

Original Research Articles

Impact of NPK Treatments on Sweet Sorghum Yields for Biofuel Feedstock in Piedmont Region of North Carolina

Keywords: sweet sorghum; biofuel; ethanol; North Carolina; Piedmont soil

1. Introduction

There is an increasing interest in using ethanol produced from various plant species as a renewable substitute for fossil fuels in the U.S. and worldwide. The production of bio-ethanol in the U.S. increased from 175 million gallons (6.624e8 liters) in 1980 to 13.5 billion gallons (5.11e10 liters) [1]. The U.S. Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA) set a standard renewable fuel consumption of 36 billion gallons (1.362e11 liters), of which 21 billion gallons (7.949e10 liters) should be from cellulosic ethanol and other advanced bio-fuels by 2022 [2]. Currently in North Carolina, 5.6 billion gallons (2.119e10 liters) of petroleum-based liquid fuels are consumed each year [3]. The North Carolina Strategic Plan for Biofuels Leadership set a goal that by 2017, 10% of North Carolina's liquid fuels (about 600 million gallons (2.27125e9 liters) per year will be produced in the state from locally grown biomass [3].

Corn (*Zea mays* L.) grain is currently the major source of bio-ethanol production in the United States [4]. However, corn is an energy and nutrient intensive crop and is a major food and feed source in the U.S. Increasing production of ethanol from corn grain would likely lead to an increase in food prices as corn would be diverted from the food chain to producing ethanol [4]. Thus, energy crops other than corn must be considered to achieve the projected ethanol production of the U.S. An ideal dedicated energy crop for commercial ethanol production should provide positive production economics, should have high energy efficiency, and should fit into the ecosystem with minimal negative environmental consequences.

Sweet sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* (L.)) is a promising crop for production of bio-ethanol and has relatively low input requirements, efficient water usage, wide adaptability to environmental conditions, and high yields of readily convertible sugars [5]. Sweet sorghum is a C4 annual grass with greater N

use efficiency and biomass yield potential than corn [6]. Sweet sorghum is a subspecies of the sorghum family and has similar characteristics as other sorghum species, but with high sugar concentration in stalks. Sweet sorghum has a rapid growth rate as well as high sugar and biomass accumulation, drought and water logging tolerance, and wide adaptability [7,8,9]. The water requirement for sweet sorghum production is 8000 m³ ha⁻¹, which is half that of sugarbeet (*Beta vulgaris*) and one quarter that of sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum* L.), due to the extensive root system and relatively short growing season for sweet sorghum [10].

Sweet sorghum and sugarcane are advantageous energy crops compared with other crops since they have readily available sugars in their stalks, and produce bagasse (solid residue) after sugars are extracted [11]. Bagasse can be used as an animal feed [12] and as a soil amendment after composting [13]. Bagasse is also a viable biomass for cellulosic ethanol production and residual solids can be burned for heating [14]. Previous studies indicate that sweet sorghum has potential to produce 8000 L ha⁻¹ ethanol, which is twice that of corn grain ethanol yield potential and 30% greater than sugarcane productivity (e.g., 6000 L ha⁻¹ in Brazil) [5,15,16]. Sweet sorghum grain yield ranges from 1.5 to 7.5 t ha⁻¹, brix indexes range from 13 to 24%, juice sugar content varies from 7.2 to 15.5%, stalk fresh yield ranges from 24 to 120 t ha⁻¹, and biomass yield ranges from 36 to 140 t ha⁻¹ [17]. Sweet sorghum has potential to produce greater biomass yield than a sugarcane crop in tropics [18]. The bagasse produced from sweet sorghum has higher biological value than sugarcane as animal feed [19], and greater micronutrient and mineral value [20]. Feedstock from sweet sorghum is an inexpensive source for integrated bio-refineries to produce high value products from the hexose feed stream and ethanol from cellulose-derived sugars [5, 21]. The bagasse from sweet sorghum is also a potential raw material for the production of paper pulp [22] and energy source for combustion, gasification, and pyrolysis processes [23]. Sweet sorghum is a good source of ethyl *tetra*-butyl ether (ETBE) which can be added to gasoline to increase the octane index and reduce amount of non-combusted compounds [24]. However, ethanol production from sweet sorghum has limitations, such as storage of harvested product and that conversion of sugars into ethanol must initiate soon after harvest. Delay in conversion will lead to souring of juices (sugars convert to organic acids) and lower ethanol productivity [25].

