



## Exogenic Agents Influencing the Sugarcane Production: A Review

Syed Shehzad Hassan

<sup>1</sup> Wuhan University China

\* **Corresponding** [sshn.mesp@gmail.com](mailto:sshn.mesp@gmail.com)

**Citation** | Shehzad.H, “Exogenic Agents Influencing the Sugarcane Production” *Int. J. Agric. Sustain. Dev.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 198-206, 2022.

**Received** | Oct 28, 2022; **Revised** | Nov 20, 2022; **Accepted** | Nov 24, 2022;

**Published** | Dec 02, 2022.

Sugarcane is a crucial crop for producing bioenergy and sugar, and it helps Pakistan's GDP. Extreme weather events are becoming more intense and frequent as a result of global warming and rising greenhouse gas emissions. A significant environmental stressor that restricts sugarcane growth, production, and metabolism globally is temperature. The development of plants involves a variety of biochemical processes, many of which are extremely sensitive to temperature stress. The production of sugarcane is currently greatly affected by temperature stress, and methods for achieving high sugarcane yields under temperature stress are key agricultural objectives. The sugarcane plant has developed a variety of acclimation and avoidance strategies to combat various environmental stresses. The capacity to produce and convey signals, as well as biochemical and physiological changes, are necessary for plant survival under various conditions. Because sugarcane has a high vulnerability to natural hazards, a relatively limited adaptive capacity, and a weak forecasting system, climate change will have a significant impact on sugarcane production globally in the future. In this paper, we briefly discuss the effects of climate change on sugarcane, the production of sugar in many nations, particularly Pakistan, and future challenges for sugar production under a changing climate scenario, and we suggest mitigation techniques for the adverse consequences of climate change.

**Keywords:** Sugarcane, Climatic Variability, Production



## Introduction

Global climate change and variability in the twenty-first century are the outcomes of both natural and manmade processes. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report [1] predicts a temperature increase of 1.8–4 °C between 2090 and 2099 compared to 1980–1999. This increase is expected to be accompanied by an increase in the frequency of extreme events like floods and drought. Since the middle of the eighteenth century, [2] atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration has increased by 30% due to the burning of fossil fuels, industrial processes, and deforestation, and projections show that CO<sub>2</sub> concentration would be doubled in a high emission scenario by the end of this century. Certain plants thrive in environments with higher levels of carbon dioxide in the air and higher average temperatures [3]. In the future, we might expect abiotic pressures, such as a shift in the distribution of precipitation, an increase in the frequency of extreme low and high temperatures, and even more extreme weather events like floods and droughts [1].

Most sugarcane insects, pathogens, and weeds have their population dynamics, life cycle durations, and overall occurrences influenced by varying environmental conditions. Climate change will have an impact on agricultural pests such as weeds, pathogens, and insects. The competitiveness of pathogens, insects, and weeds in the wheat crop will shift when temperatures, precipitation, and CO<sub>2</sub> levels change. Compared to C<sub>4</sub> cultivars, C<sub>3</sub> plants thrive in high CO<sub>2</sub> environments. Temporary weather fluctuations, as well as monthly, yearly, and long-term climatic variations, can have a significant impact on the agricultural industry. There is a strong correlation between agronomic practices, soil, seed, pests, diseases, and ultimately, crop output. Limiting factors include climate change and environmental concerns that humans have caused. Sugarcane, a C<sub>4</sub> crop that thrives in the tropics and subtropics, is a major international contributor to the production of both bioenergy and sugar. Sugarcane is a perennial crop grown on 20 million hectares in the subtropical and tropical regions [4], with an annual yield of around 1 325 million tonnes of stalks used to make sugar, energy, rum, and chemicals [5]. Cane sugar from sugarcane accounts for around 75% of the world's total sugar production for human use [6]. In Pakistan, sugarcane is a major source of income and accounts for 0.6% of the country's GDP. The sugarcane crop in 2015–2016 was grown on 1132 thousand hectares, down from 1141 thousand hectares the year before, yielding 65,475 metric tonnes [7]. The decline in sugarcane cultivation is the result of land being reallocated to produce other crops. Figure 1 shows the total area of sugarcane farms and the amount of sugarcane harvested in Pakistan. Cuts or complete stalks of sugarcane are typically planted in rows to grow new plants. Ratoons grow primarily from stubble after each harvest, and 20 successful ratoon crops can be harvested from a single plantation [8]. However, environmental factors such as pathogen infection, low winter temperature, weed competition, stalk borer injury, and water deficit conditions reduce production from season to season. The global production of sugarcane is highly dependent on climatic and meteorological factors [9].

