



Article https://doi.org/10.46909/alse-573142 Vol. 57, Issue 3 (199) / 2024: 371-384

YIELD AND QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF SUNFLOWER (*Helianthus annuus* L.) CULTIVARS BY DIFFERENT SOWING DATES

Mehmet Necat İZGİ^{1*}, Abdullah ÇİL² and Ayşe Nuran ÇİL²

¹Department of Plant and Animal Production, Kiziltepe Vocational and Training High School, Mardin Artuklu University, 47000 Mardin, Türkiye ²Eastern Mediterranean Agricultural Research Institute, Adana, Türkiye; email: abdullah.cil@tarimorman.gov.tr; aysenurcil@hotmail.com

*Correspondence: necatizgi@hotmail.com

Received: May 27, 2024. Revised: Jun. 01, 2024. Accepted: Jul. 04, 2024. Published online: Jul. 30, 2024

ABSTRACT. A field trial was initiated to ascertain the optimal sowing date for five distinct sunflower cultivars in Turkey's Mardin Province. The trial scrutinised various parameters including plant height, head diameter, seed yield, protein content, oil content and oil yield. The first sowing produced the highest seed yields (3484 kg ha^{-1}), with the Sems (3255 kg ha⁻¹) and Zuhat (3157 kg ha⁻¹) cultivars producing the highest values. The highest overall oil content was achieved in the second sowing (31.7%) and in the Zuhat cultivar (34.6%). The highest mean oil yields were observed in the Zuhat cultivar (1096 kg ha^{-1}) and in the first sowing (1084 kg ha^{-1}). There was a general decrease in yield as the sowing date was delayed. Winter sowing is suggested for the Zuhat cultivar. If possible, the second sunflower crop should be sown shortly following the harvest of the main crop. **Keywords:** cultivar; oil content; protein content; sunflower; sowing date; yield.

INTRODUCTION

Sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) is Turkey's most critical oilseed plant due to its high oil quality. Since sunflower is not affected by photoperiod (day length) (Goyne and Hammer, 1982) and has drought and low-temperature resistance, it easily adapts to many different environments and can be grown in almost every soil type and ecology. These features give the plant an advantage over other oil plants. In sunflower production, the ideal daytime air temperature is 21– 24°C. Pollination is harmed, particularly in second crop sowing at temperatures



Cite: İzgi, M.N.; Çil, A.; Çil, A.N. Yield and quality characteristics of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) cultivars with different sowing dates. *Journal of Applied Life Sciences and Environment* **2024**, 57, 371-384. https://doi.org/10.46909/alse-573142

above 36–40°C. Furthermore, at high temperatures, the oil content decreases while the protein content rises. In irrigated agricultural areas, the most suitable date for sowing the second crop is between May and June (Kolsarıcı and Bayraktar, 1987).

Oilseed agricultural production, primarily sunflower, is increasing to meet the increasing oil deficit in Turkey and the world. Among oilseed plants in Turkey, sunflower comprises 74% of the oil used for nutrition (Taskaya and Ucurum, 2012). Turkey is among the top 10 countries for sunflower cultivation area and production in the world. Turkey consumes approximately 1.5 million tonnes of edible oil each vear. Approximately 10,000 tonnes of this are met by animal fats, with the remainder being met by vegetable oils. Sunflower oil has the highest share of all vegetable oils, with an average of 1 million tonnes (Anonymous, 2019b). In addition to studies on other oilseed crops (İzgi, 2023a, 2023b) that will help fill the edible oil gap, there is a need for new studies on sunflower

Various studies on irrigation, fertiliser, salt stress, sowing forms, and dates in sunflower have been conducted. One study found that some hybrid varieties had high yield stability and little genotype-environment interaction (Göksoy, 1999). However, additional research should be conducted on early and late hybrid cultivars that are highly productive in different regions different dates, resistant to diseases and plant pests, and adapted to the ecology with cultivation experiments in the ecology's environmental conditions (Güvercin et al., 2002; Karaaslan, 2001; Önder et al., 2001).

Sunflower is primarily cultivated in Thrace, Marmara, Central Anatolia, Aegean, Mediterranean, and Black Sea regions of Turkey, with very few agricultural areas in the eastern and southeastern ecosystems. The Marmara region serves as the primary hub for sunflower production within Turkey, particularly in the Thrace region (Turhan *et al.*, 2005), and expanding sunflower cultivation areas outside of this region is critical to closing the current oil deficit in Turkey.

Therefore, it is critical to identify appropriate cultivars and sowing dates for different ecologies for sunflower agriculture to become widespread. There is a need to identify cultivars with high seed and oil yields that can adapt to the lowland ecological conditions of Mardin Province. The purpose of this study was to investigate the growth and yield characteristics of sunflower (*H. annuus*) cultivars grown for the first time in Mardin, a new province for sunflower cultivation in Turkey, at different sowing times. Under this objective, the scope of this study was to identify high-quality high-vielding hybrid sunflower and cultivars and suitable sowing dates compatible with the plain conditions of Mardin Province.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For two years (2018–2019), a field experiment was carried out in the lowland climate of Mardin Province, Turkey, at an altitude of 400 m, latitude 37.131131N, and longitude 40.940215E, during the vegetation periods of 2018 and 2019. Sunflower (*H. annuus*) cultivars Baron, Betoli, LG-5542, Şems, and Zuhat were used, and they were patented in Turkey. The vegetation periods for these cultivars are as follows: Şems and Zuhat are early; Baron, Betoli, and LG-5542 are midearly commercial hybrid cultivars.

The low-lying areas of Turkey's Mardin Province, where the research took place, experience arid, hot summers and mild, rainy winters. Analysis of climate data spanning the years encompassing the field trials and longer periods revealed a notable uptick in temperature and humidity readings during March, April, and May of the second year. However, overall temperature and humidity levels remained consistent between the two years under scrutiny. This region has a warm and temperate climate. Mardin Province is located in a region that receives significantly more precipitation in the winter than in the summer. In August, there is usually no precipitation in Mardin (Table 1). The total rainfall amounts in Mardin Province for 2018 and 2019 were 967.7 and 779.3 mm, respectively (Anonymous, 2019a). The station from which climate data was obtained was the Kızıltepe Automatic Meteorological Observation Station in Mardin, Türkiye. The distance to the area where field trials were conducted was approximately 20 km.

The soil in the trial area has a clayloam structure and is low in organic matter (1.17%). The soil has an extremely high lime content (38.77%), is alkaline (pH = 8.08), and has no salinity issues (0.010%). Phosphorus (29kgha⁻¹) suitable for soil uptake is low, and the soil is potassium rich (100.27 mg kg⁻¹) (*Table 2*). The experimental design was established according to a split plot in a randomised block design. There were four sowing dates: two for the main crop in the main plots and two for the second crop. Sunflower cultivars were included in the subplots. In both years of the trial, the sowing dates were as follows: 1st sowing date, 01 March; 2nd sowing, 10 March; 3rd sowing, 11 June; and 4th sowing, 25 June.