The growth and production characteristics of sweet sorghum are favorable for commercial ethanol production. There are approximately 4000 sweet sorghum cultivars distributed throughout the world, providing a diverse genetic pool for development of specific and high yielding varieties for each region

[26]. Dale variety was developed in Mississippi mainly for syrup production [27] but gained popularity as biofuel feedstock. The Piedmont region of North Carolina has ideal climatic conditions for sweet sorghum cultivation, yet there is limited literature available regarding the nutrient requirements, potential biomass, and juice yields. Therefore, this study was conducted to assess nutrient management and determine yield potential for sweet sorghum in the North Carolina Piedmont region.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Experimental Site

Sweet sorghum field experiment was conducted at the North Carolina A&T State University research farm, Guilford County, North Carolina (36.06, -79.73, 241.4 m elevation). The soil at the experimental location is a Mecklenburg sandy clay loam (fine, mixed, active, thermic Ultic Hapludalfs) [28], with 2 to 6 percent slopes, and moderately eroded.

2.2. Treatments

The experiment included two varieties of sweet sorghum, Dale and M81-E (produced at Mississippi Foundation Seed Stocks), and four fertilizer treatments. Fertilizer subplot treatments included: T1: 0 fertilizer (control), T2: 168-56-168 (N-P₂O₅-K₂O kg ha⁻¹), T3: 84-28-84 plus Soysoap (Biobased USA, Mocksville, NC) (0.6 L ha⁻¹), and T4: 168-56-168 plus Soy soap (0.6 L ha⁻¹). These rates were based on soil test. The fertilizer sources and application timing included 14-14-14 (N-P₂O₅-K₂O), triple super phosphate (0-45-0) and muriate of potash (0-0-60) at planting and NH₄NO₃ (34-0-0) applied as sidedress at 35 days after emergence. The side-dress application was incorporated in a band 5cm deep and 10cm from the row. Soysoap is a surfactant, which when applied as foliar spray is reported to enhance plant nutrient uptake and growth, vigor, disease resistance and yield. Soysoap was applied as a foliar surfactant once every two weeks (15 ml in 3.5 L of water) until the soft dough grain stage.

2.3. Sweet Sorghum Field Preparation

Sweet sorghum plots were plowed to 30 cm, disked, and planted with crimson clover and rye as cover crops in the Fall of 2010. In late spring of 2011, the cover crops were disked back into soil at flowering stage. Prior to sweet sorghum planting soil at the site was plowed to 30 cm and then disked. Plots were then laid out and treatments were randomized. One-third of N and all of

the P₂O₅ and K₂O were applied at planting and the remaining two-thirds of the N was side-dressed.

Sweet sorghum was planted on May 23, 2011. The spacing was 25 cm within the row and between rows was 75 cm. Plots were irrigated using overhead sprinkler system supplementing rainfall. The plant population was manually thinned 3 weeks after planting to maintain 25 cm spacing within the row. Significant weed pressure was observed in the first 30 days after planting. In addition to manual weeding, post emergence (atrazine) herbicide was applied three weeks after planting at label rates. Shoot borer (*Chilo patillus*) infestation was observed in the plots at 40 DAP and anthracnose stalk rot disease was noted during the growing season. Carbaryl (1 Quart per acre in 100 Gallons water) insecticide (Sevin, Bayer Crop Science, Research Triangle Park, NC) and a fungicide Dithane M45 (Dow AgroSciences, Indianapolis, IN) at 1.5 lb/ac rate were applied at label rates to control the pest infestations.

Dale variety was harvested in first week of September followed by variety M-81-E in the second week of September. At harvest, tops fresh weight (including cane, leaves and panicles), fresh cane weight (without leaves and panicles), and the total juice extracted were recorded. A subsample of cane and leaves were collected at each harvest, then oven dried at 70° C to a constant dry weight to estimate moisture content.

2.4. Climate Data

Climate data were recorded using an automatic weather station (ECONET station) located approximately 50 m from the experimental plots. The recorded data were retrieved from NC CRONOS Database v.2.7.2 of the State Climate Office of North Carolina (<http://www.nc-climate.ncsu.edu/>) website. Daily weather data included maximum (Avg. TMAX) and minimum (Avg. TMIN) temperatures, relative humidity (Avg. R HUM), average wind speed (Avg. WIND), total solar radiation, photo-synthetically active radiation (PAR), precipitation (Total RAIN), and open pan evaporation (Total EVAP). Daily data were then averaged for individual months (Table 1). In 2011, the photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) was greater than in the previous year (2010) and may have had an effect on crop growth.

