Supplementary Materials: Bioenergy from Low-Intensity Agricultural Systems: An Energy Efficiency Analysis

Oludunsin Arodudu, Katharina Helming, Hubert Wiggering and Alexey Voinov

Table S1. Conversion factors	for estimating energy	y inputs and energy	y outputs of base	line options.
------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------------	---------------

Energy Inputs	
Fossil tuel supply chain [1,2]	
Calorific energy per litre of diesel (MJ·L ⁻¹)	32.0-35.0
Calorific energy per litre of gasoline (MJ·L ⁻¹)	35.7-45.1
Energy for fractional distillation of fossil fuel into diesel, gasoline etc. (MJ·L ⁻¹)	2.3
Total energy cost of diesel used (MJ·L ⁻¹)	34.3–37.3
Total energy cost of gasoline used (MJ·L ⁻¹)	38-47.4
Direct energy for farm operations [3]	210.2 4550.0
Energy for ploughing ($MJ \cdot ha^{-1} \cdot a^{-1}$)	319.2-1550.0
Energy for harrowing (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	72.2–1464.7
Energy for ridging (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	34.2-843.7
Energy for sowing (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	34.2-1019.1
Energy for fertilizer application ($MJ \cdot ha^{-1} \cdot a^{-1}$)	178.6-488.2
Energy for pesticide spraying (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	72.2–578.3
Energy for liming (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	178.6-488.2
Energy for combined harvesting (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	247.0-976.4
Total direct energy for farm operations (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	1136.2-7408.6
Indirect energy for farm operations [1,4]	
Energy for fertilizer production (N-Nitrogen) (MJ·kg ⁻¹)	43.0-65.3
Energy for fertilizer production (P-Phosphorus) (MJ·kg ⁻¹)	4.8-32.0
Energy for fertilizer production (K-Potassium) (MJ·kg ⁻¹)	5.3-13.8
Energy for lime production (MJ·kg ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	0.6-1.8
Energy for pesticide production (herbicides) (MJ·kg ⁻¹)	237.3-422.0
Energy for pesticide production (insecticides + fungicides) (MJ·kg ⁻¹)	237.3-422.0
Quantity of lime (kg·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	270-699
Quantity of herbicides applied (kg·ha ⁻¹)	2.1-4.7
Quantity of insecticides applied (kg·ha ⁻¹)	0.2-1.1
Quantity of fungicides applied (kg·ha ⁻¹)	0.2-1.1
Energy for lime production (270 – 699 kg·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹ × 0.6 – 1.8 MJ·kg ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹) (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	162.0-1258.2
Energy for pesticide production (herbicides-2.1 – 4.7 kg·ha ⁻¹ × 237.3 – 422.0 MJ·kg ⁻¹) =	400 2 1002 4
498.3 – 1983.4 MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹	498.3-1983.4
Energy for pesticide production (insecticides + fungicides) \times 237.3 – 422.0 MJ kg ⁻¹ \times 2) =	05.0.000.4
$47.5 - 464.2 \times 2 \text{ MJ} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{a}^{-1}$	95.0-928.4
Total energy for transportation of inputs and co-products (MJ·kg ⁻¹ ·km ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	0.0048-0.0058
Energy for human labour (MJ·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹) (for eight farm operations)	1.5-10.3
Energy for plant operations (ethanol) [5,6]	
Energy for wet milling operations (MI·t ⁻¹)	3795.2-4886.0
Energy for human labour $(MI \cdot a^{-1})$	365.0-803.0
Total energy for plant operation (ethanol) (MI·ha ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	4174.7-61075.0
Energy for plant operations (biogas) [7]	
Energy for wet oxidation (MI · t^1)	5.0
Energy for biogas plant operation (MI- t^{-1})	193.0
Energy for human labour (MI \cdot a ⁻¹)	365 0-803 0
Total energy for plant operation (biogas) (MI-ba ⁻¹ ·a ⁻¹)	217 8-2475 0
Energy outputs	217.10 217.010
Energy from maize grain ethanol [8–10]	
Volume of ethanol per top of maize $(I + 1)$	378 0-435 0
Calorific energy ner litre of ethanol (MI.I -1)	21 1_23 /
Total energy from maize ethanol (MI-t-1)	7975 8_10170 0
Energy from maize citation (white)	7775.0-10179.0
	02.0.05.0
Volume of biogen per tern of maize (m3 ±1)	75.U-75.U
volume of plogas per ton of marze $(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{t}^{*})$	
Total anargy from mains bioges (MJ-m ³)	21.U-23.U 10026 9 12200 0
Total energy from marze blogas (MJ.C.)	10930.0-13300.0

Table S2. The individual differences in values of NEG and EROEI (for maize ethanol and maize biogas production systems), as a result of the adoption of different agronomic factor options across different agro-climatic zones.

