gulma tanaman padi berbasis teknologi pada kelompok tani desa semiring. Jurnal Pengabdian. 2(1): 69-76.

[11] Telaumbanua, M., Triyono, S., Haryanto, A and Wisnu, F.K. 2019. Controlled Electrical Conductivity (Ec) of Tofu Wastewater as a Hydroponic Nutrition. Procedia Environmental Science, Engineering and Management. 6 (3) 452-463.

[12] Telaumbanua, M., Haryanto, A., Wisnu, F.K., Lanya, B. and Wiratama, W. 2021. Design of Insect Trap Automatic Control System For Cacao Plants. Procedia Environmental Science, Engineering and Management. 8 (1) 167-175.

[13] Haryanto, A., Saputra, T.W., Telaumbanua, M., Gita, A.C. 2020. Application of artificial neural network to predict biodiesel yield from waste frying oil transesterification. Indonesian Journal of Science & Technology 5 (1) (2020) 62-74.

[14] Purbowaskito, W and Telaumbanua, M. 2019. Simulation Study of Kalman-Bucy filter Based Optimal Yaw Rate Control System for Autonomous Tractor. The 3rd International Symposium on Agricultural and Biosystem Engineering. IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 355.

[15] Santosa, Andasuryani dan Veronica, V. 2005. Kinerja traktor tangan untuk pengolahan tanah. Jurnal Teknologi Pertanian Andalas. 9(2):1 - 7.

[16] Wijaya, A.K. dan Kasda. 2018. Perancangan dan pengujian sistem penggerak penyiang gulma. Jurnal MESA. 3(1): 23 - 31.

[17] Harnel dan Buharman. 2011. Kajian teknis dan ekonomis mesin penyiang (power weeder) padi di lahan sawah tadah hujan. Jurnal Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Teknologi Pertanian. 14(1): 1 – 10.

[18] Pramuhadi, G., Daywin, F.J., Mandang, T., dan Haridjaja, O. 1999. Studi optimasi rasio kecepatan linier pisau rotari dan kecepatan maju traktor pada pelumpuran tanah pad1 sawah. Buletin Keteknikan Pertanian. 13(3):40 – 56.

[19] Sulistyosari, N. 2010. Kajian Pemilihan Alternatif Penyiangan Gulma Padi Sawah. (Skripsi). Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor. 118 hlm.

[20] Karimah, N., Sugandi, W.K., Thoriq, A., Yusuf, A. 2020. Analisis Efisiensi Kinerja pada Aktivitas Pengolahan Tanah Sawah secara Manual dan Mekanis. Jurnal Keteknikan Pertanian Tropis dan Biosistem. 8(1):1 – 13.

AESAP 2021 submission 96

3 pesan

AESAP 2021 <aesap2021@easychair.org>   24 Maret 2022 20.37
Kepada: Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>

Dear authors,

Dear authors,

Mohon dibantu dikirimkan full paper dalam bentuk word karena kami sedang melakukan proof read dan menyamakan format paper sesuai IOP: EES.
Semoga bisa kami terima paling lambat 28 Maret 2022.

Terima kasih.

Best regards,
AESAP secretariate

Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>   27 Maret 2022 14.10
Kepada: AESAP 2021 <aesap2021@easychair.org>

Terima kasih. berikut full paper akhir yang telah saya koreksi kembali.. terima kasih.

Virus-free. www.avast.com

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

📄 **Revised AESAP_Submission No 96_fix.docx**
630K

Mareli Telaumbanua <marelitelaumbanua@gmail.com>   27 Maret 2022 14.12
Kepada: AESAP 2021 <aesap2021@easychair.org>

Terima kasih banyak. berikut full paper akhir yang telah saya koreksi dan revisi kembali.. Terima kasih banyak panitia 🙏

Virus-free. www.avast.com

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

📄 **Revised AESAP_Submission No 96_fix.docx**
630K

Certificate *of Appreciation*

AESAP 2021
Agricultural Engineering
for Sustainable
Agriculture Production

Witaningsih

As a Participant in

The 4th International Conference on
Agricultural Engineering for Sustainable Agricultural Production