Table 1. Monthly weather data during sweet sorghum growing season.

Month	Avg. TMAX	Avg. TMIN	Avg. R HUM	Avg. WIND	Total RAIN	Total EVAP	Total Solar Radiation (TSR)	Photosynthetically Active Radiation (PAR)
	(°F)	(°F)	(%)	(mph)	(in)	(in)	(W/m ²)	(mol/m ²)
May-10	79.0	60.1	70.9	3.93	6.69	11.57	14025	613.4
Jun-10	88.4	68.9	69.7	2.94	2.96	14.55	16184	703.0
Jul-10	89.3	69.4	68.2	2.70	7.53	14.77	16294	717.6
Aug-10	87.8	69.2	74.4	2.58	3.9	12.30	13928	607.6
Sep-10	84.7	61.7	65.0	3.16	6.53	9.97	12061	534.4
Oct-10	73.2	48.6	65.3	3.35	2.69	7.23	10516	474.8
May-11	77.8	57.3	72.6	2.40	3.59	5.92	7607	1240.0
Jun-11	88.2	66.0	64.5	2.72	8.85	7.39	8699	1467.7
Jul-11	90.4	70.4	70.6	2.26	5.01	7.26	8232	1396.4
Aug-11	88.7	68.0	66.0	2.96	2.43	6.34	7369	1254.1
Sep-11	80.4	61.6	74.2	2.74	10.11	4.92	6110	737.3
Oct-11	73.2	48.6	65.3	3.35	2.69	7.23	10516	474.8
Nov-11	60.9	37.6	64.4	3.19	0.93	1.85	2325	326.6
Dec-11	41.3	25.5	59.8	3.77	2.42	0.95	1116	263.1

151

152

153

2.5. Experimental Design and Statistical Analysis

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

The experimental design was a 2×4 strip plot with 4 replications was used to improve homogeneity in the plots with 4 fertilizer treatments. Individual subplots measured 6m×10m. The variety treatment was randomized to main plots and fertilizer treatments were randomized to subplots. Sweet sorghum yield response to treatments was tested using analysis of variance by the PROC ANOVA model [29]. All statistical results were considered significant at 95% confidence level ($p \leq 0.05$).

2.6. Sampling

162

163

164

In the sweet sorghum growing season, 6 random soil cores from the top 15 cm were collected and composited from each plot at planting and at harvest. The composite soil samples were air dried for 48 hours, ground to pass

through a 2 mm stainless steel sieve, and analyzed for soil chemical and physical properties. Soil pH, cation exchange capacity (CEC), humic matter and bulk density were determined by the soil testing laboratory at the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (<http://www.ncagr.gov/agronomi/stmethod.htm>). Soil at the experimental site had pH:6.2, CEC: 4.8 meq/100cm³, and humic matter content (w/v) (g/cm³) 0.31%.

A specific set of parameter data was measured from a randomly selected 0.5 m² area of each plot, in two week intervals after planting. These parameters included: number of plants, number of leaves per plant, plant height, fresh biomass weight (including roots, cane, leaves and panicles), dry biomass weights, root fresh weights, root dry weights, and from 4th sampling onwards: cane fresh weight, cane dry weights, leaves fresh weight and leaves dry weights. Dry weights were determined by collecting a subsample from each fresh sample and drying at 70°C until dry weights were constant. Sweet sorghum was harvested manually at dough (grain filling) stage and juice was extracted using a sugarcane juice extractor (Model # SLR 3, Global Restaurant Supplies, Inc., North Miami, FL). One liter of juice was extracted from sweet sorghum canes and the weight was recorded to calculate the overall juice yield per treatment. The extracted juice was stored in Polyurethane bottles (Fisher Scientific) for further processing. Brix readings were recorded right at the time of juice extraction. The juice samples were oven dried at 105° C for 48 hours to determine water content. Sweet sorghum juice was fermented by a modified method of Sluiter et al., [30] and analyzed for total sugars (sucrose, fructose, and glucose) content using high performance liquid chromatography (Waters, HPLC Detector 410 Differential Refraction Index, Milford MA).

3. Results and Discussion

The mean sweet sorghum tops fresh weights across all the fertilizer treatments were significantly different, but were not affected by varieties (Table 1). All plots receiving fertilizer treatments had yields significantly greater than control (26.8 ton ha⁻¹). There was not a significant interaction between variety and fertilizer treatment (Table 2). The non-significant difference between the top fresh yields of the two varieties can be attributed to the suitability of the weather and soil conditions for both varieties in the piedmont area.

