

Original Research Article

Comparative Evaluation of Neem-Coated Urea and Nano Urea on the Growth and Physiological Attributes of Finger Millet (*Eleusine coracana L. Gaertn*)

ABSTRACT

An experimental study was conducted to investigate the effects of nitrogen fertilization on finger millet, with the objective of minimizing losses from ammonia volatilization, nitrate leaching, and denitrification, while simultaneously improving nitrogen efficiency. The experiment utilized various combinations of neem-coated urea (NCU) applied to the soil and nano urea (NU) applied to the foliage. Randomized block design (RBD) was employed, for this study with seven treatments and replicated three times. The results of the study demonstrated that the treatment combining 50% neem-coated urea (NCU) and 50% nano urea (NU) in addition to phosphorus (P) and potassium (K) (T_5) exhibited exceptional performance compared to the other treatments. This particular treatment displayed significant outcomes, including an increase in plant height of (93.7cm), improved leaf area index (3.95), greater total dry matter production (6443 kg/ha), a higher number of tillers (161.24/m²), increased productive tillers (94.2/m²), enhanced grain yield (4350 kg/ha), higher straw yield (5829 kg/ha), improved gross returns (143313 Rs/ha), a net return of (Rs. 88,247/ha), and a benefit-cost ratio of 2.60.

Keywords: Finger millet, Nano urea, Neem-coated urea, Nitrogen, Yield, Economics

1. INTRODUCTION

Finger millet, scientifically known as (*Eleusine coracana L. Gaertn*) is a prominent millet crop in India. It is a significant small millet crop that ranks third in India in terms of area and production. In India, finger millet is cultivated across an extensive area of 6.93 million hectares, resulting in a production of 8.61 million tonnes during the 2020-21 season. The average productivity of finger millet stands at 1243 kg/ha, emphasizing its significance in contributing to the country's agricultural output. (Anonymous 2020-21) [1]. Finger millet has the third-highest productivity among millets, after sorghum and pearl millet. It is an annual plant of the *Poaceae* family that is commonly cultivated as a millet in the arid regions of Asia and Africa. Finger millet holds a prominent position as one of the primary staple food crops in India. It is cultivated for its grains, which are consumed as food, as well as for fodder purposes. This crop demonstrates remarkable adaptability to impoverished and marginal upland areas where other crops struggle to thrive.

Commented [A1]: It must be synchronized with the body of the paper!

The abstract should contain: background, purpose, method, result and conclusion

It is cultivated in a wide range of soil types and weather conditions, including areas with varying levels of rainfall which is highly regarded as one of the most resilient field crops, particularly in terms of drought resistance. Despite challenging environmental circumstances, finger millet exhibits a remarkable capacity for high production, making it a valuable crop with significant potential (Murthy, 2016) [2]. In general nutrient management plays a vital role in crop production to achieve higher yields. However, the excessive and indiscriminate use of chemical fertilizers by farmers has become a significant concern. This widespread use is not only considered a leading cause of environmental pollution but also leads to the degradation of soil health. It is crucial to address this issue and promote sustainable nutrient management practices that maintain a balance between crop nutrient requirements and the preservation of environmental and soil health. By adopting responsible and judicious approaches to nutrient management, farmers can optimize yields while minimizing the negative impacts on the environment and ensuring the long-term productivity of the soil. (Rekha *et al.*, 2018) [3].

The development of nanotechnology-based fertilizers involves encapsulating or creating plant nutrients in nano-sized forms and delivering them in the form of emulsions with nanoscale particles. These innovative formulations, utilizing nanostructured materials, possess modified physicochemical properties. The utilization of such nanostructured formulations in fertilizers holds great potential as a viable solution to address the ongoing challenges associated with environmental pollution. By employing nanotechnology in fertilizers, it becomes possible to enhance nutrient uptake efficiency and minimize nutrient losses, thereby promoting sustainable and environmentally-friendly agricultural practices. (Baboo, 2021) [4].

Significant nutrient losses, especially for nitrogen (N) fertilizers, occur when chemical fertilizers are directly incorporated into the field. These losses primarily result from leaching and volatilization processes under this practice, crops tend to utilize only a fraction of the applied N fertilizers, typically ranging from 30 to 40%. These observations highlight the inefficiency of traditional fertilizer application methods and the need for improved nutrient management strategies to maximize nutrient utilization by crops and minimize environmental impacts. By adopting more targeted and efficient fertilizer application techniques, farmers can optimize nutrient uptake by crops, reduce losses, and enhance overall agricultural sustainability (Ahmad *et al.*, 2008) [5]. Considering these factors, a study was conducted to evaluate the impact of neem-coated and nano urea on the growth, yield, and economic parameters of finger millet cultivation under tropical conditions. The investigation aimed to assess the effects of these innovative fertilizer formulations on the overall performance and profitability of finger millet production in tropical regions.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted during the *rabi* season of 2022 at Karunya Institute of Technology and Sciences, Coimbatore. The experimental site is situated in the western agro-climatic zone of Tamil Nadu and can be found at approximately 10°56'N latitude and 76°44'E longitude. The site has an elevation of 474 meters above mean sea level. The soil at the site was classified as a clay loam and a pH of 7.0. Furthermore, the soil at the experimental field exhibited an electrical conductivity (EC)

Commented [A2]: This statement is much better if written in the first line of the abstract! Then, the reader can highlight the background of this research.

of 0.16 dS m⁻¹, a nitrogen content of 182 kg/ha, a phosphorus content of 17.2 kg/ha, and a potassium content of 495 kg/ha.

