

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF TRACTOR OPERATED GROUNDNUT THRESHER

1. Abstract

The production of groundnut in India is being rapidly increased in the last ten years and is expected to increase further in coming decade. Farmer mostly used traditional cultivation practices for production of groundnut, which are labour and time intensive. Therefore, time saving machineries suited to labours should be used by growers to handle harvest and post-harvest operations for this crop. The performance evaluation of the thresher for groundnut crop was conducted with 50 hp tractor. The experiment was carried out at the Cotton Research Centre and Instructional Farm of College of Agricultural Engineering and Technology, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh for kharif groundnut for Virginia Bunch type varieties of GG-20 and GG-22, respectively. The pod output capacity was observed as 524.66 kg/h (cylinder speed ~ 292 rpm) and 407.60 kg/h (cylinder speed ~ 421 rpm) for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties, respectively. The percentage of blown pods, unthreshed pods, broken pods and spilled pods were observed as 14.51, 18.92, 0.126, 1.04 % and 6.07, 14.59, 0.361, 0.99 % for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties, respectively. The average threshing and cleaning efficiency were found as 81.08, 88.21 and 85.41, 88.74 % for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties, respectively. The overall average cost of threshing operation was observed Rs.729.42 per hour and Rs.156 per quintal for both the varieties.

Keywords: Tractor, Thresher, Performance, Evaluation, Threshing efficiency, Cleaning efficiency, Groundnut.

2. INTRODUCTION

The peanut, also known as the groundnut and taxonomically classified as *Arachis hypogaea*, is a legume crop grown mainly for its edible seeds, and they are high in protein, oil and fiber. This plant is native to South America. The botanical name of groundnut, *Arachis hypogaea*, is derived from two Greek words, *Arachis* meaning a legume and *hypogaea* meaning below ground, referring to the formation of pods in the soil. Peanut or groundnut is a self-pollinating, indeterminate, annual herbaceous legume crop (Burns, 2010). It is also known as earth nut, peanut or monkey-nut. It is commonly called the poor man's nut. Peanut mostly grown due to its oil, protein and carbohydrates (Abdzad Gohari et al, 2010).The oil of peanut is one of

37 the most important vegetable oil in regions where other oily vegetables cannot grow
 38 up (Hosseinzadeh Gashti et al., 2012). Peanut has several uses as whole seeds or is
 39 processed to make peanut butter, oil, and other products (Putnam et al., 2013). Peanut
 40 is one of the most important oilseed plants in the world. Its seeds contain 40 - 50%
 41 fat, 20 - 50% protein and 10 - 20% carbohydrate depending on the variety (Okello et
 42 al., 2010).

43 Groundnut is grown on nearly 24.73 million hectares in world with annual
 44 production of 403.70 lakh tons of nuts-in-shells and the productivity is 1630 kg/ha. It
 45 is grown on large scale in India, China, USA, Senegal, Indonesia, Nigeria, Brazil and
 46 Argentina. The total area under groundnut cultivation in India is 4.56 million hectares,
 47 which accounts for the total production of 67.71 lakh tons with the productivity of
 48 1486 kg/ha (Anonymous, 2016). Country wise groundnut production for the year
 49 2015- 2016 is shown in Table 1.

50 **Table 1: Area, Production and Yield of Groundnut Major Countries**

Sr. No.	Country	Area (Lakh ha)		Production (Lakh tons)		Yield (Kg/ha)	
		2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16
1	China	46.00	46.00	164.80	165.00	3580	3590
2	India	47.69	45.55	74.02	67.71	1552	1486
3	Nigeria	27.70	25.00	34.10	30.00	1230	1200
4	USA	5.40	6.30	23.50	27.20	4400	4310
5	Sudan	12.50	21.80	9.60	18.70	770	860
6	Myanmar	8.90	8.90	13.80	13.80	1550	1550
7	Indonesia	6.30	6.20	11.50	11.30	1830	1840
8	Senegal	8.80	11.40	6.70	10.70	760	940
9	Niger	7.80	7.40	4.00	3.50	520	470
10	Cameroon	4.70	4.00	6.40	5.50	1360	1380
	Others	64.71	64.75	49.98	50.29	772	777
	World	240.50	247.30	398.40	403.70	1660	1630