Table 2. Fresh yield (t ha^{-1}) of sweet sorghum tops (including cane, leaves, and panicles) for two varieties and across multiple fertilizer treatments. Means with the same case letter within a year are not significantly different at $\alpha=0.05$.

Fertilizer N-P ₂ O ₅ -K ₂ O (kg ha^{-1})	Cane top fresh weights (tons/ha)		
	Dale	M-81-E	Mean
0-0-0	21.5	32.1	26.8 ^b
168-56-168	50.8	52.1	51.5 ^a
84-28-84-soysoap	50.3	64.5	57.4 ^a
168-56-168-soysoap	36.0	50.0	43.0 ^a
Mean	39.6	49.7	

Cane fresh weights (without leaves, panicles) showed a similar treatment response to that found for tops fresh weight in both varieties. Fertilizer treatments did not affect cane fresh weight, nor was there a significant interaction between variety and fertilizer treatment. Tops fresh weight and cane fresh weight were not affected by variety, but were affected by fertilizer across both varieties. All plots receiving fertilizer had greater yields than the zero fertilizer control (Table 3).

Table 3. Sweet sorghum final fresh cane yield at harvest. Means with the same case letter are not significantly different at $\alpha=0.05$.

Fertilizer N-P ₂ O ₅ -K ₂ O (kg ha^{-1})	Cane fresh weight tons/ha		
	Dale	M-81-E	Mean
0-0-0	15.5	20.6	18.1 ^b
168-56-168	38.1	38.1	38.1 ^a
84-28-84-soysoap	37.5	46.3	41.9 ^a
168-56-168-soysoap	26.1	36.3	31.2 ^a
Mean	29.3	35.3	

Final juice yield extracted from harvested canes was not affected by varieties, but was affected by fertilizer treatment. All plots treated with fertilizer resulted in significantly greater juice yield ($11,504 \text{ L ha}^{-1}$) compared with the zero fertilizer

control yield ($4,304 \text{ L ha}^{-1}$) (Table 4). This result is consistent with the results observed for tops and cane yields. There was no significant interaction between variety and fertilizer for total juice yield.

Table 4. Sweet sorghum final juice yield at harvest. Mean values with same letter are not significantly different at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Fertilizer N-P ₂ O ₅ -K ₂ O (kg ha ⁻¹)	Total Juice liters/ha		
	Dale	M-81-E	Mean
0-0-0	4277	4331	4304 ^b
168-56-168	12887	10273	11580 ^a
84-28-84-soysoap	13411	13950	13681 ^a
168-56-168-soysoap	8348	10154	9251 ^a
Mean	9731	9677	

Total sugar (including sucrose, fructose, and glucose) concentration in juice extracted from harvested cane was similar for each variety tested. Total sugar concentration in juice was not affected by variety or fertilizer treatment (Table 5). The interaction effect of variety and fertilizer treatments was not significant.

Table 5. Sweet sorghum total sugar level of sucrose, fructose, and glucose in juice at harvest. Mean values with same letter are not significantly different at $\alpha=0.05$.

Fertilizer N-P ₂ O ₅ -K ₂ O (kg ha ⁻¹)	Total Sugar level in %		
	Dale	M-81-E	Mean
0-0-0	10.4	11.74	10.89
168-56-168	11.81	11.31	11.56
84-28-84-soysoap	10.07	10.77	10.42
168-56-168-soysoap	13.10	10.19	11.64
Mean	11.25	11.00	

BRIX readings recorded were significantly greater for variety Dale (14%) compared to variety M-81-E (13%), but were not affected by fertilizer rate. There was no significant interaction between variety and fertilizer treatments for BRIX, which is consistent with the pattern observed for sugar concentration (Table 6). Plant stress resulting from the lack of fertilizer in control plots resulted in higher sugar concentration. The higher sugar concentration in control is due to lower biomass production. Furthermore, the lower sugar concentration in the fertilizer treatments

could be attributed to higher biomass production, which resulted in the dilution of the sugars.