## Related Studies.

Sugarcane is a C<sub>4</sub> species, meaning that rises in temperature between 8 to 34 degrees Celsius boost carbon dioxide assimilation and cane growth in the winter, while decreases in temperature slow photosynthesis and leaf growth. Sugarcane production was hindered by temperatures below 15°C, although sugarcane yields were boosted by a shift in climate during the low-temperature period. While frost is known to cause poor quality in sugarcane [10], high temperatures during the winter months are expected to diminish both its occurrence and severity. Nevertheless, sugarcane is negatively affected by high temperatures, resulting in a reduced plant population and delayed germination [11].

Temperatures above 32 degrees Celsius cause a rise in the number of nodes, a decrease in the length of the internodes, an increase in the amount of fiber in the stalk, and a

decrease in the amount of sucrose [12]. Sugarcane's internode and leaf growth slows or stops entirely when nighttime temperatures are excessive, limiting the crop's potential sugar and cane output [13]. With an increase in temperature and associated changes in daily evaporation due to shifting climatic conditions, water stress may result, necessitating more frequent irrigation cycles to keep up with water loss and crop needs. Over-irrigation, which leads to waterlogging and salinity issues, can lower sugarcane yield [14]. Sugarcane ripening is also affected by changes in temperature. When it comes to natural ripening, low temperatures in the winter are crucial. Sugarcane's ripening and quality are negatively impacted by rising temperatures brought on by climate change.

The degree, length, and kind of plant's reaction to temperature stress. High temperatures can cause cells to die or get damaged, which can result in the catastrophic breakdown of cellular order [15]. The stability of different proteins, the structure of the cytoskeleton, and the efficiency of enzymatic activities are all negatively impacted by heat stress [16]. When plants are subjected to extreme heat, they respond in some ways. They range from long-term, phenological, and morphological changes to the more immediate, avoidance mechanisms including increased transpiration and reduced photosynthesis a shift in the leaves' position. Plants respond to stress by closing their stomata, increasing their stomatal densities, and changing the composition of the lipids in their membranes. Leaf rolling intensity is modified by high-temperature stress [17].

Even more so in tropical and subtropical locations, low temperatures have an impact on crop distribution and planting windows due to the stress they place on plant life [18]. To prevent oxidative and osmotic stress, low temperatures stifle a plant's metabolic activity, stunting its growth and development [19]. Temperature-responsive plant tactics include cellular remodeling, changes in gene expression, and reprogramming of metabolic pathways [20]. This system, known as ICE-CBF-COR, is activated in response to low-temperature stress by binding C-repeat binding factors to dehydration-sensitive elements in gene promoters [21][22]. Both cold-tolerant and cold-sensitive sugarcane varieties showed up-regulation of miR139 and down-regulation of its target (ref. Other miRNAs involved in cold response have been discovered, including miR156K and miR394 [23].