Agro-Climatic Zones	Tropics					Sub-Trop	pics		Temperate			
Energy efficiency indicator	NEG (in GJ·ha ⁻¹) EROEI			NEG (in GJ·ha ⁻¹)		EROEI		NEG (in GJ·ha-1)		EROEI		
Pictual	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize
Bioruer	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas
		Agronomic factor category: Farm power options										
Baseline: Four wheel drive > 50 HP	24 422	0 6 128 5	1217	44.95	52 284	160 172 1	1218	40 117	16 21 6	16 / 127 8	1217	11.06
tractor (Initial value)	2.4-42.2	9.0-138.5	1.5-1-7	4.4-9.5	5.2-26.4	10.9-125.1	1.5-1.8	4.0-11.7	4.0-34.0	10.4-127.8	1.5-1.7	4.1-9.0
Two wheel drive 20-49 HP tractor	↓ 3.2–5.7 ↓	↓ 3.2–5.7 ↓	↓ 0.3–0.6 ↓	↓ 3.0–3.7 ↓	↓ 3.2–5.7 ↓	↓ 3.2–5.7 ↓	↓ 0.2–0.4 ↓	↓ 1.7–5.7 ↓	↓ 3.2–5.7 ↓	↓ 3.2–5.7 ↓	↓ 0.3–0.4 ↓	↓ 1.9–4.3 ↓
Single axle riding type 10–20 HP	0 4-5 0 ↑	104-50↑	0.0-0.1	02-05	104-50↑	104-50↑	0.0_0.1↑	↑06_07	104-50↑	104-50↑	0.0_0.1 ↑	105_10↑
tractor	↓ 0.4-5.0	↓ 0.4-5.0	0.0-0.1 ↓	↓ 0.2-0.5 ↓	↓ 0.4-5.0	↓ 0.4–5.0	0.0-0.1	0.0-0.7 ↓	↓ 0.4–5.0	↓ 0.4-5.0	0.0-0.1	↓ 0.5-1.0
Ordinary single axle < 9 HP tractor	↓ 0.1–3.5 ↓	↓ 0.1–3.5 ↓	↓ 0.2–0.5 ↓	↓ 2.4–2.8 ↓	↓ 0.1–3.5 ↓	↓ 0.1–3.5 ↓	↓ 0.1–0.3 ↓	↓ 0.9–4.3 ↓	↓ 0.1–3.5 ↓	↓ 0.1–3.5 ↓	↓ 0.1–0.3 ↓	↓ 1.2–3.2 ↓
Man	↑ 6.4–85.0 ↑	↑ 2.5–27.8 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 1.7–2.1 ↑	↑ 9.2–96.8 ↑	↑ 2.8–40.5 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	0.0–3.2 ↑	↑ 9.7–88.5 ↑	↑ 3.3–33.1 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.2 ↑	↑ 1.4–1.5 ↑
Ox	↑ 0.3–6.0 ↑	↑ 1.4–11.3 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.5–1.0 ↑	↑ 0.3–6.0 ↑	↑ 1.6–11.2 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.6–0.7 ↑	↑ 0.3–6.0 ↑	↑ 1.6–11.1 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–1.2 ↑
Buffalo	↑ 0.4–6.2 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.2 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.7–1.3 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.2 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.2 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.7–0.9 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.2 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.2 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.5–1.3 ↑
Horse	↑ 0.6–6.8 ↑	↑ 0.6–6.8 ↑	0.0–0.2 ↑	↑ 1.3–2.1 ↑	↑ 0.6–6.8 ↑	↑ 0.6–6.8 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.9–1.4 ↑	↑ 0.6–6.8 ↑	↑ 0.6–6.8 ↑	0.0–0.2 ↑	↑ 1.0–1.4 ↑