Table 6. BRIX index in sweet sorghum juice samples at harvest. . Mean values with same letter are not significantly different at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Fertilizer N-P ₂ O ₅ -K ₂ O (kg ha ⁻¹)	BRIX reading of juice at Harvest in %		
	Dale	M-81-E	Mean
0-0-0	11.6	12.4	12.0
168-56-168	14.9	14.4	14.7
84-28-84-soysoap	14.9	12.8	13.9
168-56-168-soysoap	14.5	12.5	13.5
Mean	14.0 ^a	13.0 ^b	

Total sugar and BRIX should have similar response patterns, since BRIX is a measure of solid sugars in juice samples. However, the values of sugar content and BRIX are different based on the fact that total sugar level is a measure of sucrose, fructose, and glucose. Sugar yield from the juice extracted was calculated based on the sugar concentration of juice (Table 7). There was not an effect of variety or fertilizer treatments on sugar yield. However, differences in sugar yield among fertilizer treatments were significant at $p = 0.05$, when all fertilized treatments produced higher sugar yield (1,290 L ha⁻¹) than the zero fertilizer control (501 L ha⁻¹). Sweet sorghum biomass production study has shown mixed results for different fertilizer treatments. Our results were similar to results reported from previous research studies. The tops fresh weights, cane fresh weights, extracted juice, and total sugar levels were similar to the sweet sorghum yields reported in previous research (Almodares and Sepahi, 1997). Sweet sorghum variety M-81-E tops fresh yield/biomass ranged from 38.4 to 49.7 T ha⁻¹, whereas variety Dale yield was 27.6 to 39.6 T ha⁻¹.

Table 7. Sweet sorghum sugar yield.

Fertilizer N-P ₂ O ₅ -K ₂ O (kg ha ⁻¹)	Sugar yield in L ha ⁻¹		
	Dale	M-81-E	Mean
0-0-0	448	553	501
168-56-168	1567	1146	1356
84-28-84-soysoap	1424	1506	1465
168-56-168-soysoap	1090	1026	1058

Mean	1132	1058	
------	------	------	--

Greater PAR was recorded during the growing season (Table 1), which likely influenced the greater crop yields recorded.

4. Conclusions

Sweet sorghum experimental results with different fertilizer treatments produced higher tops fresh weight and cane fresh weight than the zero fertilizer control. The juice extracted from cane was greater for all fertilized treatments compared with the zero fertilizer control, but was not affected by variety. Total sugar levels and BRIX responded to fertilizer treatments similarly, in that all fertilized treatments had greater sugar percentage than the control, but no significant difference was observed. Overall yields in all measured variables, T3 (84-28-84 Kg ha⁻¹ plus soysoap) resulted in greater yields than the control but was statistically equal to that of other higher fertilizer rates. Based on the data, treatment T3 gave significantly higher yields than T1 and T2 treatments. So a fertilizer rate of 84-28-84 (N-P-K) Kg ha⁻¹ plus soysoap may be recommended for sweet sorghum producers in piedmont area of North Carolina.

References:

1. Renewable Fuels Association R.F.A., 2011. Historic U.S. fuel ethanol production. pp; 2.
2. United States Department of Energy USDOE, 2007. Energy Independence and Security Act. CRS Report for Congress.
3. Biofuels Center of North Carolina B.C.O.N., 2007. North Carolina's Strategic Plan for Biofuels Leadership.
4. Perlack, R.D. Biomass as Feedstock for a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry: The Technical Feasibility of a Billion-Ton Annual Supply. 2005.
5. Bennett, A.S.; Anex, R.P. Production, transportation and milling costs of sweet sorghum as a feedstock for centralized bioethanol production in the upper Midwest. Bioresource Technology 100:1595-1607. DOI: 10.1016/j.biortech.2008.09.023.
6. Gardner, J.C.; Maranville, J.W.; Paparozzi, E.T. Nitrogen use efficiency among diverse sorghum cultivars. Crop Science 1994,34,728-733.