51 (Status paper on groundnut, 2017)

52

53 **Table 2: State Wise Area, Production and Yield of Groundnut**

Sr. No.	States	Area (Lakh ha)			Production (Lakh tons)			Yield (Kg/ha)		
		2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
1	Gujarat	18.40	14.00	14.14	49.20	22.20	23.58	2668	1586	1668
2	AP	13.90	10.30	7.75	12.40	7.90	8.02	892	771	1035
3	Rajasthan	4.60	5.00	5.21	9.00	10.20	10.56	1992	2024	2028
4	Tamil Nadu	3.40	3.40	3.52	9.20	9.00	8.82	2723	2699	2509
5	Karnataka	6.60	6.50	5.91	5.70	5.60	4.85	863	870	821

6	MP	2.10	2.30	2.36	3.20	3.70	3.50	1573	1602	1483
7	Maharashtra	3.20	2.40	2.40	3.90	2.50	2.37	1248	1063	988
8	Telangana	-	-	1.27	-	-	2.06	-	-	1622
9	West Bengal	0.78	0.79	0.84	2.02	2.00	2.00	2573	2544	2372
	Others	2.12	2.11	2.15	2.48	2.50	1.95	1308	1639	907
	All India	55.10	46.80	45.55	97.10	65.60	67.71	1764	1400	1486

54 (Status paper on groundnut, 2016)

55 **Table 3 1: District Wise Groundnut Production in Gujarat State (2015-16)**

Sr. No.	District	Area ('00ha)	Production ('000tonnes)	Yield (kg/ha)
1	Rajkot	2731	273	1680
2	Junagadh	2538	253	2052
3	Dwarka	1763	176	1627
4	Amreli	1419	142	2200
5	Jamnagar	1316	132	1856
6	Gir-somnath	1196	120	2413
7	Banaskantha	1166	117	1898
8	Bhavnagar	1093	109	1758
9	Kutch	447	45	2234

56 (SEA Kharif Groundnut Crop Survey 2015-16)


57 More than 150 varieties of groundnut have been released by AICRP for
58 different agro-ecological situations of India, however only a few age old varieties like
59 TMV-2, TMV-7, GG-11, Chitra Kaushal, SV-xi, JL-24 and AK-12-24, K-6, CO-2,
60 Polachi-1, GAUG-10, and new varieties like TG37-A, GBPD-4, Narayani, ICGV-
61 91114, TPG-41, TG-38, VRI-6 are popular among the farmers for large scale
62 cultivation.

63 The spreading, semi spreading and bunch types groundnut varieties are grown in
64 Gujarat. The spreading varieties like GAUG-10, GG-11, GG-13 etc. and GG-20 is
65 semi-spreading while bunch type varieties of groundnut like JL-24, GG-2, GG-4, GG-
66 7 etc. have been recommended and adopted by the farmers for cultivation in
67 Saurashtra region. The groundnut is sown at the row spacing of 45 cm and 60 cm for
68 bunch type and spreading type, respectively

69

70 **3. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

71 A Groundnut Thresher which is beater or hammer mill type was taken for the
72 study. In fact it is a modification of the drummy type. It is provided with an aspirator
73 blower at the main grain outlet for final cleaning. Sieve assembly is also provided
74 beneath the concave, driven by a crankshaft pulley, which gets its power from the
75 cylinder shaft. The working principle of a hammer mill type threshing drum.



76

77

78

Fig. 1: Hammer mill type threshing drum



Fig. 2: Groundnut thresher

Table 3.2: Specification of Groundnut Thresher

A. General

1	Name	Groundnut thresher (square, box type tractor operated)
2	Make	Geeta works
3	Model	B
4	Type	Tangential flow
5	Year of manufacture	2015