Donkey	↑ 0.5–6.4 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.4 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↑ 1.0–1.6 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.4 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.4 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.8–1.0 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.4 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.4 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.7–1.3 ↑
Mule	↑ 0.4–6.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.1 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.7–1.2 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.1 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.7–0.8 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.1 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.5–1.2 ↑
Camel	↑ 0.5–6.3 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.3 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.2 ↑	↑ 1.1–1.8 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.3 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.3 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.8–1.2 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.3 ↑	↑ 0.5–6.3 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.8–1.3 ↑
				Agronomic fa	actor category: Se	ed sowing option	ns					
Baseline: Native seeds	24 42 2	0.6.128 E	1217	44.05	E 2 28 4	160 122 1	12.10	40.117	46.246	16 4 107 8	12 17	41.06
(Initial value)	2.4-42.2	9.6-136.5	1.5-1-7	4.4-9.3	5.2-26.4	16.9–123.1	1.5-1.6	4.0-11.7	4.0-34.0	10.4-127.8	1.5-1.7	4.1-9.0
Hybrid seeds	↓ 3.8–7.1 ↓	↓ 3.8–7.1 ↓	↓ 0.3–0.5 ↓	\downarrow 2.5–4.0 \downarrow	↓ 2.2–2.7 ↓	↓ 2.2–2.7 ↓	↓ 0.1–0.3 ↓	↓ 0.7–6.2 ↓	↓ 2.2–3.7 ↓	↓ 2.2–3.7 ↓	↓ 0.2–0.3 ↓	$\downarrow 1.44.2\downarrow$
GMO seeds	↓ 0.3–2.2 ↓	↓ 0.3–2.2 ↓	↓ 0.1–0.2 ↓	↓ 0.5–0.6 ↓	↓ 0.3–1.3 ↓	↓ 0.3–2.2 ↓	0.0	↓ 0.3–0.6 ↓	↓ 0.3–2.2 ↓	↓ 0.3–2.2 ↓	0.0–0.1↓	↓ 0.4–0.5 ↓
				Agronomic	factor category: I	Fertilizer options						
Baseline: Synthetic fertilizer	24 42 2	0.6 128 5	1217	44.95	52 284	160 122 1	12.19	4.0.11.7	16 21 6	16 / 127 8	12 17	11.06
(Initial value)	2.4-42.2	-42.2 9.0-138.5	1.3-1-7	4.4-7.5	5.2-20.4	10.9-123.1	1.3-1.8	4.0-11.7	4.0-34.0	10.4-127.0	1.3-1.7	4.1-9.0
Animal manure	↑ 0.4–7.6 ↑	↑ 0.3–5.7 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	$\uparrow \overline{0.8-1.8} \uparrow$	↑ 0.5–20.4 ↑	↑ 0.3–18.5 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.2 ↑	↑ 1.4–1.7 ↑	↑ 1.0–13.2 ↑	↑ 0.8–11.3 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.2 ↑	↑ 1.3–3.3 ↑
Biogas digestate	↑ 0.4–8.8 ↑	↑ 0.4–6.9 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.9–2.2 ↑	↑ 0.5–21.6 ↑	↑ 0.3–19.7 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.2 ↑	↑ 1.7–1.9 ↑	↑ 1.0–14.4 ↑	↑ 0.9–12.6 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.3 ↑	↑ 1.4–3.7 ↑