## Result and Discussion

The rate at which many plants grow increases when atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels rise, as this gas has a direct effect on photosynthesis and stomatal physiology. Increasing temperatures combined with higher concentrations will impact plant growth, leading to changes in weed distribution and competitiveness over the world [24]. C<sub>4</sub> plants' CO<sub>2</sub> transport is more efficient, their photosynthesis is greater, and their photorespiration is lessened due to a different arrangement of internal mesophyll cells than in C<sub>3</sub> plants. In the future, when CO<sub>2</sub> levels rise, C<sub>4</sub> crops may face more severe competition from C<sub>3</sub> weeds. Both C<sub>3</sub> and C<sub>4</sub> plants' stomatal aperture and transpiration loss may be reduced by 30–40% if the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration was doubled. Both C<sub>3</sub> and C<sub>4</sub> plants may have their stomatal aperture and transpiration loss reduced by 30–40% and 25–40%, respectively if the CO<sub>2</sub> content in the air is doubled. Long-term field studies showed that under high CO<sub>2</sub> conditions, LAI (Leaf Area Index) did not grow in any species. According to Brown [25], as CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations rise, starch concentrations fall. Likewise, a rise in body mass results in a lower total protein level. Plants' photosynthesis is affected and their growth and root-shoot ratio are both accelerated by high CO<sub>2</sub> levels [4]. Under increased CO<sub>2</sub>, plants have less nitrogen available to them [26]. With rising CO<sub>2</sub>, the carbon-to-nitrogen ratio in leaves rose. Environmental stress inhibits crop productivity and plant growth, with drought being the primary abiotic stress that affects crop productivity [27]. When there is a shortage of water, sugarcane crops can lose as much as 60 percent of their productivity [19]. Sugarcane is a vital catalyst for the advancement of biotechnological methods in water-deficient regions [28].

Plants respond to drought by employing some drought-tolerant strategies, including slowing their rate of growth, altering their life cycle, evolving their sensitivity to stress to express stress tolerance quickly, and allocating resources more equitably to facilitate stress adaptation and growth [29]. Molecular breeding and other biotechnological methods can be used to increase agricultural yields even in water-scarce environments [30].

Sugarcane's physiological and morphological response to drought stress varies with its length, severity, damaged tissues, and the plant's genotype [31]. Common water responses in sugarcane include stomatal closure, restriction of the stalk and leaf growth, leaf rolling, reduced leaf area [32], and interruption of cell elongation and division [33]. Most severely impacted is the lengthening of stems and leaves [34]. Similarly, root growth affects [51] under water-deficient situations. Under water stress, the transpiration rate, stomatal conductance, and photosynthesis rate all drop in sugarcane crops, even though they use the C4 photosynthetic pathway [35].

During periods of water deficit, photosynthesis slows down because of a decrease in phosphoenol pyruvate carboxylase and Rubisco activity. The accumulation of sugar in leaves also affects the rate of photosynthesis, and a high sugar content moderates carbon fixation. Cell membrane damage is mitigated by an uptick in trehalose sugar under water-deficient conditions [36]. Increased starch hydrolysis under conditions of low CO<sub>2</sub> fixation maintained carbon availability, allowing for speedier post-stress growth recovery.

Increasing temperatures, fluctuating precipitation patterns, higher CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, and the increased likelihood of extreme weather events like floods and droughts are just some of the ways that climate change can impact agricultural production. Further droughts are on the horizon, as anticipated by Held et al. [37], with only minor variations in precipitation expected. Sucrose yield is affected by both extremes in rainfall and regular drought since sugarcane needs more water to grow. In addition to affecting stomatal conductance, photosynthesis, and respiration are all impacted by water stress. Farmers may irrigate more to lessen the effects of the drought, but this will just exacerbate the salt problem and raise the water table. Weaker rainfall during the harvesting period is associated with better crop yields. Sugarcane productivity is severely constrained by nitrogen. Extreme nitrogen fertilizer use is common among farmers in wetter years because of the risk of nitrogen leaching during floods. Roots may have less oxygen to use, which can prevent them from taking up nutrients if the soil is constantly soggy from too much water. Cane quality declines as a result of increased precipitation due to a shorter "dry off" period. Weeds, illnesses, and insect pests all increase or decrease in frequency as precipitation patterns shift. Insect pests like termites and nematodes thrive in hot, dry climates. A drop in the number of weeds, such as *Cyperus* spp., may occur in areas that experience frequent drought. How drought affects sugarcane harvest is conditional on the plant's growth stage and how long the stress lasts. Sucrose yield is mostly affected by drought during the early to mid-growth stages. During the final stages of development, moderate dryness raises the amount of sucrose in stalks. Chinese agriculture faces the greatest threat from drought [38].

When crops are under environmental stress, they are less able to compete with weeds and are more susceptible to insect and disease attacks. Alterations in weather patterns also affected the regularity and severity of rainstorms. Herbicides lose some of their effectiveness when it rains after they've been applied. Weeds have a competitive edge over crops because moisture is necessary for weed seed germination. Herbicides applied to the soil will be taken up less effectively in the presence of more rain and a change in the intensity of that rain.

