AgRISTARS

Yield Model Development

ARGENTINA CORN YIELD MODEL

(M84-10105) ARGENTINA CORN YIELD MODEL
(National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) 15 p+ 4C A02/MF A01 CSCL 02C

SUSAN L. CALLIS
CLARENCE SAKAMOTO

USDA/NOAA
CIAD/MODELS BRANCH
ROOM 200, FEDERAL BLDG
608 CHERRY STREET
COLUMBIA, MO 65201

Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center
Houston Texas 77058
ARGENTINA CORN YIELD MODEL

By

Susan L. Callis

and

Clarence Sakamoto

AISC Models Branch

January 16, 1984
A model based on multiple regression was developed to estimate corn yields for the country of Argentina. A meteorological data set was obtained for the country by averaging data for stations within the corn-growing area. Predictor variables for the model were derived from monthly total precipitation, average monthly mean temperature, and average monthly maximum temperature. A "trend variable" was included for the years 1965 to 1980 since an increasing trend in yields due to technology was observed between these years.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to select monthly weather variables that could be used to estimate yields of the Argentina corn crop. The corn-growing area in Argentina is indicated in Figure 1. Most of Argentina's corn is grown in a concentrated area in central Argentina where the climate is predominantly humid subtropical. The western edge of the soybean area in central Cordoba is semi-arid with warm to hot summers. There drought and high temperatures can be a problem during the growing season which begins with planting in October and November and extends to harvest in April through June.

METHOD

Multiple regression analysis of yield with selected agroclimatic indices was used to derive a suitable model. The regression equation for the corn model derived is:

\[ \hat{Y} = \alpha + B_1 T + B_2 (\text{ETMETH}_i) + B_3 (\text{TX}_i) + E \]

where

\[ \hat{Y} \] = Estimated yield
\[ \alpha \] = Constant
\[ B_j \] = Coefficients of the variables \( j = 1 - 3 \)
\[ T \] = Trend 1965-1980
\[ \text{ETMETH}_i \] = ET - \( \hat{ET} \) for month \( i \): where \( \hat{ET} = K \cdot \text{PET} \) and \( K = \frac{ET}{PET} \).
\[ \text{TX}_i \] = Maximum temperature for month \( i \), and
\[ E \] = Unexplained error.

Trend between the years 1965 and 1980 was determined from a plot of yields as shown in Figure 2. ET (evapotranspiration) minus \( \hat{ET} \) (climatically appropriate evapotranspiration) was used as an index representing soil moisture for plant growth. A more complete definition is given in the Appendix. Large positive \( \hat{ET} - ET \) values suggest wet conditions.
Figure 1. DENSITY OF PLANTED AREA IN CORN 1977/78 CROP YEAR
(Source: "Agronomic Characterization of the Argentine Indicator Region")
Figure 2. Plots of Production and Yield Versus Year for Argentina Corn.
In developing the models, various procedures of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS Institute, Inc., 1979) were used. The procedures used and the operations performed with each are summarized in the Appendix. The selected model had the highest $R^2$ and included variables that were significant at the 10 per cent level and were agronomically meaningful.

DATA

Crop data for Argentina from 1960 to 1979 was obtained from the Foreign Agricultural Service (Alan Vandagrith, personal communication, 1982). A data set was created with year of yield as year of planting. Since the growing season spans two numerical years, the crop data was expressed in terms of "year + 1" (or harvested year) and the meteorological data corresponding to any yield included data for that year and "lagged" data for the previous year.

The meteorological data was created using the general Argentina meteorological station file. This file was composed of data from several different sources, including the Monthly Climatic Data for the World and the Servicio Meteorological Nacional in Argentina (R.E. Jensen, C.M. Sakamoto, and S.E. Mummert; August, 1974). Stations inside the corn-producing area were averaged by province and weighted according to the percentage that their province contributed to the entire country's production. Figure 3 shows the corn-growing area in Argentina and associated stations; Table 1 lists the stations used and their weights.

The years between 1961 and 1980 (year of harvest) were used in the model since these years contained the most complete meteorological data.

PROCEDURES

Weather variables were selected from correlations and plots with yield. These variables, along with TREND, were tried in regression equations. The limited number of data years severely limits the number of variables that
Figure 3. Five major agricultural provinces in Argentina.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATION NAME</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUENOS AIRES</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva de Julio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORDOBA</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Cuarto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Ville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA FE</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casilda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Delicias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Meteorological Stations Used for the Argentina Corn Model.
can be included in a regression model by limiting the number of degrees of freedom. This influenced the choice of model considered "best" for soybeans. Three weather variables plus TRENDS were considered the optimum model with 19 years of data. The three weather variables are:

- ETMETH11, \( ET - \hat{ET} \) for November
- TX12, \( \text{Maximum temperature for December} \)
- TX11, \( \text{Maximum temperature for January} \).

The coefficient for the November variable was positive which reflects moisture requirements just after planting. The coefficients for maximum temperature for December and January were negative indicating that temperatures too high in the peak summer months during the tasselling and silking stages lead to stress on the plant. There is a critical growth period for corn. The statistics of the selected model are summarized in Table 2.