B. Power unit

2	Type of prime mover	Tractor operated
3	Recommended power	35hp and above
4	Type of drive	PTO

C. Main drive

1	Type	Belt pulley
2	Size of belt, mm	2580
3	Diameter of pulley, mm	203

D. Threshing system

1. Cylinder

1	Type	Beater
2	Constructional feature	It is fabricated from circular CI flanges locked on the cylinder shaft at spacing. MS

			flat beater (perpendicular to the axis of cylinder) are welded on MS angle (3 nos.) fitted parallel to the axis of cylinder of which are bolted to each flanges with nut bolts.	
	3	Diameter, mm	540	
	4	Width, mm	825	
	5	No.& type of bearings	2 pillow block bearing	
	6	No. & size of beaters/projections/bars	7 (4+3 fitted perpendicular to each other, on each MS angle (3 nos.), blade edge)	
	7	Spacing between beaters, mm	230	
	8	No. of flanges	2	
88		2. Concave		
	1	Type	Semi-circular, open	
	2	Effective width, mm	650	
	3	Effective length, mm	830	
	4	Effective area, m^2	0.5395	
	4	Concave clearance range, mm	15-30	
	5	Concave clearance, mm	20	
	6	Method of clearance adjustment	By raising and lowering the concave	
	7	Constructional feature	It is fabricated from longitudinal MS flats at spacing and semi-circular MS rods are inserted with MS pipes spacer across the longitudinal flats to maintain spacing	
	8	Concavity, mm	265	
	9	Nos. and spacing of cross bars, mm	4, 245	
	8	Method of fixing	It is mounted on two curved angle iron of size bolted by 2 nut bolts	
89		E. Sieve		
	Sr. No.	Parameters	Upper sieve	Lower sieve
	1	Type	Punched elliptical holes	Punched elliptical holes
	2	Material and size	GI sheet, 0.79 mm	GI sheet, 0.79 mm
	3	Size of holes, mm	32.09x2.07(F), 49.17x19.19(R)	56.43x7.77(F), 113.32x8.64(M), 49.38x19.14(R)
	4	Density of holes in 100 cm^2	36(F), 3(R)	5(F), 5(M), 3(R)
	5	Size of sieve, mm	1445x760	1510x750
	6	Effective size, mm	685x150(F), 710x420(R)	695x525(F), 695x225(M), 695x560(R)
	7	Effective area, cm^2	1027 (F), 2982(R)	3478(F), 1563(M), 3892(R)
	8	Sieve slope, degree	5	10
90		F. Shaking Mechanism		

1	Constructional details		The mechanism consists of a pitman shaft supported by two bearings and connected to the sieve box. The rotational motion of pitman shaft is converted into to and fro motion of sieve box. The sieve box is mounted on two connecting arms (with ball bearings) at its front and to connecting arms at its rear end.
3	Pitman shaft		
	Material		MS rod
	Size , mm		655x38.0 ϕ
	No and types of bearings on pitman shaft		2
	Provision for lubrication		One grease nipple is provided on each bearing cover.
4	Hangers		
	Numbers		4
	Length of angles, mm		
		Total	200(F), 240(R)
		Center to center	145(F), 190(R)
	Stroke length, mm		55
	Nos. and type of bearing on each hanger		2, Ball bearing
91	G. Blower		
	1 Number		1
	2 Type		Suction type
	3 No. of blade		4
	4 Size of blade, mm		730 x 175 x 0.80
	5 Diameter, mm		700
	6 Provision for changing air displacement		Suction windows are provided
	7 Nos. , location and size of window, mm		2, LHS-RHS, 400 ϕ
	8 Nos. and type of bearings		2, Pillow block bearing
92	H. Crop feeding		
	1 Type		Hopper
	2 Method of feeding		Manual
	3 Size of feeding hopper, mm		815 x 325
	4 Height of hopper form platform, mm		870
	5 Height of feeding hopper from ground level, mm		2300
93	I. Transport		
	1 Type		Tractor mounted
94	J. Overall Dimensions		
	1 Length, mm		2770
	2 Width, mm		1360
	3 Height, mm		2120
	4 Ground clearance, mm		430
	5 Total mass, kg		1160

95	K. Main pod/ grain outlet	
	1 Size, mm	225×100
	2 Inclination, degree	5
	3 Height of outlet from ground level, mm	535

96 **L. Foreign material outlet**

97 **1. For stones/soil clods**

	1 Size, mm	205x115
	2 Inclination, degree	5
	3 Height of outlet from ground level, mm	515

98 **1. For soil powder**

	1 Size, mm	100x40
	2 Inclination, degree	Vertical
	3 Height of outlet from ground level, mm	825

99 **3. Sieve overflow outlet**

	1 Size, mm	250x35
	2 Inclination, degree	5
	3 Height of outlet from ground level, mm	535

100 **4. Straw outlet**

	1 Size, mm	845x390
	2 Inclination, degree	40-75
	3 Height of outlet from ground level, mm	985

101

102 **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

103 Experimental data collected during the course investigation. It is also
 104 including the evaluation of the various crop parameters like moisture content of pods
 105 and vine, pod-vine ratio. It also includes various performance parameter like crop feed
 106 rate, pod output capacity, percentage of blown pods, percentage of un threshed pods,
 107 percentage of broken pods, percentage of spilled pods, threshing efficiency and
 108 cleaning efficiency.