This study examined plant height. diameter, seed vield, protein head content, oil content, and oil vield values. Sowing dates were allocated to the main plots, while the subplots were assigned to sunflower cultivars. The experimental design included three replications, with each plot spanning 6 m in length and comprising four rows spaced 70 cm apart. Within each row, seeds were spaced 30 cm apart, resulting in a total plot area of 16.80 m². A 2-m gap separated individual plots, and a 3-m gap separated blocks. Sowing was conducted at a seed rate of 5 kg ha^{-1} , with seeds buried at an average depth of 4-5 cm. Fertilisation was NPK (20 - 20 - 20)achieved using composite fertiliser, applying 100 kg ha⁻¹ of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium nutrients. At sowing, this fertiliser was applied to the seedbed's bottom at a depth of 10 cm. Sprinkler irrigation was used until the plants reached a length of 40-50 cm and then furrow irrigation was done. When they reached a length of 10-12 cm, the plants were uprooted to improve their development, and when they reached 30-35 cm in height, the soil was piled on both sides of the plants to keep them from breaking and falling. Weeding was performed manually and by hoeing. No pesticides for fungi, insects, or weeds were applied during the trial.

A total of 10 sunflower heads were manually harvested. Plants 30 cm from the start and end of each row, as well as one row at the start, were excluded. They were İzgi et al.

left to dry for about 15 days in the open air before being placed in individually numbered sacks for each parcel.

Oil and protein analyses of sunflower seeds were carried out in the Eastern Mediterranean Agricultural Research Institute Quality Laboratory in Adana, Türkiye. The crude protein content (calculated as $N \times 5.30$) was determined on sunflower samples using the standard Kjeldahl procedure (AOAC, 2005). Crude oil was extracted with petroleum ether using a Soxhlet apparatus for 4 h (AOCS, 2005). The data were

analysed using the JMP statistical programme (SAS software programme). The results were calculated using a combined analysis of variance (ANOVA). Based on the ANOVA results, the LSD test was used to compare significantly different means (*Table 3*).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The experiment was carried out by sowing five sunflower cultivars on four different dates in the lowland conditions of Mardin Province.

 Table 1 – Main climatic data from the growing season in Mardin Province (multiannual average values and from the 2018–2019 agricultural year)

_	Precip	oitation (r	nm)	Temp	erature	(°C)	Hu	midity ('	%)
Month	2000- 2019	2018	2019	2000- 2019	2018	2019	2000- 2019	2018	2019
February	33.5	94.3	27.4	8.8	10.2	8.8	56.6	70.9	71.3
March	59.7	7.2	95.8	12.4	14.3	10.7	59.3	64.1	75.1
April	35.1	32.5	79.7	15.9	17.7	13.9	53.8	53	70.9
May	34.7	26.6	49.2	21.7	21.8	22.7	40.5	60.8	29.1
June	3	28.5	16.3	28.4	28.1	29.5	24.5	33.9	24
July	0.9	0	1.7	32.4	30.9	30.8	21	31.3	21.8
August	0.3	0	0.1	30.9	30.2	31.7	27.8	38.3	20.7
September	1.3	0.1	0.3	26.6	27	26.3	29.8	35.3	24.3
October	21.5	115.3	32.7	20.7	19.8	22.3	36.7	44	30.4
November	30.50	128.4	11.8	13.4	11.1	13.5	50	73.1	41.6
Total/Mean	220.5	432.9	320.7	15.0	15.9	14.4	38.6	60.4	59.8

Table 2 - Main soil physicochemical indicators at 0-20 cm depth

Parameters	Value
Texture class	Clay-loamy
рН	8.08
Organic matter content, %	1.17%
Lime (CaCO ₃), %	38.77%
Total salt, %	0.010%
Available P, kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹	29.0 kg ha⁻¹
Available K, mg kg⁻¹	100.27 mg kg⁻¹

Variation				F value			
sources		Plant	Head	Seed	Protein	Oil	Oil
3001003		height	diameter	yield	content	content	yield
Year (Y)	1	530.5**	13.1*	0.74ns	44.21**	2.39ns	0.32ns
Cultivar (C)	4	45.9**	16.1**	45.2**	281.3**	94.2**	64.8**
Y×C	4	0.64**	2.3ns	28.6**	139.2**	5.58**	33.0**
Sowing date (S)	3	31.9**	5.5**	142.7**	1.6ns	2.4ns	8.9**
Y×S	3	1.4 ns	9.8**	3.0*	2.3ns	3.6*	2.9*
C×S	12	6.3**	3.0**	1.3ns	9.1**	6.3**	2.3*
Y×C×S	12	3.0**	3.5**	2.9**	1.7ns	4.0**	19.3**
CV		5.39	6.89	8.51	4.98	4.61	9.73

 Table 3 – Variance analysis results of vegetative characteristics of sunflower cultivars sown on different dates

*statistically significant at 5% (P<0.05), **statistically significant at 1% (P<0.01), ns: not significant, Y: Year, C: Cultivar, S: Sowing Date, DF: Degrees of Freedom

Plant height, head diameter, seed yield, protein content, oil content, and oil yield were examined, and significant differences were determined separately for each of the analysed properties.

Plant height

For plant height, all sources of variation (year (Y), cultivar (C), $Y \times C$, sowing date (S), $Y \times S$, $C \times S$, $Y \times C \times S$) were significant at the 1% level (Table 3). Table 4 presents the average plant height of the sunflower cultivars. In the first vear, the average plant height was higher than in the second year. Among the cultivars, LG-5542 had the highest plant height (193.0 cm), while Sems had the lowest height (81.9 cm). Plant height was significantly influenced by the sowing date. A decrease was observed as the sowing date was delayed. The plant height values varied depending on the sowing date. The highest value was recorded for the first sowing date (146.9 cm), while the lowest values were observed for the third and fourth sowing dates (132.8 and 129.8 cm, respectively). Regarding the Y \times C interaction, LG-5542 had the highest average (122.2 cm in the first year), while Betoli had the lowest (99.5 cm in the

second year). The highest plant height for the C × S interaction was observed for the Zuhat cultivar at the first planting date (157.1 cm). The Şems cultivar had the lowest plant height (101.2 cm) when planted on the fourth date. *Table 4* indicates that for the Y × S interaction, the maximum value of plant height occurred at the first sowing date of the first year (180.9 cm), while the minimum value was recorded at the fourth sowing date of the second year (98.1 cm) (*Table 4*).

The sowing date and cultivars affected plant height, agreeing with the results of two previous studies (Çil *et al.*, 2016; Yılmaz and Kınay, 2015). Excessive elongation of plant height is considered undesirable. In this study, there were no instances of breaking or plant detachment. The regulation of plant height is determined by the interplay of genetic and environmental factors (Singh *et al.*, 2019).

Head diameter

The Y × C interaction was statistically insignificant for head diameter; however, the Year factor was significant at the 5% level. C, S, Y × S, C × S, and Y × C × S were significant at the 1% level (Table 3). Sems had the largest head diameter at 25.0 cm, while LG-5542 had the smallest at 21.4 cm. Sems had the highest value (26.1 cm) in the second vear. Baron. Betoli. and LG-5542 cultivars had the lowest values (21.5, 22.0, and 21.4 cm) in the first year, and LG-5542 (21.3 cm) had the lowest in the second year, based on the Y \times C interaction. The Sems cultivar had the highest value (26.6 cm) at the second sowing date, based on the C \times S interaction. However, the LG-5542 cultivar had the lowest value at the third sowing date. Additionally, in the second year, Sems had the highest value (30.5 cm) at the second sowing date, based on the $Y \times S \times C$ interaction. At the first sowing date of the first year, the Betoli cultivar showed minimum values of 19.8 and 19.9 cm, as shown in Table 5. Saleem et al. (2008) found that early sowing date had a positive effect on sunflower head diameter Genetics. environmental conditions. cultural practices. soil structure, and irrigated/dry cultivation all play a role in sunflower head diameter (Singh, 2019). Numerous studies have shown that head diameter has a direct effect on 1000-seed weight, grain yield, and oil yield (Cil et al., 2016; Sefaoglu and Kaya, 2018; Yılmaz and Kınay, 2015).