**TEST RESULTS**

A jackknife test was run on the model. In this test a year was eliminated from the crop data and the model was used to predict that year's yield. This process was done for each successive year beginning with 1961. The results were reasonable with the greatest difference (3.24 quintals) between predicted and actual yield in 1976. That year severe drought badly damaged the corn crop and harvest was hampered by rains. Test results are printed on Table 3 and plotted on Figure 4.
Definition of Variables

The difference between ET and ET is an index of the amount of moisture available for plant growth. Soil moisture depletion is based on evapotranspiration (ET) estimates, determined as follows:

\[
(ET)_n = \frac{(S)_{n-1}}{AWC} \left[ \{ (PET)_n - (P)_n \} + (P)_n \right]
\]

where

- \((ET)_n\) = "Actual" evapotranspiration,
- \((S)_{n-1}\) = Available moisture at end of \(n-1\) month,
- \(AWC\) = Maximum water holding capacity,
- \((P)_n\) = Precipitation for month \(n\), and
- \((PET)_n\) = Potential evapotranspiration for month \(n\).

ET - ET measures the difference between the actual evapotranspiration and the "climatically appropriate" evapotranspiration, giving an indication of soil moisture supply and demand.

Statistical Analysis System Procedures Used

- **PROC CORR**
  Computes correlation coefficients between variables, including Pearson product-moment and weighted product-moment correlation.

- **PROC PLOT**
  Graphs one variable against another, producing a printer plot.

- **PROC STEPWISE**
  Provides five methods for stepwise regression. Stepwise is useful when selecting variables to be included in a regression model from a collection of independent variables.

- **PROC STEPWISE FORWARD**
  Begins by finding the one-variable model that produces the highest \(R^2\). For each of the other independent variables, FORWARD calculates F-statistics reflecting the contribution to the model if the variable were to be included.
PROC STEPWISE BACKWARD

Begins by calculating statistics for a model including all the independent variables. The variables are deleted from the model one by one until all the remaining variables produce F-statistics significant at the .10 level.

PROC STEPWISE STEPWISE

The stepwise method is a modification of the forward selection technique, differing in that variables already in the model do not necessarily stay there. After a variable is added (as in the forward selection method) the stepwise method looks at all the variables already included in the model and deletes any variable that does not produce an F-statistic significant at the .10 level. Only after this check is made and the necessary deletions accomplished can another variable be added to the model.

PROC STEPWISE MAXR

(Maximum $R^2$ improvement) Unlike the three techniques above, this method does not settle on a single method. Instead it looks for the "best" two-variable model, the "best" three variable model, and so forth.

PROC PETM

Uses latitude and mean monthly temperature to calculate Thornthwaite's potential evapotranspiration for each month.

PROC ZINDEX

Uses monthly PET's, precipitation, SS (beginning moisture in surface layer), AWCS (available water capacity in surface layer), SU (beginning moisture in the underlying layer), and AWCU (available water capacity in the underlying layer) to calculate Palmer's soil moisture budget, drought index Z, ET, and ET.
### Table 2. Statistics of Argentina Corn Model.

| Variable | df | SS | MS | P>|F| |
|----------|----|----|----|-----|
| Intercept| 1  | 12.84 | 12.84 | 0.834 |
| DEFPRNT| 4  | 0.73 | 0.18 | 0.75 | 0.633 |
| EFPRNT | 4  | 0.52 | 0.13 | 0.70 | 0.633 |
| ET | 4  | -0.52 | 0.13 | 0.70 | 0.633 |
| T1 | 4  | -1.28 | 0.32 | 0.75 | 0.633 |

The values in the model are significant at the 0.1000 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHS</th>
<th>Beta1</th>
<th>Betas</th>
<th>Coef1</th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Coeff1</th>
<th>Coeff2</th>
<th>Coeff3</th>
<th>Coeff4</th>
<th>Coeff5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.738544</td>
<td>0.442291</td>
<td>-0.46770</td>
<td>1.43055</td>
<td>75.0350</td>
<td>0.7086</td>
<td>0.4516</td>
<td>-1.1720</td>
<td>-4.1440</td>
<td>-1.1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.740467</td>
<td>0.520714</td>
<td>-0.50149</td>
<td>1.2549</td>
<td>71.2264</td>
<td>0.5759</td>
<td>0.2849</td>
<td>-1.0322</td>
<td>-4.0392</td>
<td>-1.0132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.790051</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>73.4680</td>
<td>0.7001</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.741844</td>
<td>0.517553</td>
<td>-0.5077</td>
<td>1.4174</td>
<td>73.4097</td>
<td>0.6709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.441710</td>
<td>0.531042</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.3665</td>
<td>0.6014</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.485465</td>
<td>0.567717</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.0126</td>
<td>0.5416</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.484696</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.484497</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.484497</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.484497</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.484497</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.484497</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.484497</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.484497</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.484497</td>
<td>0.570446</td>
<td>-1.5338</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>70.6169</td>
<td>0.5709</td>
<td>0.4052</td>
<td>-1.5333</td>
<td>-4.5330</td>
<td>-1.5330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Results of Jackknife Test for Argentina Corn Model.
Figure 4. Argentina Corn Model.