"The Role of Agricultural and Biosystem Engineering to Provide and Manage Food, Land, Water and Bioenergy to Achieve Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) toward Industry 4.0"

Bogor Indonesia, 11-12 October 2021
8:00 - 16:00 (GMT+7)

Head of Department
Mechanical and Biosystem Engineering, IPB University

Prof. Dr. Ir. Sutrisno, M.Agr,

Chairman

Dr. Supriyanto, STP, M.Kom

Organized by:
Departemen of Mechanical and Biosystem Engineering, Faculty of Agricultural Technology, IPB University
Indonesian Society of Agricultural Engineers (ISAE), Bogor Chapter.
Indonesian Industrial and Beverage Crops Research Institute, Ministry of Agriculture - Republic of Indonesia

TMB | **Departemen**
Teknik Mesin dan Biosistem
Fakultas Teknologi Pertanian IPB University
BOGOR CHAPTER

PERTETA

Balittri
Balai Penelitian Tanaman Industri dan Penyegar

YARI IPB
Yanmar Research Institute - IPB

IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science

Table of contents

Volume 1038
2022

‹ Previous issue   Next issue ›

The 4th International Conference on Agricultural Engineering for Sustainable Agriculture Production (AESAP 2021) 11/10/2021 - 11/10/2021 Online

Accepted papers received: 26 May 2022
Published online: 21 June 2022

JOURNAL LINKS

Journal home

Journal scope

Information for organizers

Information for authors

Contact us

Reprint services from Curran Associates

Desrial and K Muhammad

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012060
Postural analysis in design evaluation of oil palm loose fruits collector machine
L Saulia, I D M Subrata and M M Yusuf

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012061
Performance Comparison of the Implementations of Single Row Power Weeder (Single Engine) and Multi-Row Power Weeder (Twin-Engine) in Rice Fields
M Telaumbanua, Witaningsih, B Lanya, A Haryanto, S Suharyatun and F K Wisnu

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012062
Analysis of Soil Puddling Method and the Effect to Soil Physical Properties and Rice Plant Growth
A N Dewanti and T Mandang

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012063
Determine Field and Machine Operating Condition of Rice Combine Harvester to Minimize Grain Loss
Z A Nugroho and T Mandang

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012064
Characteristics of Oil Palm Stem Mulch as Soil Conditioner at Oil Palm
A Alfarisi, T Mandang and A Sutejo

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

Post Harvest Technology

012065
Study of the use of Binahong (*Anredera cordifolia*) herbal as complementary treatment wounds in the Tenger Tribe
LN Azizah, Mashuri and Z Abidin

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012066
Characterization of Edible Film based on Yam Bean Starch, Calcium Propionate and Agarwood *Bouya* Essential Oil
L P Wigati, A A Wardana, F Tanaka and F Tanaka

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012067
Coating Application to Extend the Shelf Life of Sweet Potatoes cv. Cilembu
E Darmawati and M Ekawati

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012068
The Quality of Arabica Coffee Beans Evaluation at Various Processing in Luwu Regency South Sulawesi, Indonesia
Nendyo Adhi Wibowo, Fadjry Djufry, Syafaruddin, Tajul Iflah and Dani

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012069
Application of Palm Stearin Edible Coating on Cavendish Banana (*Musa acuminata*)
W Agusta, D Anggraeni, H D Hermansyah and A D Gebrina

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012070
Optimized Utilization of Post-Harvest Coffee Agricultural Equipment and Machines
Y D Setyoningtyas, E Darmawati and Sutrisno

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012071
Drying kinetics of porang (*Amorphophallus mueller B.*) chips under open sun drying
L.C. Hawa, F.G. Septiyanto, R. Yulianingsih, B. Susilo, A. Lastriyanto, S.H. Sumarlan, Y. Tihardo and L. G. Sinambela

+ Open abstract   View article   PDF

012072
Food Safety Aspect in the Use of Hydrogen Peroxide in the Cleaning Process of Coriander Seeds