109 **4.1 Field Testing and Evaluation**

110 Performance of groundnut thresher was evaluated at Cotton research Centre
 111 and Instructional Farm of College of Agricultural Engineering & Technology, JAU,
 112 Junagadh for the varieties of GG-22 and GG-20, respectively.

113 **4.2 Crop Parameters**

114 The crop parameters such as crop variety and pod-vine ratio were determined
 115 during the study.

116 **4.2.1 Type of crop and variety**

117 The experiment was conducted on groundnut of GG-22 and GG-20 varieties.
118 Both are Virginia Bunch type groundnut which are semi-spreading type.

119 **4.2.2 Pod-vine ratio**

120 Pod-vine ratio was determined by taking crop samples. The pods and plant
121 matters (vine) were separated and it was observed as 0.3354 and 0.5836 for varieties
122 GG-22 and GG-20 respectively.

123 **4.3 Field Observations**

124 Field observations such as moisture content, crop feed rate, fuel consumption
125 and labour requirement were determined during the study.

126 **4.3.1 Crop moisture content**

127 The moisture content of pods and vine were measured by the oven drying
128 method as shown in Appendix-III. It was found that moisture contents of pods are
129 11.73 % (d.b.) and 6.81 % (d.b.) for varieties GG-22 and GG-20, respectively. The
130 moisture contents of vine are 11.53 % (d.b.) and 12.92 % (d.b.) for GG-22 and GG-20
131 varieties respectively.

132 **4.3.2 Crop feed rate**

133 Crop feed rate was measured as per standard method. Test results indicated
134 that at threshing cylinder speed of 292 rpm and 421 rpm, the crop feed rate was varied
135 from 2033.89 to 2117.65 and 1282.05 to 1333.33 for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties,
136 respectively.

137 **4.3.3 Fuel consumption**

138 The hourly fuel consumption in case of threshing was 2.46 lit/hr and 2.14 lit/hr
139 for the varieties GG-22 and GG-20, respectively. Both tests were carried out by 50hp
140 tractor.

141 **4.3.4 Labour requirement**

142 Six labours were required during the threshing of groundnut crop. One labour
143 was required for feeding of crop, one labour was required for straw handling, one
144 labour was required for pod handling and others were required for crop handling.

145 **4.4 Determination of Threshing Parameters**

146 The threshing parameters such as crop feed rate, pod output capacity,
147 percentage of blown pods, percentage of un threshed pods, percentage of broken pods,
148 percentage of spilled pods, threshing efficiency and cleaning efficiency were
149 determined during the study.

150 **4.4.1 Pod output capacity**

151 Pod output capacity was varied from 518.63 kg/h to 531.97 kg/h with an
152 average capacity of 524.66 kg/h for groundnut variety of GG-22. For GG-20 it was
153 varied from 375.41 kg/h to 454.79 kg/h with an average capacity of 407.60 kg/h.

154 **Table 4.1: Feed rates and pod output capacity for GG-22 variety**

Sr. No.	Crop feed rate, kg/h	Pod output capacity, Kg/h
1	2117.65	518.63
2	2033.89	523.38
3	2195.12	531.97
Av.	21115.55	524.66

155

156

157

158

159 **Table 4.2: Feed rates and pod output capacity for GG-20 variety**

Sr. No.	Crop feed rate, kg/h	Pod output capacity, Kg/h
1	1298.70	392.59
2	1333.33	375.41
3	1282.05	454.79
Av.	1304.36	407.60

160 **4.4.2. Percentage of blown pods**

161 It is indicated in Table 4.3. Percentage of blown pods was varied from 12.17
162 % to 16.07 % with an average value of 14.51 % at sieve shaker speed of 182 rpm the
163 variety GG- 22. It was varied from 4.34 % to 8.58 % with an average value of 6.07 %
164 at sieve shaker speed of 248 rpm for the variety GG- 20.