Sethoxydim's efficacy was reduced in goosegrass and *Urochloa plantaginea* (signal grass) was not effectively controlled by ACCase-inhibiting herbicides when applied later in the growth cycle. When dryness, leaf pubescence, and thickness increase, which prevents herbicides from penetrating the plant [39]. Reduced plant growth and reduced herbicide

effectiveness are both effects of water stress. Fewer efforts have been made to determine how climate change will affect weeds, in contrast to the many studies that have focused on the effects of climate change on crop output. Production losses can be attributed in part to how environmental stress modifies the effectiveness of herbicides. Understanding how environmental variables affect the efficacy of herbicides is essential under these varying climatic settings.

The agricultural sector is affected in multiple ways by climate change, both directly due to shifts in temperature and/or precipitation and indirectly due to shifts in pest pressure and the availability of pollination services. Sugarcane is vulnerable to attack from herbivores due to some abiotic and biotic stressors, including weed competition, low soil nitrogen levels, and a lack of water. Input costs for managing disease pathogens and overwintering pests have risen as a result of the prevalence of these problems brought on by extreme weather. There are a couple of pests that threaten sugarcane crops in Florida, and they're called sugarcane leaf and orange rust. The decline in crop and pasture growth and the resulting reduction in canopy covers make ideal conditions for weed invasion as a result of less precipitation. Eoreumalofitini is a serious problem for sugarcane, and the abundance of dry leaf tissue during a drought correlates positively with the number of E. lofting eggs. There were 82.8%-90.2 % fewer E. lofting eggs on sugarcane plants when water was plentiful, as opposed to when water was scarce. Cyclones in the moist tropics can spread weed seeds by wind and water. Even moderate drought can boost the population of many herbivorous arthropods, leading to crop damage and making host plants more appealing to arthropod herbivores.

There are a few weeds that may survive the summer's high temperatures only to return in the dead of winter. Pest insects include the aphid-like Heteronychuslicas and the stink bugs (Margarodes spp. No protection from rising or falling temperatures. According to research [41], rising temperatures make it easier for new pests and illnesses to invade sugarcane fields. Temperature changes brought on by global warming will have an impact on infectious illnesses, noxious weeds, and insect pests. A temperature rise is associated with an increase in the incidence of smut illnesses, as discussed. Increased temperatures during pollination caused sterility, led to premature pollen shed and shortened the time it took for grains to fill. Heat stress inhibits herbicide uptake by increasing the conductance and permeability of stomata. The above discussion will aid in determining potential measures for weed control in the face of altering climatic conditions. As a result, assessing how climate change may affect weed flora and the effectiveness of herbicides is essential for developing effective adaptation and mitigation plans.

Temperature and precipitation patterns are dynamic systems that are constantly shifting in response to both human and natural influences. Human-caused emissions of greenhouse gases accumulate in the Earth's atmosphere and cause its concentration to rise over time.

The CO<sub>2</sub> concentration has already reached 387 mol mol<sup>-1</sup> as of 2007 and is projected to reach 600 mol mol<sup>-1</sup> by 2050. The employment of modern agricultural technology is a primary factor in the 30% increase in GHG emissions. The spread of weeds can harm crops and people's health. The Sugarcane ecosystem is affected in several ways by weed species in the wild. A 24% decrease in sugarcane stalk density, a 19% decrease in biomass, and a 15% decrease in commercial sugar production [41] are the results of annual summer weeds that are not controlled. The C<sub>3</sub> weeds outperformed the C<sub>4</sub> weeds in terms of leaf area and biomass growth when exposed to greater CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. Weeds like Parthenium (Parthenium hysterophorus), which is a C<sub>3</sub> plant, will fare significantly better in a higher-CO<sub>2</sub> setting. Weed density and species both play a role in how much of a toll they take on crop yields. When weeds emerge in large numbers, competition is fierce. Changes in

crop-weed competition due to climate and CO<sub>2</sub> levels have been observed.