Seed yield

The Y factor and C × S interaction were insignificant, but the Y × S interaction was significant at the 5% level. C, Y × C, S, and Y × C × S were statistically significant at the 1% level (Table 3). Based on the calculated mean values for cultivars, it Şems and Zuhat demonstrated the most substantial seed yield (3255 and 3157 kg ha⁻¹, respectively). The lowest value was observed in LG–5542 (2404 kg). The highest yield was obtained at the first sowing date (3484 kg). Based on the Y × C averages, the highest average amount was obtained in the Zuhat cultivar (3554 kg) in the second year, and the lowest amount was obtained for the LG-5542 cultivar in the second year.

Based on the interaction between Y \times S, the highest value was obtained at the first sowing date of the first year (3610 kg), and the lowest value was obtained at the fourth sowing date of the second year (2614 kg). The Şems cultivar had the highest value (4340 kg) at the first sowing date of the first year, while cultivars LG-5542 and Betoli recorded the lowest values (1679 and 1742 kg, respectively) at the fourth sowing date of the second year, according to the Y \times S \times C interaction (*Table 6*).

Early sowing allows plants to root development complete more quickly, resulting in more aboveground growth. Each cultivar is best adapted to a specific region's climatic conditions. Sefaoglu and Kaya (2018) found that seed vield values ranged from 1469 to 2798 kg ha⁻¹. In studies on different hybrid cultivars, sowing dates, and irrigation regimes, early sowing increased seed vield compared to late sowing (Baghdadi et al., 2014; Barros et al., 2004; Flagella et al., 2002; Jones, 1984; Saleem et al., 2008). High temperatures also reduced seed yield during the flowering and seed filling periods. Seed yield is well known to be proportional to head diameter (Cil et al., 2016; Yılmaz and Kınay, 2015).