Agro-Climatic Zones	Tropics					Sub-Trop	pics		Temperate			
Energy efficiency indicator	NEG (in GJ·ha ⁻¹)		ER	EROEI		NEG (in GJ·ha ⁻¹)		EROEI		GJ·ha ⁻¹)	ERG	OEI
	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize	Maize
Biofuel	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas	Ethanol	Biogas
				Agronom	ic factor category:	Tillage options						
Baseline: Mouldboard with	24 42 2	0 6 129 E	1217	44.05	E 2 28 4	16 0 122 1	12.10	40 117	46.246	16 4 107 9	12 17	4106
pesticide application (initial value)	2.4-42.2	9.6-136.5	1.5-1-7	4.4-9.3	5.2-26.4	16.9–123.1	1.5-1.6	4.0-11.7	4.0-34.0	10.4-127.0	1.5-1.7	4.1-9.0
Mouldboard without	102051	↑0 2 05↑	0001	↑010 2 ↑	102051	102051	0.0	↑0104↑	102051	102051	0.0	↑0102↑
pesticide application	0.2-0.3	0.2=0.3	0.0-0.1 ↓	0.1-0.3	0.2-0.3	0.2-0.3	0.0	0.1-0.4	0.2-0.3	0.2-0.3	0.0	0.1=0.3
Chisel	↑ 0.2–1.2 ↑	↑ 0.2–1.2 ↑	0.0–0.1↓	↑ 0.4–0.5 ↑	↑ 0.2–1.2 ↑	↑ 0.2–1.2 ↑	0.0	↑ 0.2–0.5 ↑	↑ 0.2–1.2 ↑	↑ 0.2–1.2 ↑	0.0	↑ 0.3–0.4 ↑
Disk	↑ 0.4–2.4 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.4 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.7–0.8 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.4 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.4 ↑	0.0	↑ 0.3–0.7 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.4 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.4 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–0.6 ↑
Ridge plant	↑ 0.4–2.7 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.7 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.7–0.9 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.7 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.7 ↑	0.0	↑ 0.3–0.7 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.7 ↑	↑ 0.4–2.7 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–0.6 ↑
Stubble and mulch	↓ 0.1–2.8 ↑	↓ 0.1–2.8 ↑	0.0–0.1↓	↓ 0.2–0.2 ↑	0.0–2.6 ↑	0.0–2.6 ↑	0.0	0.0–0.3 ↑	↑ 0.1–2.5 ↑	↑ 0.1–2.5 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.5 ↑
Strip till	↑ 0.3–3.8 ↑	↑ 0.3–3.8 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.6–1.1 ↑	↑ 0.3–3.8 ↑	↑ 0.3–3.8 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.5–0.6 ↑	↑ 0.3–3.8 ↑	↑ 0.3–3.8 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–0.7 ↑
No till	↑ 0.2–3.4 ↑	↑ 0.2–3.4 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.5–1.0 ↑	↑ 0.2–3.4 ↑	↑ 0.2–3.4 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–0.5 ↑	↑ 0.2–3.4 ↑	↑ 0.2–3.4 ↑	0.0–0.1 ↑	↑ 0.4–0.7 ↑
				Agronomic	c factor category: I	rrigation options	6					
Baseline: Rain-fed (Initial value)	2.4-42.2	9.6-138.5	1.3–1-7	4.4-9.5	5.2-28.4	16.9-123.1	1.3-1.8	4.0-11.7	4.6-34.6	16.4-127.8	1.3–1.7	4.1-9.6
Surface	↓ 0.2–9.6 ↑	↓ 0.2–33.4 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.2 ↓	↓ 1.3–1.6 ↑	↓ 0.2–18.3 ↑	↓ 0.2–55.3 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.1 ↑	↓ 0.8–2.1 ↑	↓ 0.2–12.1 ↑	↓ 0.2–39.9 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.2 ↓	↓ 1.1–1.7 ↑
Sprinkler	↓ 3.9–5.7 ↑	↓ 3.9–29.5 ↑	↓ 0.2–0.5 ↓	↓ 2.6–2.7 ↓	↓ 3.9–14.4 ↑	↓ 3.9–51.4 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.2 ↓	↓ 1.2–2.8 ↓	↓ 3.9–8.2 ↑	↓ 3.9–36.0 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.3 ↓	↓ 1.5–1.9 ↓
Drip	↓ 3.1–7.8 ↑	↓ 3.1–31.7 ↑	↓ 0.2–0.4 ↓	↓ 2.3–2.4 ↓	↓ 3.1–16.6 ↑	↓ 3.1–53.5 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.2 ↓	↓ 1.1–1.9 ↓	↓ 3.1–10.4 ↑	↓ 3.1–38.1 ↑	↓ 0.1–0.2 ↓	↓ 1.2–1.4 ↓
			I	Agronomic fac	tor category: Co-p	roduct reintegra	ition					
Non-reintegration of co-products	2.4-42.2	9.6-138.5	1.3–1-7	4.4–9.5	5.2-28.4	16.9–123.1	1.3–1.8	4.0-11.7	4.6-34.6	16.4-127.8	1.3–1.7	4.1–9.6
Reintegration of co-products	↑ 9.6–305.3 ↑	↑ 0.2–26.1 ↑	↑ 1.6–3.4 ↑	↑ 0.2–0.5 ↑	↑ 15.8–300.4 ↑	↑ 0.3–25.6 ↑	↑ 2.0–2.8 ↑	↑ 0.2–0.6 ↑	↑ 15.8–305.6 ↑	↑ 0.3–25.3 ↑	↑ 1.8–3.0 ↑	↑ 0.1–0.6 ↑
			Ag	ronomic factor	r category: Maxim	um transport dis	stances		1			
10–20 km	2.4-42.2	9.6-138.5	1.3–1.7	4.4-9.5	5.2-28.4	16.9–123.1	1.3-1.8	4.0-11.7	4.6-34.6	16.4-127.8	1.3-1.7	4.1-9.6
21–800 km	24.2-27.4	3.8-83.7	0.0-0.5	0.8-3.4	6.8-41.5	11.7-60.8	0.0-0.5	1.2–3.0	15.0-32.6	12.0-68.7	0.0-0.5	0.8-3.0