At more northern latitudes, the temperature is the most important element in determining where weeds grow. Several species might thrive in conditions made possible by an increase in precipitation and warmth. The consequences of water stress were mitigated by CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment, which also boosted the development of water-stressed C<sub>3</sub> and C<sub>4</sub> plants. Increases in water use efficiency (WUE) of 55% in sunflower, 54% in maize, 48% in soybeans, and 76% in redroot were seen when concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> were raised from 300 to 600 ppm. This stimulation of WUE was greater in weeds than in crops, giving them a competitive edge. It will be important in the future to optimize herbicide application for more effective weed management as rising CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations diminish the effectiveness of many herbicides and plant development.

Weed population and phenology are both affected by climate change. Most weed species are known to invade new regions, and scientists worry that invasive species will become a problem as the climate changes because of the weeds' strong reactivity to high CO<sub>2</sub>. C<sub>3</sub> plants respond more favorably to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> levels, increasing their photosynthetic rates, than do C<sub>4</sub> plants. According to the research by Alberto, who discusses the relationship between temperature and carbon dioxide, higher CO<sub>2</sub> levels promote the development of barnyard grass at a temperature of 37/29 degrees Celsius. For effective chemical management, knowing how chemicals interact with plants and the environment is crucial. This includes knowing what factors diminish the effectiveness of pesticides and herbicides. The ability of a plant to take in a herbicide depends heavily on how that herbicide reacts with its surrounding environment.

### **Conclusions**

The sugarcane plant's growth, development, and productivity are severely hampered by the environmental hazards it must contend with. Temperature increases, shifts in precipitation patterns, and environmental fragility are all thought to be the result of the current rate of greenhouse gas emissions, which is driving global warming. Sugarcane farmers need a deeper understanding of how plants react to and adapt to environmental challenges including fluctuating temperatures and the presence of invasive species like weeds, insects, and pathogens. In recent years, researchers have examined sugarcane yield in response to shifting climates, but a full comprehension of sugarcane production in the face of climate change remains elusive. Sugarcane plants respond to various stresses by activating a wide range of metabolic pathways and amassing a wide range of metabolites, including antioxidants, osmoprotectants, and heat shock proteins.