		137 AB	3e-9 138 4 ^B	5 ^{de} 143.9 ^A	2 ⁱ 120.3 ^c	^{7a-c} 146.6 ^A		30	Mean		Mean		-i 22.6 [₿]	⁴ 22.9 ^B	⁴ 21.4 ^c	- DE DA
4 126.0	J126.C	20.7	131.6	139.5	101.2	150.7		129.8	ate		ate	4	21.39	21.5 ^{f-}	21.4 ^{f-}	22 3e
3 133.9 ^{e-} € 134.7 ^{ef} 135.1 ^{ef} 115.9 ^h	133.9 ^e . 134.7 ^{ef} 135.1 ^{ef} 115.9 ^h	134.7 ^{ef} 135.1 ^{ef} 115.9 ^h	135.1 ^{ef} 115.9 ^h	115.9 ^h		144.3 ^{cd}	g Date	132.8 ^c	owing D	ars (cm)	owing D	~	22.5 ^{e-i}	21.8 ^{e-i}	21.0 ⁱ	25.2 ^{a-c}
2 145.6 ^{cd} 139.0 ^{d-f} 133.1 ^{e-g} 134.3 ^{e-g} Sowin 139.7 ^B	145.6 ^{cd} 139.0 ^{d-f} 146.7 ^{b-d} 133.1 ^{e-9} 134.3 ^{e-9} Sowin 139.7 ^B	139.0 ^{d-f} 139.0 ^{d-f} 133.1 ^{e-g} 134.3 ^{e-g} Sowin 139.7 ^B	146.7 ^{b-d} 133.1 ^{e-g} 134.3 ^{e-g} Sowin 139.7 ^B	133.1 ^{e-g} 134.3 ^{e-g} Sowin 139.7 ^B	134.3 ^{e-g} Sowin 139.7 ^B	Sowin 139.7 ^B	139.7 ^B		tivar × S	in two ye	tivar × S	2	23.2 ^{d-f}	23.6 ^{c-e}	21.8 ^{e-i}	26.6 ^a
1 1	144.2 ^{cd} 144.2 ^{cd} 154.1 ^{ab} 157.1 ^a 157.1 ^a cording to 1	148.4 ^{bc} 154.1 ^{ab} 130.9 ^{fg} 157.1 ^a 146.9 ^A ording to	154.1 ^{ab} 154.1 ^{ab} 157.1 ^a 146.9 ^A cording to	130.9 ^{fg} 157.1 ^a 146.9 ^A :ording to	157.1 ^a 146.9 ^A cording to	146.9 ^A ording to ⁷	146.9 ^A ording to ¹	ording to T	Cult	cultivars	Cu	-	23.4 ^{c-e}	24.6 ^{b-d}	21.2 ^{hi}	25.7 ^{ab}
2019 2019 106.6 ^F 99.5 ^G 99.5 ^G 102.7 ^{FG} 101.8 ^{FG} 117.1 ^E 117.1 ^E 117.5 ^B	106.6 ^F 99.5 ^G 102.7 ^{FG} 101.8 ^{FG} 117.1 ^E 117.1 ^E ar	99.5 ⁶ 99.5 ⁶ 102.7 ^{F6} 101.8 ^{F6} 117.1 ^E ar 105.5 ^B	102.7 ^{FG} 101.8 ^{FG} 117.1 ^E 105.5 ^B	101.8 ^{FG} 117.1 ^E ar 105.5 ^B	117.1 ^E ar 105.5 ^B	ar 105.5 ^B	105.5 ^B		ultivar	unflower	ultivar	2019	23.7 ^{BC}	23.8 ^{BC}	21.3 ^D	26.1 ^A
2018 2018 168.2 ^C 177.3 ^B 185.0 ^A 138.7 ^D 176.1 ^B Ye 169.1 ^A	168.2 ^c 177.3 ^B 177.3 ^B 138.7 ^D 138.7 ^D 76.1 ^B 76	177.3 ^B 185.0 ^A 138.7 ^D 138.7 ^D Ye Ye 169.1 ^A	185.0 ^A 138.7 ^D 176.1 ^B Ye 169.1 ^A	138.7 ^D 176.1 ^B Ye 169.1 ^A	176.1 ^B Ye 169.1 ^A	Үе 169.1 ^A	169.1 ^A		Year × C	ates for s	Year × C	2018	21.5 ^D	22.0 ^D	21.4 ^D	23.8 ^{BC}
4 100.5⊢n 88ºP 93.6⊓-P 81.9P 126.69-1 98.1 98.1	100.5 [⊢] n 88 ^{op} 93.6 ^{n–p} 81.9 ^p 126.6 ^{g–1} 98.1 98.1	88 ⁰⁰ 93.6 ^{n-p} 81.9 ^p 126.6 ^{g-i} 98.1	93.6 ^{n–p} 81.9 ^p 126.6 ^{g–i} 98.1	81.9 ^p 126.6 ^{g-i} 98.1 ffferences	126.6 ⁹⁻ⁱ 98.1	98.1 fferences	98.1 fferences	fferences		sowing d		4	21.7 ^{h-0}	23.0 ^{e-m}	21.3 ^{j-0}	22.1 ^{f-0}
3 3 107.0 ^{k−m} 96.9 ^{m−o} 93.6 ^{n−p} 111.1 ^{−n} 111.1 ^{−h} 112.0 anificant di	107.0 ^{k-m} 96.9 ^{m-o} 93.6 ^{n-p} 101.1 ^{⊢n} 111.4 [⊥] 102.0 aprificant di	96.9 ^{m→0} 96.9 ^{m→0} 93.6 ^{n→P} 111.1 ^{μ→} 102.0 102.0	93.6 ^{n-p} 101.1 ¹⁻ⁿ 111.4 ^{j-1} 102.0 gnificant di	101.1 ⁻ⁿ 111.4 ⁻ 102.0 gnificant di	111.4 ^{j–1} 102.0 gnificant di	102.0 gnificant di	102.0 gnificant di	gnificant di		different	0		24.6 ^{d-f}	23.8 ^{e-j}	21.0 ^{k-0}	27.9 ^{ab}
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{2} \\ \textbf{0} \\ \textbf{s} \\ \textbf{wing}, \end{array}$	118.4 ^{h-k} 101.6 ^{h-n} 101.6 ^{h-n} 108.4 ^{j-m} 101.5 ^{h-n} 101.5 ^{h-n} 109.2 109.2 109.2 108.2 nd sowing,	101.6 ⁻¹ 101.6 ⁻¹ 108.4 ^{-m} 101.5 ⁻ⁿ 101.5 ⁻ⁿ 109.2 indicate sit	108.4⊢m 115.8⊢k 101.5⊢n 109.2 indicate siç indicate siç	115.8 ^{i-k} 101.5 ⁱ⁻ⁿ 109.2 indicate siç nificant diff	101.5 ^{Ln} 109.2 indicate siç nificant diff 2 nd sowing,	109.2 indicate siç nificant diff ^{2nd} sowing,	109.2 indicate siç nificant diff 2 nd sowing,	indicate siç nificant diff 2 nd sowing,	ultivar	ed at four	201	2	24.9 ^{c-e}	23.9 ^{e-i}	22.5 ^{e-n}	30.5 ^a
1 100.6 [⊢] n 100.6 [⊢] n 111.5 [−] L 115.2 [⊢] K 115.2 [⊢] K 112.8 ^{gh} ving Date 112.9 n a column istically sig	100.6⊢n 111.5J⊣ 115.5⊢h 115.5⊢h 108.5⊢m 108.5⊢m 112.8g ^h 112.9 112.9 n a column istically sig	115.2 ¹⁺ 115.2 ¹⁺ 108.5 ^{1-m} 128.8 ^{gh} 128.8 ^{gh} 12.9 112.9 1 a column istically sig	<u>115.2⊢k</u> <u>108.5⊢m</u> <u>128.89h</u> <u>Ming Date</u> <u>112.9</u> n a column istically sig' March; 2::	108.5 ^{j-m} 128.8 ^{gh} <u>Ning Date</u> 112.9 n a column istically sigi	128.8 ^{gh} wing Date 112.9 istically sign March; 2:	wing Date 112.9 n a column istically sign March; 2:	112.9 1 a column istically sign March; 2: 1	i a column istically sigi March; 2: 1	Date × Cı	ta acquire Date x Ci		-	23.5 ^{e-k}	24.4 ^{d–g}	20.5 ^{m-o}	24.0 ^{e-h}
4 151.5 ^f 175.2cd 185.4 ^{bc} 120.4 ^{gl} 176.1 ^b 161.5 161.5 ttters withir tters withir tters withir tters withir tters withir tters withir tters withir	151.5f 175.2cd 185.4bc 120.4 gl 176.1b 161.5 itters withlir tits no stati g date, 01	175.2 ^{cd} 185.4 ^{bc} 120.4 ^{gl} 176.1 ^b ear × Sov 161.5 161.5 is no stati g date, 01	185.4bc 120.4 gl 176.1b 176.1b ear × Sov 161.5 is no stati 15 no stati g date, 01 0 date, 01	120.4 g ⁱ 176.1 ^b ear × Sov 161.5 tters within e is no stati g date, 01	176.1 ^b ear × Sov 161.5 tters within e is no stati ig date, 01	ear × Sov 161.5 tters within e is no stati ig date, 01	161.5 tters within e is no stati ig date, 01	tters within e is no stati ig date, 01	Sowing	sowing	2	4	20.9-0	19.9°	21.5 ^{h-0}	22.6 ^{e-n}
3 160.8 ^{ef} 172.4 ^{de} 176.6 ^{b-d} 177.1 ^{dd} 177.1 ^{dd} 163.5 wercase le wercase le	160.8 ^{ef} 172.4 ^{de} 176.6 ^{b-d} 130.8 ^g 177.1 ^{cd} Y Y Y There wercase le	$\frac{172.4^{de}}{172.4^{de}}$ $\frac{172.4^{de}}{177.1^{cd}}$ $\frac{130.8^{g}}{177.1^{cd}}$ wercase le	176.6 ^{b-d} 177.1 ^{cd} 163.5 wercase le	130.8 ⁹ 177.1 ^{cd} γ 163.5 wercase le There	177.1 ^{cd} 163.5 wercase le vercase le	γ 163.5 wercase le Therε	163.5 wercase le There	wercase le There	Year ×	- Head dia Vear x	a		20.4 ^{no}	19.8°	21.0 ^{k-0}	22.4 ^{e-o}
2 2 172.8 ^{de} 176.4 ^{b-d} 185.0 ^{bc} 150.3 ^f 167.1 ^{de} 167.1 ^{de} 167.1 ^{de}	172.8de 176.4b-d 185.0bc 150.3f 167.1de 170.3 170.3	176.4 ^{b-d} 185.0 ^{bc} 150.3 ^f 167.1 ^{de} 170.3 Different lov	185.0 ^{bc} 150.3 ^f 167.1 ^{de} 170.3 Different lo ^v	150.3 ^f 167.1 ^{de} 170.3 Different lo ^v	167.1 ^{de} 170.3 Different lo ¹	170.3 Different lov	170.3 Different lov	Different lov		Table 5 –	200	2	21.4 ^{i–o}	23.3 ^{e-l}	21.2 ^{k-0}	22.7 ^{e-n}
1 187.9 ^{ab} 185.2 ^{a-c} 193.0 ^a 153.2 ^f 185.3 ^{bc} 180.9	187.9 ^{ab} 185.2 ^{a-c} 185.2 ^{a-c} 153.2 ^f 185.3 ^{bc} 185.3 ^{bc} 186.3 ^{bc} 180.9	10.30 193.0a 193.0a 193.0a 185.3 ^{ac} 185.3 ^{bc} 180.9 *[*1 193.0 ^a 153.2 ^f 185.3 ^{bc} 180.9 *[153.2 ^f 185.3 ^{bc} 180.9 *L	185.3 ^{bc} 180.9 *[180.9 *[180.9 *[*				-	23.2 ^{e-l}	24.8 ^{de}	22.09-0	27.4 ^{bc}
Baron Baron Betoli LG-5542 Şems Zuhat Mean	Baron Betoli LG-5542 Şems Zuhat Mean	Betoli Betoli Sems Zuhat Mean	LG-5542 Şems Zuhat Mean	Şems Zuhat Mean	Zuhat Mean	Mean	Mean				Cultivar		Baron	Betoli	LG-5542	Şems