165 **Table 4.3: Percentage of blown pods for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties**

Sr. No.	For variety GG-22, %	For variety GG-20, %
1	15.31	4.34
2	16.05	8.58
3	12.17	5.29
Av.	14.51	6.07

166

167 **4.4.3. Percentage of unthreshed pods**

168 Percentage of unthreshed pods was measured it is indicated in Table 4.4.
 169 Percentage of blown pods was varied from 17.62 % to 20.70 % with an average value
 170 of 18.92 % at cylinder speed of 292 rpm for the variety GG- 22. It was varied from
 171 13.52 % to 16.39 % with an average of 14.59 % at cylinder speed of 421 rpm for the
 172 variety GG- 20.

173 **Table 4.4: Percentage of unthreshed pods for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties**

Sr. No.	For variety GG-22, %	For variety GG-20, %
1	18.44	13.52
2	20.70	16.39
3	17.62	13.88
Av.	18.92	14.59

174 **4.4.4. Percentage of broken pods**

175 Percentage of broken was varied from 0.088 % to 0.168 % at a blower speed
 176 of 627 rpm with an average value of 0.126 % for the variety GG-22. It was varied
 177 from 0.337 % to 0.373 % at a blower speed of 775 rpm with an average value of
 178 0.361 % for the variety GG- 20.

179 **Table 4.5: Percentage of broken pods for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties**

Sr. No.	For variety GG-22, %	For variety GG-20, %
1	0.088	0.372
2	0.123	0.337
3	0.168	0.373
Av.	0.126	0.361


180 **4.4.5 Percentage of spilled pods**

181 Percentage of spilled pods was varied between 0.83 % and 1.30 % at sieve
 182 shaker speed of 182 rpm with an average value of 1.04 % for the variety GG-22. It
 183 was varied from 0.854 % to 1.130 % at sieve shaker speed of 248 rpm with an
 184 average value of 0.99 % for the variety GG- 20.

185 **Table 4.6: Percentage of spilled pods for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties**

Sr. No.	For variety GG-22, %	For variety GG-20, %
1	0.99	0.854
2	0.83	1.130
3	1.30	0.99
Av.	1.04	0.99

186




187

188

Fig 3: Various losses during threshing operation for GG-22 variety

189



190

191

Fig 4: Various losses during threshing operation for GG-20 variety

192

4.4.6. Threshing efficiency

193 Threshing efficiency was varied from 79.3% to 82.38 % with an average value
 194 of 81.08 % for the variety GG-22. It was varied from 83.61 % to 86.48 % with an
 195 average value of 85.41 % for the variety GG- 20. Thus higher threshing efficiency
 196 was observed in GG-20 (85.41 %) as compared to GG-22 (81.08 %).

197 **Table 4.7: Threshing efficiency for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties**

Sr. No.	For variety GG-22, %	For variety GG-20, %
1	81.56	86.48
2	79.30	83.61
3	82.38	86.13
Av.	81.08	85.41

198


199 **4.4.7. Cleaning efficiency**

200 Cleaning efficiency varied from 85.89 % to 90.80 % with an average value of
 201 88.19 % for the variety GG-22. It was varied from 88.39 % to 89.35 % with an
 202 average value of 88.74 % for the variety GG-20. It was observed that due to sufficient
 203 drying of the crop the groundnut was separated easily and efficiently from the foreign
 204 materials (stone, soil and plant stem). Thus higher cleaning efficiency was obtained
 205 for both the varieties.

206 **Table 4.8: Cleaning efficiency for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties**

Sr. No.	For variety GG-22, %	For variety GG-20, %
1	87.95	89.35
2	85.89	88.39
3	90.80	88.47
Av.	88.21	88.74

207




208

209

Fig 5: Percentage of threshed and unthreshed pods for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties

210



211

212

Fig 6: Percentage of cleaned pods and foreign material for GG-22 and GG-20 varieties

213

4.5 Cost of Operation

214

Cost of groundnut threshing was calculated in terms of fixed cost and

215

Operating costs:

216

4.5.1 Cost calculation for thresher

217

FIXED COST

218

1. Depreciation cost

219

Life of thresher = 8 years

220

Annual use = 300 hrs

221

$$D = \frac{C - S}{L \times H}$$

222

Where,

223

C = Cost of thresher

224

S = Salvage value

225 $L = \text{Life of thresher}$
 226 $H = \text{No. of working hour per year}$
 227 $= \frac{154000 - 15400}{8 \times 300}$
 228 $= 57.75 \text{ Rs/h}$

229 2. Interest
 230 $I = \frac{C + S}{2} \times \frac{i}{H}$

231
 232 Where,
 233 $C = \text{Cost of thresher}$
 234 $S = \text{Salvage value}$
 235 $I = \text{Interest per hour}$
 236 $i = \text{Percentage rate of interest per year}$
 237 $= \frac{154000 + 15400}{2 \times 100} \times \frac{10}{300}$
 238 $= 28.23 \text{ Rs/h}$

239 3. Housing cost
 240 $= \frac{1.5\% \text{ of initial cost}}{\text{annual use}}$
 241 $= \frac{2310}{300}$
 242 $= 7.70 \text{ Rs/hr}$

243 4. Insurance and taxes cost
 244 $= \frac{2.0\% \text{ of initial cost}}{\text{annual use}}$
 245 $= \frac{3080}{300}$
 246 $= 10.27 \text{ Rs/h}$

247 Therefore, fixed cost for thresher = Depreciation cost + Interest + Housing cost
 248 + Insurance and taxes cost
 249 $= 57.75 + 28.23 + 7.70 + 10.27$
 250 $= 103.95 \text{ Rs/h}$

251 **OPERATING COST**

252 1. Repair and maintenance
 253 $= \frac{5\% \text{ of initial cost}}{\text{annual use}}$
 254 $= \frac{7700}{300}$
 255 $= 25.67 \text{ Rs/h}$

256 2. Wages

257 Labour cost = 300 Rs per day for 8 hour
 258 = 37.5 Rs/h
 259 Therefore, cost of six labour = 225 Rs/h
 260 Total operating cost for thresher = Repair and maintenance cost + Wages cost
 261 = 25.67 + 225
 262 = 250.67 Rs/h
 263 Total Thresher cost = Fixed cost + Operating cost
 264 = 103.95 + 250.67
 265 = 354.62 Rs/h
 266

267 **4.5.2. Cost calculation for tractor**

268 **FIXED COST**

269 1. Depreciation cost

270 Life of thresher = 10 years

271 Annual use = 1000 hrs

272
$$D = \frac{C - S}{L \times H}$$

273 Where,

274 C = Cost of tractor

275 S = Salvage value

276 L = Life of tractor

277 H = No. of working hour per year

278
$$= \frac{750000 - 75000}{10 \times 1000}$$

279 = 67.50 Rs/h

280 2. Interest

281
$$I = \frac{C + S}{2} \times \frac{i}{H}$$

282 Where,

284 C = Cost of tractor

285 S = Salvage value

286 I = Interest per hour

287 i = Percentage rate of interest per year

288
$$= \frac{750000 + 75000}{2 \times 100} \times \frac{10}{1000}$$

289 = 41.25 Rs/h

290

291 3. Housing

292 =
$$\frac{1.5\% \text{ of initial cost}}{\text{annual use}}$$

293 =
$$\frac{11250}{1000}$$

294 = 11.25 Rs/h

295 4. Insurance and taxes cost

$$\begin{aligned}
296 &= \frac{2.0\% \text{ of initial cost}}{\text{annual use}} \\
297 &= \frac{15000}{1000} \\
298 &= 15 \text{ Rs/h}
\end{aligned}$$

299 Therefore, fixed cost for tractor = Depreciation cost + Interest + Housing cost

$$\begin{aligned}
300 &+ \text{Insurance and taxes cost} \\
301 &= 67.50 + 41.25 + 11.25 + 15 \\
302 &= 135
\end{aligned}$$

303 **OPERATING COST**

304 1. Repair and maintenance

$$\begin{aligned}
305 &= \frac{5\% \text{ of initial cost}}{\text{annual use}} \\
306 &= \frac{37500}{1000} \\
307 &= 37.5 \text{ Rs/h}
\end{aligned}$$

308 2. Operator cost

- 309 • 300 Rs per day of 8 hrs

- 310 • Therefore, it is 37.5 Rs/h

311 3. Fuel cost

- 312 • In a one hour 2.5 litre average diesel was consumed and prevailing
- 313 diesel price was 64 Rs/lit.