## References

- [1] D. Watson, R. Nielsen, D. Palm, L. Brix, M. Amstrup, and F. Syversen, “Exports of Nordic Used Textiles,” Dec. 2016, doi: 10.6027/TN2016-558.
- [2] W. Attavanich and B. A. McCarl, “How is CO<sub>2</sub> affecting yields and technological progress? A statistical analysis,” *Clim. Change*, vol. 124, no. 4, pp. 747–762, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.1007/S10584-014-1128-X/METRICS.
- [3] R. M. Adams *et al.*, “Global climate change and US agriculture,” *Nat. 1990 3456272*, vol. 345, no. 6272, pp. 219–224, 1990, doi: 10.1038/345219a0.
- [4] M. L. Parry, C. Rosenzweig, A. Iglesias, M. Livermore, and G. Fischer, “Effects of climate change on global food production under SRES emissions and socio-economic scenarios,” *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 53–67, 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2003.10.008.
- [5] D. Cammarano *et al.*, “The impact of climate change on barley yield in the Mediterranean basin,” *Eur. J. Agron.*, vol. 106, pp. 1–11, May 2019, doi: 10.1016/J.EJA.2019.03.002.
- [6] C. Rosenzweig, A. Iglesias, X. B. Yang, P. R. Epstein, and E. Chivian, “Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events; Implications for Food Production, Plant Diseases, and Pests,” *Glob. Chang. Hum. Heal. 2001 22*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 90–104, 2001, doi: 10.1023/A:1015086831467.
- [7] W. Schlenker and M. J. Roberts, “Nonlinear temperature effects indicate severe damages to U.S. crop yields under climate change,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 106, no. 37, pp. 15594–15598, Sep. 2009, doi: 10.1073/PNAS.0906865106/SUPPL\_FILE/APPENDIX\_PDF.PDF.
- [8] D. B. Lobell, W. Schlenker, and J. Costa-Roberts, “Climate trends and global crop production since 1980,” *Science (80-. )*, vol. 333, no. 6042, pp. 616–620, Jul. 2011, doi: 10.1126/SCIENCE.1204531/SUPPL\_FILE/LOBELL.SOM.REVISED2.PDF.
- [9] R. Raymundo *et al.*, “Climate change impact on global potato production,” *Eur. J. Agron.*, vol. 100, pp. 87–98, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.EJA.2017.11.008.
- [10] R. Miao, M. Khanna, and H. Huang, “Responsiveness of Crop Yield and Acreage to Prices and Climate,” *Am. J. Agric. Econ.*, vol. 98, no. 1, pp. 191–211, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1093/AJAE/AAV025.
- [11] FAO, “Agricultural technology ecosystems in East Africa,” Feb. 2023, doi: 10.4060/CC3657EN.
- [12] “About Sugar | International Sugar Organization.” <https://www.isosugar.org/sugarsector/sugar> (accessed Mar. 12, 2023).
- [13] H. Emmanuel, S. Herrera, E. H. Sentiés-Herrera, L. I. Trejo-Téllez, and F. C. Gómez-Merino, “The Mexican sugarcane production system: History, current status and new trends Integrative improvement of crop productivity through agronomic and nutrient management, conventional plant breeding, biotechnologies and nanosciences View project Nutrition ma,” *Sugarcane*, pp. 39–71, 2017, Accessed: Mar. 12, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317770009>
- [14] “Food and Agriculture Statistics | FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.” <https://www.fao.org/food-agriculture-statistics/en/> (accessed Mar. 12, 2023).
- [15] A. Singels, M. Jones, F. Marin, A. Ruane, and P. Thorburn, “Predicting Climate Change Impacts on Sugarcane Production at Sites in Australia, Brazil and South Africa Using the Canegro Model,” *Sugar Tech*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 347–355, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1007/S12355-013-0274-1/METRICS.
- [16] C. Zhao *et al.*, “Temperature increase reduces global yields of major crops in four independent estimates,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 114, no. 35, pp. 9326–9331, Aug. 2017, doi: 10.1073/PNAS.1701762114/SUPPL\_FILE/PNAS.1701762114.SAPP.PDF.
- [17] H. Feng and B. A. Babcock, “Impacts of Ethanol on Planted Acreage in Market