The number of consequently, the seed yield increase as increases. A number of factors affect

		Table 5 -	- Head di	ameter da	ita acquire	ed at four	different	sowing da	ates for s	unflower	cultivars	in two ye	ars (cm)*		
			Year >	< Sowing	Date × CI	ultivar			1 2 2 2 2 N	- utiviou	Č	iver c C	- C		Maan
Cultivar		20	18			20	19		real ~ L	uluvar	5		owilig De		
	-	2	3	4	-	2	3	4	2018	2019	-	2	3	4	Cullivar)
Baron	23.2 ^{e⊣}	21.4 ^{i–o}	20.4 ^{no}	20.9 ^{i–o}	23.5 ^{e-k}	24.9 ^{c-e}	24.6 ^{d-f}	21.7 ^{h–o}	21.5 ^D	23.7 ^{BC}	23.4 ^{c-e}	23.2 ^{d-f}	22.5 ^{e–i}	21.3 ^{9–i}	22.6 ^B
Betoli	24.8 ^{de}	23.3e⊣	19.8°	19.9°	24.4 ^{d–g}	23.9 ^{e–i}	23.8 ^{e–j}	23.0 ^{e-m}	22.0 ^D	23.8 ^{BC}	24.6 ^{b-d}	23.6 ^{c-e}	21.8 ^{e–i}	21.5 ^{f-i}	22.9 ^B
LG-5542	22.09-0	21.2 ^{k-0}	21.0 ^{k-o}	21.5 ^{h–o}	20.5 ^{m-o}	22.5 ^{e–n}	21.0 ^{k-o}	21.3 ^{j–o}	21.4 ^D	21.3 ^D	21.2 ^{hi}	21.8 ^{e⊣i}	21.0 ⁱ	21.4 ^{f⊣}	21.4 ^c
Şems	27.4 ^{bc}	22.7 ^{e–n}	22.4 ^{e–o}	22.6 ^{e–n}	24.0 ^{e-h}	30.5 ^a	27.9 ^{ab}	22.1 ^{f–o}	23.8 ^{BC}	26.1 ^A	25.7 ^{ab}	26.6ª	25.2 ^{a-c}	22.3 ^{e–i}	25.0 ^A
Zuhat	22.4 ^{e-o}	23.1 ^{e–l}	22.0 ^{f-o}	22.6 ^{e–n}	22.6 ^{e-n}	23.1 ^{e⊣}	23.8 ^{e–j}	26.6 ^{b-d}	22.5 ^{CD}	24.0 ^B	22.5 ^{e–i}	23.1 ^{d-g}	22.9 ^{d-h}	24.6 ^{b–d}	23.3 ^B
				Year × So	wing Date				Υe	ar		Sowing	g Date		
Mean	24.0 ^{AB}	22.3 ^{CD}	21.1 ^E	21.5 ^{DE}	23.0 ^{BC}	25.0 ^A	24.2 ^A	22.9 ^{BC}	23.8 ^A	22.2 ^B	23.5 ^{AB}	23.7 ^A	22.7 ^{BC}	22.2 ^c	
	*	Different lo	wercase l	etters within	n a column	indicate s	gnificant d	lifferences	between v	alues, acc	ording to	Fukey's te	st (p ≤ 0.05	5).	
			Ther	e is no stat	stically sign	nificant dif	ference be	tween valu	les with the	e same lov	vercase le	tters.			
			1: 1 st sowir	ng date, 01	March; 2: 2	2 nd sowing	, 10 March	1; 3: 3 rd sow	ving, 11 Ju	ine; and 4:	4 th sowin	g, 25 June			

seeds and, the diameter of the sunflower head

sunflower seed yield, including environmental, morphological, physiological, and agronomic factors as well as cultivar and genetic structure (Andrei *et al.*, 1992). Sunflower seed yield can decrease (de La Vega and Hall, 2002) or increased (Kızılgeçi and Öztürk, 2018) when the appropriate sowing date is delayed.

Protein content

Y, C, Y \times C, and C \times S factors and interactions were statistically significant (1%), but S, $Y \times S$, and $Y \times C \times S$ were statistically insignificant (Table 3). Based on the mean values, the Sems cultivar had the highest protein content at 26.6%. whereas the Baron cultivar had the lowest at 17.4%. Examination of the interaction between Y and C indicates showed that Sems cultivar maintained the я consistently high protein content across both years, with negligible variance observed (26.9 and 26.4%, respectively). In the $C \times S$ interaction, Sems had the highest protein content.

No statistically significant differences were detected among the various sowing dates, as evidenced by the protein content values of 26.6, 26.9, 26.9, and 26.2 (*Table 7*).

According to Alpman and Sinan (2020), the protein contents of various cultivars and row spacing applications ranged between 20.8 and 22.1%, with this application having a significant effect on the protein content. Gupta *et al.* (1994) found that as the sowing date was delayed, the plant's oil yield increased, while its protein yield declined. Different nitrogen dose applications (Marschner, 2011), agricultural applications, and cultivar genetic factors can affect the protein content in the seed.

Oil content

Y and S were insignificant, but C, Y \times C, C \times S, and Y \times C \times S were significant for the oil content (1%). The $Y \times S$ interaction was significant for the oil content according at the 5% probability level (Table 3). Based on the mean values, the Zuhat cultivar demonstrated the highest oil content at 34.6%, whereas the Betoli cultivar exhibited the lowest value at 27.0%. Based on the mean values for the $Y \times C$ interaction, the Zuhat cultivar recorded the highest values in the second year (34.9%), while the Betoli cultivar displayed the lowest values in both the first and second years (27.3 and 26.7%, respectively). Based on $C \times S$, Zuhat had the highest oil content in the first sowing (35.9%), and Betoli had the lowest value in the third sowing (26.1%). Based on the averages of the $Y \times S$ interaction, the highest values were observed at the third sowing date of the first year and at second sowing date of the second 32.0%. vear (32.1)and respectively). The lowest values were observed at the fourth sowing date of the first year (30.7%) and at the first, third, and fourth sowing dates of the second vear 30.5. and 30.5%. (30.5.respectively). The Zuhat cultivar had the highest value (37.0%) based on the $Y \times S$ \times C interaction, specifically on the first sowing date of the second year (Table 8). The Betoli cultivar had the lowest value (24.5%) in the third sowing of the second year. Saleem et al. (2008) found that the average oil content was higher in late sowing than in early sowing, consistent with our findings. In other studies, seed oil contents were 33.5-44.5% (Yılmaz and Kinay, 2015), 42.85-46.18% (Demir, 2019), and 40.37% (Cil et al., 2016).