- 314 • Therefore, fuel cost for tractor = 160 Rs/h

315 4. Oil cost

- 316 • Oil consumption is taken as 30 percent of the fuel consumption

- 317 • Therefore, oil cost for tractor = 48 Rs/h

$$\begin{aligned}
318 & \\
319 &\text{Total operating cost for tractor} = \text{Repair and maintenance} + \text{Operator cost} + \text{Fuel cost} \\
320 &+ \text{Oil cost} \\
321 &= 37.5 + 37.5 + 160 + 48 \\
322 &= 283 \text{ Rs/h}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
323 &\text{Total tractor cost} = \text{Fixed cost} + \text{Operating cost} \\
324 &= 135 + 283 \\
325 &= 418 \text{ Rs/h}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
326 &\text{Total operational cost} = \text{Thresher cost} + \text{Tractor cost} \\
327 &= 354.62 + 418 \\
328 &= 772.62 \text{ Rs/h}
\end{aligned}$$

329 Therefore, average cost of groundnut threshing, Rs/kg

$$\begin{aligned}
330 &= \frac{\text{Cost of operation (Rs/h)}}{\text{Average pod output capacity (kg/h)}} \\
331 &\quad (\text{Average pod output capacity} = 466.13 \text{ kg/h})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{772.62}{466.13} \\
&= 1.65 \text{ Rs/kg} \\
&= 165 \text{ Rs/q}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the fixed and operating cost were found as Rs.103.95, 250.67 per hour and Rs.135, 283 per hour for thresher and tractor, respectively. The overall average cost of threshing operation was observed Rs.772.62 per hour OR Rs.165 per quintal.

CONCLUSION

Threshing operation is also different in India and among the developing countries. The threshing is done from the old traditional method of using sticks and racks to the modern power threshers. In India the smallholder and marginal farmers do manual threshing. After harvest bunch type plants are stacked in heaps with the pod-end exposed. The crop has remained in this state for a week. The pods are plucked from the plants with labour or threshed by power thresher. Drying the plants for a few days facilitates the threshing operation. In order to get timeliness of threshing, nowadays power thresher is mostly used for groundnut crop. Mechanization of this process removed a substantial amount of drudgery from farm labour.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akali, I.D. and Guven Onur (1990). Physical properties of peanut in Turkey. AMA. Vol. 21(3): 55-60.
- Bidir ,U.B., Kilgour J. (1994). Groundnut harvesting machine for Northern Nigeria, AMA. Vol, 25(1): 33-36
- Burns, N. and Grove, S.K., 2010. *Understanding nursing research-eBook: Building an evidence-based practice*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
- Chen, C.C., Chon, T.H, and Lu, L.H. (1989). Threshing performance of an impact type groundnut thresher. Journal of Agriculture Research of China. Vol. 38(1): 140-155.
- Dafalla, M.A., Dawelbeit, M.I. and Abouda, S.E.K. (1992). Effect of some machine and crop factors on mechanical groundnut threshing. AMA, Vol. 23(3): 43-46.
- Gashti, Alireza Hosseinzadeh, Mohammad Naghi Safarzadeh Vishekaei, and Mohammad Hadi Hosseinzadeh. "Effect of potassium and calcium application on

365 yield, yield components and qualitative characteristics of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*
366 L.) in Guilan Province, Iran." *World Applied Sci. J* 16, no. 4 (2012): 40-546.

367 Ghatge, J.S., Bandgar, P.S. and Mehetre, S.A. (2014). Development and performance
368 evaluation of pedal operated pod stripping machine. *International Journal of*
369 *Agricultural Engineering*, Vol. 7(1): 217-220.

370 Goel, A.K. and Nanda, S.K. (1994). Comparative performance of different methods of
371 groundnut threshing. *AMA*, Vol. 25(1): 37-41.

372 Gole, S.V. and Shahu, R. (2009). Ergonomically designed thresher. *AMA*. Vol. 40(2):
373 73-75.

374 Govindraj, G. and Mishra, A.P. (2011). Labour demand and labour saving options, A
375 case of groundnut crop in India. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*,
376 Vol. 24: 423-428.