7. Buxton, D.R.; Anderson, I.C.; Hallam, A. Performance of Sweet and Forage Sorghum Grown Continuously, Double-Cropped with Winter Rye, or in Rotation with Soybean and Maize. *Agron. J.* 1999,91:93-101.
8. Hunter, E.L.; Anderson, I.C. Sweet Sorghum, *Horticultural Reviews*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.2010; pp. 73-104.
9. Reddy, B.V.S.; Sanjana, P. Sweet Sorghum: Characteristics and Potential. *International Sorghum and Millets Newsletter* 2003,44:26-28.
10. Soltani, A.; Almodares, A. Evaluation of the investments in sugarbeet and sweet sorghum production. 1994 National convention of sugar production from agriculture products. 13-16.
11. Monti, A.; Venturi, G. Comparison of the energy performance of fibre sorghum, sweet sorghum and wheat monocultures in northern Italy. *European Journal of Agronomy* 2003;19:35-43. DOI: 10.1016/s1161-0301(02)00017-5.
12. Ratnavathi, C.V.; Suresh, K.; Kumar, B.S.V.; Pallavi, M.; Komala, V.V.; Seetharama, N. Study on genotypic variation for ethanol production from sweet sorghum juice. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2010;34:947-952. DOI: 10.1016/j.biombioe.2010.02.002.
13. Negro, M.J.; Solano, M.L.; Ciria, P.; Carrasco, J. Composting of sweet sorghum bagasse with other wastes. *Bioresource Technology* 1999;67:89-92. DOI: 10.1016/s0960-8524(99)00100-5.
14. Sipos, B.; Réczey, J.; Somorai, Z.; Kádár, Z.; Dienes, D.; Réczey, K. Sweet Sorghum as Feedstock for Ethanol Production: Enzymatic Hydrolysis of Steam-Pretreated Bagasse. *Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology* 2009;153:151-162. DOI: 10.1007/s12010-008-8423-9.
15. David, L.; Geraldo, S. Bumper Crop: As Brazil Fills up on Ethanol, It weans Off Energy Imports; After Years of State Support, Use of Cheap Fuel made is Widespread; U.S. Delegations Pay a Visit. 2006 Wall Street Journal.
16. Guigou, M.; Lareo, C.; Pérez, L.V.; Lluberas, M.E.; Vázquez, D.; Ferrari, M.D. Bioethanol production from sweet sorghum: Evaluation of post-harvest treatments on sugar extraction and fermentation. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2011;35:3058-3062. DOI: 10.1016/j.biombioe.2011.04.028.
17. Almodares, A.; Sepahi, A.M.S. Sweet sorghum cultural practices in Iran. *Chinese academy of sciences* 1997;175-183.
18. Monk, R.L.; Miller, F.R.; McBee, G.G. Sorghum improvement for energy production. *Biomass* 1984;6:145-153. DOI: 10.1016/0144-4565(84)90017-9.
19. Sumantri, A., Edi, P. Sweet sorghum research and development in Indonesia. *Chinese academy of sciences* 1997;49-54.
20. Seetharama, N.; Dayakar, R.B.; Ratnavathi, C.; Shahid, P.M.; Binu, M.; Bharath, K.K. Sorghum as raw material for alcohol production. 2002; Distillers Association of Maharashtra.

21. Bohlmann, G.M. Biorefinery process economics. *Chemical Engineering Progress*. ABI/INFORM Trade and Industry 2005;101:37.
22. Andreuccetti, P.; Bacchiet, P.; Barbucci, P.; Belletto, A.; Frati, G. Energy Crops: farming tests in two different Italian sites, and preliminary assessment of technologies to use them for electricity production. Grassi, G., Bertini, I (Eds.), *First European Forum on Electricity Production from Biomass and Solid Wastes by Advanced Technologies*. Florence November 1991;27-29:223-228.
23. Venturi, P.; Venturi, G. Analysis of energy comparison for crops in European agricultural systems. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2003;25:235-255. DOI: 10.1016/s0961-9534(03)00015-1.
24. Amaducci, S.; Monti, A.; Venturi G. Non-structural carbohydrates and fibre components in sweet and fibre sorghum as affected by low and normal input techniques. *Industrial Crops and Products* 2004;20:111-118. DOI: 10.1016/j.indcrop.2003.12.016.
25. Parrish, D.J.; Cundiff, J.S. Long-term retention of fermentables during aerobic storage of bulked sweet sorghum. *Proceedings of the 5th Annual Solar and Biomass Workshop*, Atlanta, GA 1985;137-140.
26. Broadhead, D. M.; Coleman, O. H.; Freeman, K. C. Dale, a new variety of sweet sorghum for sirup production. *Mississippi Farm Research*. 1970. 33:3; 1-8.
27. Fortner, J.; Harward, K.; Lytle, D.; Williamson D. Web Soil Survey. 2006;ESRI Federal User Conference.
28. SAS, version 9.2 of the SAS system for Windows 7. Copyright, SAS Institute Inc. SAS and all other SAS Institute Inc. product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA.
29. Sluiter, A.; Hames, B.; Ruiz, R.; Scarlata, C.; Sluiter, J.; Templeton, D.; Crocker, D. Determination of Structural Carbohydrates and Lignin in Biomass. 2008; Laboratory

© 2014 by the authors; licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).