some ag	gri	cul	ltu	ral	te	ch	nic	que	es	aff	ect the oil								
		(Cultiver)	(cullival)	2835 ^B	2784 ^B	2404 ^c	3255 ^A	3157 ^A											
	1	Jale	4	2342	2088	1920	2539	2759		2330 ^D	5).								
⟨g ha ⁻¹)			e	2500	2414	2148	2915	2801	g Date	2556 ^C	t (p ≤ 0.0								
years (ł			7	3127	3212	2561	3636	3362	Sowing	3180 ^B	key's tes ırs. 25 June.								
s in two		Cult	-	3372	3422	2987	3931	3706		3484 ^A	ing to Tu case lette sowing,								
ver cultivar		cultivar	2019	2904 ^{DE}	2540^{G}	2149 ^H	3207 ^{BC}	3554 ^A	ar	2904	lues, accord same lower e; and 4: 4 th								
for sunflov		rear ×	2018	2767 ^{EF}	3028 ^{CD}	2659 ^{FG}	3304 ^B	2760 ^{EF}	۲e	2870	between va ss with the ing, 11 Jun								
ing dates f			4	2492 ^{n–r}	1742 ^t	1679 ^t	2737 ^{I-p}	3040 ^{hm}		2338 ^E	lifferences b tween value i; 3: 3 rd sowi								
rent sow		_	e	2758 ^{k-o}	2189 ^{rs}	1859 ^{s–t}	3117 ⁹⁻¹	3148 ^{f-k}		2614 ^D	gnificant d erence be 10 March								
four diffe	ıltivar	2019	2	3158 ^{f−j}	3075 ^{9-m}	2272 ^{qr}	3449 ^{d-g}	3911 ^{bc}		3173 ^c	indicate siç inficant diff i nd sowing,								
quired at	Date × CL	18				-	3206 ^{f−i}	3155 ^{f-k}	2786 ^{j-o}	3523 ^{c−f}	4118 ^{ab}	ving Date	3358 ^B	a column tically sigr //arch; 2: 2					
d data ac	Year × Sowing D		4	2192 ^{rs}	2434°-r	2161 ^{rs}	2341 ^{pr}	2478 ^{n–r}	ear × Sov	2321 ^E	ters within is no statis i date, 01 N								
Seed yiel			8	8	8	18	8	18	18	18	18	18	3	2241 ^{q-s}	2640 ^{n-q}	2437°-r	2714 ^{m-p}	2454 ^{n-r}	×
Table 6 –		20.	2	3096 ^{g-m}	3350 ^{e-h}	2851 ^{i–n}	3822 ^{b-d}	2813 ^{i–o}		3187 ^{BC}	Different lov								
-			-	3537 ^{e-f}	3689 ^{c-e}	3188 ^{f⊣}	4340 ^a	3295 ^{e-h}		3610 ^A	*								
		Cultivar		Baron	Betoli	LG-5542	Şems	Zuhat		Mean									

Genetic factors, ecologies (Singh et al.,

2019), species, cultivars, genotypes, and

able 7 – Protein content data acquired at four different sowing dates for sunflower cultivars in two years (%)*	Year × Sowing Date × Cultivar	2018 2019 Tear × Cultivar × Sowing Date Mean	2 3 4 1 2 3 4 2018 2019 1 2 3 4 Cuinvai	19.7 20.2 17.1 15 17.9 16.5 16.6 18.4 ^D 16.5 ^E 15.8 ^h 18.8 ^{d±} 18.4 ^{dt} 16.8 ^{gh} 17.4 ^E	15.5 15.9 18 26.8 27.2 26.6 26.8 16.9 ^E 26.9 ^A 22.6 ^b 21.3 ^c 21.2 ^c 22.4 ^{bc} 21.9 ^B	18.6 23.3 22.8 17.9 17.7 21.3 21 21.5 ⁸ 19.5 ⁰ 19.6 ^d 18.2 ^f 22.3 ^{bc} 21.9 ^{bc} 20.5 ⁰	27.2 26.6 26.8 26.3 26.6 27.1 25.5 26.9 ^A 26.4 ^A 26.6 ^a 26.9 ^a 26.9 ^a 26.2 ^a 26.6 ^A	18.3 18.2 18.7 19.3 19.2 17.2 17.5 18.7 ^{cp} 18.3 ^D 19.5 ^{de} 18.7 ^{df} 17.7 ^{lg} 18.1 ^f 18.5 ^D	Year × Sowing Date Year Sowing Date	19.8 20.8 20.7 21.1 21.7 21.8 21.5 20.5 ^B 21.5 ^A 20.8 20.8 21.3 21.1	fferent lowercase letters within a column indicate significant differences between values, according to Tukey's test (p ≤ 0.05).	There is no statistically significant difference between values with the same lowercase letters.	4: 45 actives deta 04 March: 0. Ond actives 40 March: 9: 9rd actives 44 historiand 4: 4th actives 05 historian
Table 7 – Protein o	Year × So	2018	2 3	19.7 20.2	15.5 15.9	18.6 23.3	27.2 26.6	18.3 18.2	Үеа	19.8 20.8	Different lowercase let	There	1. 1st couries
		Cultivar	-	Baron 16.5	Betoli 18.3	LG-5542 21.3	Şems 26.8	Zuhat 19.7		Mean 20.5	*		

content (Çil et al., 2016; Ozer et al., 2004;

Yılmaz and Kınay, 2015).

Yield and quality characteristics of sunflower (Helianthus annuus L.) cultivars by different sowing dates

Furthermore, high temperatures during the seed filling period have been shown to reduce the oil content (Ozer *et al.*, 2004).

Oil yield

For oil yield, the Y factor was statistically insignificant, but the $Y \times S$ and $C \times S$ interactions were significant at the 5% level. At the 1% level, C, $Y \times C$, S and $Y \times C \times S$ were significant (*Table 3*). the evaluated sunflower Among cultivars. Zuhat had the highest oil vield at 1096 kg ha⁻¹, while Betoli and LG-5542 vielded the lowest at 751 and 772 kg ha⁻¹, respectively. The first sowing period resulted in the highest oil production of 1084 kg ha⁻¹, which was influenced by the sowing date variable. Conversely, the fourth sowing date resulted in the lowest yield of 718 kg ha^{-1} . An examination of the $Y \times C$ interaction indicated that Zuhat achieved the highest oil yield (1249 kg ha⁻¹) in the second vear, while Betoli and LG-5542 exhibited the lowest yields in the first year (680 and 654 kg ha⁻¹, respectively).

Further investigation into the $C \times S$ interaction revealed that Zuhat produced the highest oil yield (1335 kg ha^{-1}) in the first sowing, whereas Betoli vielded the lowest amount of oil (582 kg ha^{-1}) at the fourth sowing date (Table 9). The highest oil yields found in among studies were 2690 kg ha⁻¹ (Yılmaz and Kınay, 2015), 1413 kg ha⁻¹ (Cil *et al.*, 2016), 1119 kg ha^{-1} (Sefaoğlu and Kava, 2018), and 1180 kg ha⁻¹ (Andrei et al., 1992). Head diameter, seed yield, and oil content, as different ecologies well as and agricultural practices, have a direct impact on sunflower oil yield (Flagella et al., 2002; Yılmaz and Bayraktar, 1996).

The oil content and yield of sunflower are influenced by cultivar characteristics, agronomic practices, and environmental conditions (Ashley *et al.*, 2002). Numerous studies have identified oil yield as the primary criterion for economic efficiency in all oil crops.

These studies demonstrate that earlier sowing dates are associated with higher oil yields, whereas later sowing dates result in reduced oil yields (Cil et al., 2016; İzgi, 2023a, 2023b; Saleem et al., 2008; Unger, 1980). It can be concluded that root development is more pronounced during the early sowing period, which positively influences the vield of sunflower plants. Furthermore, the superior yield of the Zuhat cultivar in this region underscores the significant impact of genetic factors. as demonstrated in this study.