377 http://eands.dacnet.nic.in/latest_2016.htm
378 <http://www.wikipedia.com>

379 Hwang, Y. (1983). Development of peanut combine harvester. *AMA*. Vol. 14(2): 11-
380 16

381 IS: 9164, Indian Standard Test Guide for estimating cost of farm machinery operation,
382 Indian Standard Institution (BIS), Manak Bhavan, New Delhi.

383 IS:11334, Indian Standard Test Code for power thresher for groundnut, Indian
384 Standard Institution (BIS), Manak Bhavan, New Delhi.

385 Magar, A.P., Bhutada S.H., Suryawanshi, S.L. and Bombale V.T. (2010).
386 Performance evaluation of square beater bar type threshing drum on groundnut
387 threshing. *International Journal of Agricultural Engineering*. Vol. 2(2):
388 293-298.

389 Manes, G.S., Sharma, R. and Khurana R. (2006). Adoption status of safety measures
390 on threshers. *Journal of Research*, Vol. 43(1): 134-137.

391 Nobahar, Amin, Hamid Reza Zakerin, Marefat Mostafavi Rad, Saeed Sayfzadeh, and
392 Ali Reza Valadabady. "Response of yield and some physiological traits of groundnut
393 (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) to topping height and application methods of Zn and Ca nano-
394 chelates." *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis* 50, no. 6 (2019): 749-
395 762.

396 Omran. M.A., Omer, M.E.E. and Hassan, I.M. (2005). Modification and performance
397 of multi-crop thresher, *Journal of Science and Technology*. Vol. 6(2): 1-19.

398 Padmanathan, P.K., Kathirvel, K., Duraisamy, V.M. and Maian, V. (2007). Influence
399 of crop, machine and operational parameters on picking and conveying
400 efficiency of an experimental groundnut combine. *Journal of Applied Sciences*
401 *Research*, Vol. 8(3): 700-705.

402 Padmanathan, P.K., Kathirvel, K., Manian, R, and Duraisamy V.M. (2006). Design,
403 development and evaluation of tractor operated groundnut combine harvester.
404 *Journal of applied sciences research*, Vol. 2(12): 1338-1341.

405 Paramsivam, P. (1997). Effect of cylinder speed and performance of axial flow
406 thresher. *Current Research University of Agriculture Science*, Vol. 26(10):
407 177-179.

408 Rajasekar, M., Arunkumar, S., Divakar, S. and Santosh kuamr R. (2017). Design
409 fabrication and performance analysis of groundnut thresher. *International*
410 *Research Journal of Engineering and Technology*. Vol. 4(2), 1631-1637.

411 Reddy, K.M., Vijay Kumar D., Reddy, B.R. and Reddy, B.S. (2013). Performance
412 evaluation of groundnut thresher for freshly harvested crop. *International*
413 *Journal of Agricultural Engineering*. Vol. 6(1): 67-70.

414 Sheikh, D.A. (2000). Modification of grain thresher to work with groundnut. *AMA*.
415 Vol. 31(4): 67-71.

416 Sheikh, G.A., Awsd, K.A. and Mohamed, A.A. (2007). Improvement of the modified
417 grain thresher for groundnut threshing. *AMA*. Vol. 39(3): 67-72.

418 Singh, M., Manes, G.S., and Singh, S. (2009). Development and testing of axial flow
419 groundnut thresher. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, Vol. 79(9): 740-
420 744.

421 Suryavanshi, S.H., Shridar, B., Kathirvel, K. (2008). Development of power tiller
422 operated groundnut harvester. *AMA*, Vol. 39(3); 29-32.

423 Thangavelu, S. and Swaminathn, K.R. (1986). Groundnut crop moisture content and
424 rotor speed in stripping. *AMA*, Vol. 17(1): 39-41.

425 Wilson, U., Sankat, C.K. and Anwar, M.T. (1997). Design and performance of an
426 axial flow peanut thresher. *Transaction of ASAE*, Vol. 33(1): 35-42.

427 Zafar, A.W., Kalwar, S.A. and and Anwar, M.T. (1997). Design and performance of
428 FMI axial flow groundnut thresher. *AMA*, Vol. 28(1): 31-34