Table S2. Cont.

 \downarrow before or after values in a range indicates decrease in NEG or EROEI OR negative effects on NEG or EROEI OR negative difference in NEG or EROEI as a result of the adoption of a particular agronomic factor; \uparrow before or after values in a range indicates increase in NEG or EROEI OR positive effects on NEG or EROEI OR positive difference in NEG and EROEI as a result of the adoption of a particular agronomic factor; 0.0 values in a range indicates no effects on NEG or EROEI OR no difference in NEG OR EROEI as a result of the adoption of a particular agronomic factor; \downarrow before values in a range indicates decrease in NEG or EROEI at lower limit of the range; \downarrow after values in a range indicates decrease in NEG or EROEI at upper limit of the range as a result of the adoption of a particular agronomic factor; \uparrow before values in a range indicates increase in NEG or EROEI at lower limit; \uparrow after values in a range indicates increase in NEG or EROEI at upper limit; \uparrow after values in a range indicates increase in NEG or EROEI at upper limit of the range as a result of the adoption of a particular agronomic factor.

References

- 1. Patzek, T. Thermodynamics of the corn-ethanol biofuel cycle. Crit. Rev. Plant Sci. 2004, 23, 519–567.
- 2. Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Conversion factors for Bioenergy. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S Department of Energy. Available online: https://content.ces.ncsu.edu/conversion-factors-for-bioenergy (accessed on 22 December 2016).
- 3. Grisso, R.; Perumpral, J.V.; Vaughan, D.; Roberson, G.T.; Pitman, R. *Predicting Tractor Diesel Fuel Consumption*; Virginia Cooperative Extension, Virginia Tech, Virginia State University: Petersburg, FL, USA, 2010; p. 10
- 4. Arodudu, O.T.; Voinov, A.; van Duren, I. Assessing bioenergy potentials in rural areas. *Biomass Bioenergy* **2013**, *58*, 350–364.
- 5. Graboski, M.S. Fossil Energy Use in the Manufacture of Corn Ethanol. A Report for the National Corn Growers Association; Colorado School of Mines: Golden, CO, USA, 2002; p. 113.
- 6. Galitsky, C.; Worrel, E.; Ruth, M. Energy Efficiency Improvement and Cost Saving Opportunities for the Corn Wet Milling Industry. An Energy Star[®] Guide for Energy and Plant Managers; Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, University of California: Berkeley, CA, USA, 2003; p. 84.
- 7. Uellendahl, H.; Wang, G.; Møller, H.B.; Jørgensen, U.; Skiadas, I.V.; Gavala, H.N.; Ahring, B.K. Energy balance and cost-benefit analysis of biogas production from perennial energy crops pretreated by wet oxidation. *Water Sci. Technol.* **2008**, *58*, 1841–1847.
- 8. White, P.J.; Johnson, L.A. *Corn Chemistry and Technology*; American Association of Cereal Chemists: St. Paul, MN, USA, 2003; p. 892.
- 9. Bonnardeaux, J. Potential Uses for Distillers Grains. Department of Agriculture and Food, Government of Western Australia: Western Australia, Australia. Available online: https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/ (accessed on 19 October 2014).
- 10. Naylor, R.L.; Liska, A.J.; Burke, M.B.; Falcon, W.P.; Gaskell, J.C.; Rozelle, S.D.; Cassman, K.G. The Ripple Effect: Biofuels, Food Security, and the Environment. *Environment* **2007**, *49*, 30–43.