CONCLUSIONS

This study's findings showed that the highest oil yield was achieved on the first sowing date (March 1) with the Zuhat cultivar. Delayed sowing exposed the plants' flowering and seed filling periods to extreme temperatures, leading to reductions in head diameter, seed yield, and oil content, which collectively diminished oil yield. However, planting a second sunflower crop immediately after the main crop harvest in regions capable of producing two crops per year will enhance vield. Differences in climate data had no effect on seed yield during the trial years. Future sunflower research in arid and semi-arid conditions is anticipated to significantly contribute to reducing the global edible oil deficit and conserving diminishing groundwater resources.

	Mean (Cultiver)	(cullivar)	32.3 ^B	27.0 ^D	32.2 ^E	30.0 ^c	34.6 ^A					Mean
	ate	4	30.1 ^{fg}	28.1 ^{hi}	33.0 ^{cd}	28.2 ^h	34.5 ^{a-c}		30.8)5). *		Date
		e	32.9 ^{cd}	26.1 ^j	33.5 ^{b-d}	31.0 ^{ef}	33.1 ^{b-d}	J Date	31.3	e. (kg ha ⁻¹)		Buimoe
C	tivar × S	2	33.3 ^{b-d}	26.5 ^{ij}	32.2 ^{de}	31.9 ^{de}	34.7 ^{ab}	Sowing	31.7	Tukey's tr etters. ng, 25 Jun vo years		uitivar ×
č	5	-	32.9 ^{cd}	27.3 ^{h-j}	30.0 ^{fg}	28.9 ^{gh}	35.9 ^a		31.0	cording to wercase l t: 4 th sowir Vars in tv	Ċ	3
	ultivar	2019	32.1 ^D	26.7 ^F	30.8 ^E	30.2 ^E	34.9 ^A	ar	30.9	values, ac le same lo une; and 4 ower culti		CUITIVAL
0 n N	Year × U	2018	32.5 ^{CD}	27.3 ^F	33.6 ^{BC}	29.8 ^E	34.2 ^{AB}	Ye	31.5	between ues with th wing, 11 J		rear ×
		4	31.1 ^{hi}	28.1 ^{kl}	33.2 ^{c-h}	27.3 ^{kl}	34.4 ^{b-f}		30.5 ^B	differences etween val h; 3: 3 rd so h; diates		
	19	e	31.1 ^{hi}	24.5 ^m	31.4 ^{gi}	32.3 ^{fh}	33.1 ^{c-h}		30.5 ^B	ignificant of ference be , 10 Marcl		
ILIVAI	20,	2	32.7 ^{d-h}	28.3 ^k	30.9 ^{h–j}	32.7 ^{d-h}	35.3 ^{a-c}		32.0 ^A	indicate s nificant dif sowing four diffe	ltivar	2019
ate x Cu		-	33.6 ^{b-g}	25.9 ^{lm}	27.6 ^{kl}	28.4 ^{kl}	37.0 ^a	ing Date	30.5 ^B	a column stically sig March; 2: 3 quired at	ate × Cu	
owing D		4	29.1 ^{i–k}	28.1 ^{k-l}	32.8 ^{d-h}	29.2 ^{i-k}	34.6 ^{b-f}	ar × Sow	30.7 ^B	ters within is no statis date, 011 data acc	owing D	
Year × S	8	ę	34.6 ^{b-e}	27.7 ^{kl}	35.6 ^{ab}	29.6 ^{i–k}	33.2 ^{c-h}	Υe	32.1 ^A	ercase let There 1 st sowing Oil yield	Year × S	
	201	2	33.8 ^{b-f}	24.7 ^m	33.6 ^{b-g}	31.1 ^{hi}	34.1 ^{b-f}		31.5 ^{AB}	ifferent low 1: Table 9 –		2018
		-	32.3 ^{f-h}	28.7 ^{jk}	32.4 ^{e-h}	29.3 ^{i-k}	34.8 ^{a-d}		31.5 ^{AB}	*		
	Cultivar		Baron	Betoli	LG-5542	Şems	Zuhat		Mean			Cultivar

Sowing Date	84 ^A 1009 ^B 802 ^C 718 ^D	ig to Tukey's test (p ≤ 0.05). tse letters. owing, 25 June.
ear	89.8 10	values, accordi ne same lowerc une; and 4: 4 th ;
Ye	90.9	s between lues with th wing, 11 J
	723 ^D	difference: etween va ch; 3: 3 rd so
	807 ^C	significant ifference b ig, 10 Marc
e	1022 ^B	in indicate ignificant d :: 2 nd sowin
owing Dat	1038 ^B	nin a colum atistically s 11 March; 2
Year × So	712 ^D	letters with tre is no sti ing date, 0
	798 ^c	lowercase The 1: 1st sow
	996 ^B	Different

751^D

919^c

818^{hi} 582^k 725^{ij}

32.9^{cd}

1040^{cd}

1110^{bc}

936^{B-D}

902^{cD}

775-0

1033^{e-g}

1077^{dg} 818^{j–n} 771^{l–o} 1523^a

6390-9

776-0

1049^{d-g} 827^{j-m}

Betoli

870^{h-l}

d-u802

731-0 867^{hl}

1144^{cf} 1056^{d–g} 1034^{e-g} 1273^{bc} 1147^{c-e}

_G-5542

Şems Zuhat

635^{jk} 724^{ij}

848^{fg}

937^{ef}

829^{gh} 1158^b

902^{e-h} 28.9^{gh} 1335^a

680^F 654^F 971^{BC}

822^E 891^{DE} 987^{BD}

489^r 558^{qr}

> 702^{m-p} 1127^{d-f}

> > 683^{n-q}

804^{I-n} 814^{k-n}

957^{9-k} 1190^{cd}

958^{9-j}

1131^A

Mean

8561-1

1096^A

928^{e-g}

1168^b

1249^A

944^{BD}

747^{I-0} 1048^{d-9}

860^{i⊣} 542^q 583P[⊢] 1008^{e–h}

1380^{ab}

772^D 979^B

> 906^{e-h} 929^{eg}

31.0^{ef}

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: MNI; Methodology: MNI; Analysis: AÇ, ANÇ; Investigation: AÇ, ANÇ; Resources: MNI; Data curation: MNI; Writing, Review, Supervision: MNI. All authors declare that they have read and approved the publication of the manuscript in this present form.

Funding: There was no external funding for this study.

Acknowledgments: In this study, the Eastern Mediterranean Agricultural Research Institute (DATAEM) treated seed supply as well as oil and protein analysis.

Conflicts of Interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Alpman, K.; Sinan, N.S. The effect of plant frequency on yield and yield components of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) varieties in different maturization group in dry conditions in Çukurova (in *Turkish*). Journal of Science and Engineering Sciences. 2020, 39(5).
- Andrei, E.; Ivancia, V.; Barnaveta, E.; Tarnauceanu, D. Aspects and directions on seed production of sunflower in lasi County. *Cercetari Agronomice in Moldova*. **1992**, 25.
- Anonymous. Mardin Meteorology Directorate Data (in *Turkish*). Mardin, Türkiye, <u>https://www.mgm.gov.tr/tahmin/il-ve-</u> <u>ilceler.aspx?il=Mardin</u> (accessed on
- 16.04.2023). 2019a. **Anonymous.** Edible oil In: R.T.M.C. ticaret.gov.tr, editor Ministry of Commerce Ankara (in *Turkish*). <u>https://ankara.ticaret.gov.tr/</u> (accessed on 20.04.2023). 2019b.
- AOAC. Official Methods of Analysis of the AOAC. 18th ed. Methods 990.03. Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Arlington, VA, USA. 2005.