- Equilibrium,” *Am. J. Agric. Econ.*, vol. 92, no. 3, pp. 789–802, Apr. 2010, doi: 10.1093/AJAE/AAQ023.
- [18] H. Ruan *et al.*, “Future climate change projects positive impacts on sugarcane productivity in southern China,” *Eur. J. Agron.*, vol. 96, pp. 108–119, May 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.EJA.2018.03.007.
- [19] A. D. Baez-Gonzalez *et al.*, “Potential impact of future climate change on sugarcane under dryland conditions in Mexico,” *J. Agron. Crop Sci.*, vol. 204, no. 5, pp. 515–528, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1111/JAC.12278.
- [20] W. K. de Medeiros Silva, G. P. de Freitas, L. M. Coelho Junior, P. A. L. de Almeida Pinto, and R. Abrahão, “Effects of climate change on sugarcane production in the state of Paraíba (Brazil): a panel data approach (1990–2015),” *Clim. Change*, vol. 154, no. 1–2, pp. 195–209, May 2019, doi: 10.1007/S10584-019-02424-7/METRICS.
- [21] F. R. Marin *et al.*, “Climate change impacts on sugarcane attainable yield in southern Brazil,” *Clim. Change*, vol. 117, no. 1–2, pp. 227–239, Mar. 2013, doi: 10.1007/S10584-012-0561-Y/FIGURES/3.
- [22] D. B. Lobell, M. B. Burke, C. Tebaldi, M. D. Mastrandrea, W. P. Falcon, and R. L. Naylor, “Prioritizing climate change adaptation needs for food security in 2030,” *Science*, vol. 319, no. 5863, pp. 607–610, Feb. 2008, doi: 10.1126/SCIENCE.1152339.
- [23] U. Adhikari, A. P. Nejadhashemi, and S. A. Woznicki, “Climate change and eastern Africa: a review of impact on major crops,” *Food Energy Secur.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 110–132, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1002/FES3.61.
- [24] K. Yoshida, M. Srisutham, S. Sritumboon, D. Suanburi, and N. Janjiraattikul, “Weather-induced economic damage to upland crops and the impact on farmer household income in Northeast Thailand,” *Paddy Water Environ.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 341–349, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1007/S10333-019-00729-Y.
- [25] M. E. Brown *et al.*, “Do markets and trade help or hurt the global food system adapt to climate change?,” *Food Policy*, vol. 68, pp. 154–159, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2017.02.004.
- [26] “Office of the Cane and Sugar Board. Production Report. 2019.”  
<http://www.ocsb.go.th/th/home/index.php>
- [27] V. Nicaise, “Crop immunity against viruses: Outcomes and future challenges,” *Front. Plant Sci.*, vol. 5, no. NOV, p. 660, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.3389/FPLS.2014.00660/BIBTEX.
- [28] “Bangkok Post. Thai Sugar Body Seeks to Sweeten Environment and Health. 2019.”  
<https://www.bangkokpost.com/business/1758849/thai-sugar-body-seeks-to-sweeten-environment-and>
- [29] H. A. Hussain *et al.*, “Individual and concurrent effects of drought and chilling stresses on morpho-physiological characteristics and oxidative metabolism of maize cultivars,” *bioRxiv*, p. 829309, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1101/829309.
- [30] C. C. Ummenhofer and G. A. Meehl, “Extreme weather and climate events with ecological relevance: a review,” *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, vol. 372, no. 1723, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1098/RSTB.2016.0135.
- [31] B. Schauburger *et al.*, “Consistent negative response of US crops to high temperatures in observations and crop models,” *Nat. Commun.* 2017 81, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–9, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1038/ncomms13931.
- [32] M. C. Hunter, R. G. Smith, M. E. Schipanski, L. W. Atwood, and D. A. Mortensen, “Agriculture in 2050: Recalibrating Targets for Sustainable Intensification,” *Bioscience*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 386–391, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1093/BIOSCI/BIX010.
- [33] A. Raza *et al.*, “Impact of Climate Change on Crops Adaptation and Strategies to Tackle Its Outcome: A Review,” *Plants 2019, Vol. 8, Page 34*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. 34, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.3390/PLANTS8020034.
- [34] B. Bajželj *et al.*, “Importance of food-demand management for climate mitigation,” *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 2014 410, vol. 4, no. 10, pp. 924–929, Aug. 2014, doi: 10.1038/nclimate2353.



- [35] S. A. Zafar *et al.*, “Mechanisms and molecular approaches for heat tolerance in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) under climate change scenario,” *J. Integr. Agric.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 726–738, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1016/S2095-3119(17)61718-0.
- [36] X. Wang *et al.*, “The Effects of Mulch and Nitrogen Fertilizer on the Soil Environment of Crop Plants,” *Adv. Agron.*, vol. 153, pp. 121–173, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1016/BS.AGRON.2018.08.003.
- [37] E. L. Birch, “A Review of ‘Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability’ and ‘Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change,’” <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2014.954464>, vol. 80, no. 2, pp. 184–185, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.1080/01944363.2014.954464.
- [38] S. P. Long and D. R. Ort, “More than taking the heat: crops and global change,” *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 240–247, Jun. 2010, doi: 10.1016/J.PBI.2010.04.008.
- [39] M. K. Mosleh, Q. K. Hassan, and E. H. Chowdhury, “Development of a remote sensing-based rice yield forecasting model,” *Spanish J. Agric. Res.*, vol. 14, no. 3, 2016, doi: 10.5424/sjar/2016143-8347.
- [40] B. B. Asimwe, R. Baldan, A. Trovato, and D. M. Cirillo, “Prevalence and molecular characteristics of *Staphylococcus aureus*, including methicillin resistant strains, isolated from bulk can milk and raw milk products in pastoral communities of South-West Uganda,” *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2017, doi: 10.1186/s12879-017-2524-4.
- [41] N. An, S. Hemmati, and Y. J. Cui, “Assessment of the methods for determining net radiation at different time-scales of meteorological variables,” *J. Rock Mech. Geotech. Eng.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 239–246, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.JRMGE.2016.10.004.



Copyright © by authors and 50Sea. This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.