- AOCS. Method Ce 1-62. Fatty Acid Composition by Gas Chromatography. AOCS Methods American Oil Chemists Society. 2005.
- Ashley, R.; Eriksmoen, E.; Whitney, M.; Rettinger, B. Sunflower date of planting study in Western North Dakota. *Annual Report Dickinson Research Extension Center.* 2002, 8, 1-12.
- Baghdadi, A.; Halim, R.A.; Nasiri, A.; Ahmad, I.; Aslani, F. Influence of plant spacing and sowing time on yield of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.). *Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment.* 2014, 12, 688-691.
- Barros, J.F.; de Carvalho, M.; Basch, G. Response of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) to sowing date and plant density under Mediterranean conditions. *European Journal of Agronomy.* 2004, 21, 347-356. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2003.10.0</u> 05
- Çil, A.; Çil, A.N.; Şahin, V.; Akkaya, M.R. A study on determination of the best sowing date for sunflower (*Helianthus* annuus L.) as second crop in Çukurova conditions (in *Turkish*). Journal of Field Crops Central Research Institute. 2016, 25, 1-6.
- de La Vega, A.J.; Hall, A.J. Effects of planting date, genotype, and their interactions on sunflower yield: I. Determinants of oil-corrected grain yield. *Crop Science*. 2002, 42, 1191-1201. https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2002.11 91
- Demir, İ. Changes in yield and yield components of hybrid sunflower cultivars in irrigated and rainfed conditions (in *Turkish*). *International Agriculture and Rural Development Congress* 2019, Siirt University, Siirt Turkey, pp. 10-12.

- Flagella, Z.; Rotunno, T.; Tarantino, E.; Di Caterina, R.; De Caro, A. Changes in seed yield and oil fatty acid composition of high oleic sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) hybrids in relation to the sowing date and the water regime. *European Journal of Agronomy*. 2002, 17, 221-230. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00012-6
- Goyne, P.; Hammer, G. Phenology of sunflower cultivars. II. Controlledenvironment studies of temperature and photoperiod effects. *Australian Journal* of Agricultural Research. **1982**, 33, 251-261.

https://doi.org/10.1071/AR9820251

- Göksoy, A.T. A study of some agronomical characteristics of synthetic varieties obtained from inbred lines of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.). *Turkish Journal of Agriculture and Forestry.* 1999, 23, 349-354.
- Gupta, S.; Subrahmanyam, D.; Rathore, V. Influence of sowing dates on yield and oil quality in sunflower. *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science*. **1994**, 172, 137-144.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-037X.1994.tb00539.x

- Güvercin, R.; Tanrıverdi, M.; Yılmaz, H. Harran Ovasında yetiştirilebilecek bazı ayçiçeği çeşitlerinin verim ve verim unsurları üzerinde bir araştırma (in *Turkish*). Harran Journal of Agricultural and Food Science. 2002, 6, 57-64.
- **İzgi, M.N.** Agronomic and quality parameters and yield interactions of various safflower (*Carthamus tinctorius* L.) cultivars at different sowing dates. *Turkish Journal of Agricultural Research.* **2023**a, 10, 252-264. https://doi.org/10.19159/tutad.1288786
- **İzgi, M.N.** Field performance of some soybean [*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.] cultivars sown on different dates. *Turkish Journal of Agricultural*

Research. **2023**b, 10, 27-37. <u>https://doi.org/10.19159/tutad.1219472</u>

Jones, O.R. Yield, water-use efficiency, and oil concentration and quality of dryland sunflower grown in the southern high plains. *Agronomy Journal*. **1984**, 76, 229-235. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1984.000

https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1984.000 21962007600020014x

- Karaaslan, D. 2001, Determination of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) varieties suitable for Diyarbakır dry conditions (in *Turkish*). Türkiye IV. Field Crops Congress Proceedings Book, 2001, Tekirdağ, Türkiye. 4, 17-21.
- Kızılgeçi, F.; Öztürk, F. Effects of different planting times on yield and yield components of some sunflower (Helianthus annuus L.) genotypes (in *Turkish*). *El-Cezerî Journal of Science and Engineering*. **2018**, 5, 749-755. https://doi.org/10.31202/ecjse.418282
- Kolsarıcı, Ö.; Bayraktar, N. Oil Crops Application Guide (in *Turkish*). Ankara University, Faculty of Agriculture Publications, Ankara, Türkiye, 1987.
- Marschner, H. Marschner's Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants. Academic press. 2011.
- Ozer, H.; Polat, T.; Ozturk, E. Response of irrigated sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) hybrids to nitrogen fertilization: growth, yield and yield components. *Plant Soil and Environment*. 2004, 50. http://dx.doi.org/10.17221/4023-PSE
- Önder, M.; Öztürk, Ö.; Ceyhan, E. Determination on yield and some yield components of oil sunglower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) varieties. *Selcuk Journal of Agricultural Food Sciences*. 2001, 15, 136-146.
- Saleem, M.; Ma, B.; Malik, M.; Cheema, M.; Wahid, M. Yield and quality response of autumn-planted sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) to sowing dates and planting patterns. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*. 2008, 88, 101-

İzgi et al.

109.

https://doi.org/10.4141/CJPS07052

- Sefaoğlu, F.; Kaya, C. Determination of adaptation capabilities of some oil sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) genotypes in Erzurum ecological conditions. *Alinteri Journal of Agriculture Science*. 2018, 33, 37-41.
- Singh, V.K.; Sheoran, R.; Chander, S.; Sharma, B. Genetic variability, evaluation and characterization of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) germplasm. *Bangladesh Journal of Botany*. 2019, 48, 253-263. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.3329/bjb.v48i2.475</u> <u>47</u>
- Taşkaya, T.B.; Uçurum, İ. Vegetable Oil Deficit in Türkiye (in *Turkish*). *The Journal of Agricultural Economics Researches*. 2012, 14.
- Turhan, H.; Kaya, Y.; Öztürk, İ. Comparison of yield, yield elements and oil ratios of some hybrid sunflower varieties. Türkiye VI (in *Turkish*). Field Crops Congress, 2005, Tekirdağ, Türkiye. 2005, 21-24.

- Unger, P.W. Planting date effects on growth, yield, and oil of irrigated sunflower 1. *Agronomy Journal*. **1980**, 72, 914-916. <u>https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1980.000</u> <u>21962007200060012x</u>
- Yılmaz, G.; Kınay, A. Determination of yield and yield components some sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) varieties in Tokat-Kazova conditions (in *Turkish*). Anadolu Journal Of Agricultural Sciences. 2015, 30, 281-286. http://dx.doi.org/10.7161/anajas.2015.3

http://dx.doi.org/10.7161/anajas.2015.3 0.3.281-286

Yılmaz, H.A.; Bayraktar, N. Determination of yield and yield components of 12 sunflower Helianthus annuus L. varieties in two different locations (in *Turkish*). Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 1996, 2, 63-69. <u>https://doi.org/10.1501/Tarimbil_0000</u> 000286

Academic Editor: Dr. Isabela Maria Simion

Publisher Note: Regarding jurisdictional assertions in published maps and institutional affiliations ALSE maintain neutrality.



© 2024 by the authors; licensee Journal of Applied Life Sciences and Environment, Iasi, Romania. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).