The experimental design followed a randomized block design (RBD) comprising of seven treatments with three replications each. The selected finger millet variety for the experiment was CO13, which is known to have a growth duration of 95-100 days. The recommended fertilizer dosage of N: P₂O₅:K₂O at 60:30:30 kg/ha was applied using urea, single super phosphate, and muriate of potash. The experimental treatments consisted of the following T₁: Control, T₂: P and K only, T₃: 100% Neem coated urea + P and K, T₄: 75% Neem coated urea + 25% Nano urea + P and K, T₅: 50% Neem coated urea + 50% Nano urea + P and K, T₆: 25% Neem coated urea + 75% Nano urea + P and K, and T₇: 100% Nano urea + P and K. Nitrogen and phosphorus levels were adjusted accordingly based on the treatment combinations.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Effect of Nitrogen on plant growth of finger millet

The analysis of the results indicated that the application of nitrogenous fertilizers had a significant impact on the plant height of finger millet at various stages of growth. The higher mean plant height was observed in treatment T₅(93.7 cm), which consisted of a combination of 50% Neem coated urea, 50% Nano urea+ P, and K fertilizers. The lower mean plant height was recorded in the control group T₁(83.2 cm), where no nitrogenous fertilizers were used, Abdullahi *et al.*, (2014) [6] reported that enhanced nitrogen availability and soil integration may have contributed to the increase in plant height by facilitating a continuous, steady release of nutrients that improved crop growth. This could have accelerated the growth of the plant.

The results demonstrated the application of a notable influence on the leaf area index of finger millet at different growth. The treatment with the higher leaf area index mean value was T₅(3.95), which comprised of 50% Neem coated urea + 50% Nano urea + P and K. Conversely, the control group (T₁) exhibited a lower leaf area index of (2.84). These findings suggest the use of nitrogenous fertilizers, particularly in combination with appropriate levels of P and K, can enhance the leaf area index of finger millet during the growth stages. The leaf area index (LAI) is a significant parameter that demonstrates crop development and estimates crop yield. Higher crop yields are an indication of an effective LAI as it balances the growth of each component in crops and regulates the interaction between their source (Hebbal *et al.*, 2018) [7].

The results of the investigation showed that the application of fertilizers had a significant impact on the dry matter production of finger millet during various phases of the crop's growth. Treatment T₅ (50% neem coated urea + 50% + nano urea + phosphorus and potassium) fertilizers, demonstrated the higher average dry matter production (6443 Kg ha⁻¹) throughout all stages. Conversely, the control group (T₁) exhibited a lower average dry matter production. Revathi, (2016) [8] documented that the enhanced dry matter production observed can be attributed to the combined impact of increased plant height, and improved dry matter production. Moreover, the enhancement in leaf area index (LAI) likely

Commented [A3]: How about the data analysis?

F-test followed by Tukey Test, DMRT etc

Commented [A4]: Where is the analysis that there are significant differences?

Commented [A5]: Is T5 significant differences from other treatments? Where is the data analysis to support that statement? Remember, the writer use RBD and then analyze and use those research design!

played a crucial role in augmenting the photosynthetic efficiency of finger millet, thereby facilitating the synthesis of a greater amount of dry matter production.

A significantly higher number of tillers/m² was observed in T₅ (50% Neem coated urea+ 50% Nano urea + P and K) (161.24/m²). These results indicate that the application of specific nutrient combinations, such as 50% Neem coated urea + 50% Nano urea + P and K (T₅) and 75% Neem coated urea + 25% Nano urea + P and K (T₄), can significantly improve the number of tillers/m² in finger millet at the harvesting stage. These findings highlight the importance of balanced nutrient management for maximizing tiller development and potentially improving crop yield. The increase in the number of tillers observed at higher nitrogen (N) dosages may be related to the competition for nutrients which is initiated by an adequate nitrogen supply. Due to the increased competition, the soil's nutrients are more effectively assimilated (Patil *et al.*, 2018) [9].

The yield attributing characters such as the number of productive tillers m⁻² was statistically higher in treatment T₅, with 50% Neem coated urea + 50% Nano urea + P and K, had the highest number of productive tillers with (94.2/m²). Which is statistically on par with T₄ (75% Neem coated urea + 25% Nano urea + P and K). A balanced diet nutrients increased the growth of roots and tillering, which in turn raised the amount of photosynthetically active radiation and enhanced crop photosynthesis. The abundant nitrogen in neem coated urea might be responsible for its better performance over normal urea. This adequate nitrogen supply facilitates the partitioning of photosynthates to the primary culm, a source of nutrients and carbohydrates for the growth of tillers. The usage of neem coated urea, which made nitrogen consistently and continuously available throughout the entire crop season, is responsible for the increased productive tillers (Kumari and Chaudhary, 2018) [10].

3.2. Effect of Nitrogen on Yield and Economics of finger millet

The analysis of the grain yield data revealed that various treatments significantly influenced the grain yield of finger millet. Notably, treatment T₅, which involved a combination of 50% neem coated urea (NCU), 50% nano urea (NU), and phosphorus (P) and potassium (K) fertilizers, exhibited a higher grain yield (4350 Kg/ha¹) which was significantly superior over all other treatments. It serves as a key metric to assess the productivity and efficiency of finger millet production. Samanta *et al.*, (2022) [11] reported that the significantly higher grain production of finger millet was greatly attributed to better nitrogen utilization, which produced increased yield-attributing characteristics.

The higher straw yield (5829 kg/ha) was recorded in treatment T₅ (50% Neem coated urea + 50% Nano urea + P and K), which is significant with T₄ (75% Neem coated urea + 25% Nano urea + P and K) (5798 kg/ha). The finger millet experienced substantial expansion across all stages of crop development, which was characterized by an increased number of leaves. This rapid development in turn enabled a greater amount of photosynthetic activity, causing the crop to synthesize more energy, when the straw yield of finger millet dramatically increased with an increase in nitrogen level (Camara *et al.*, 2003) [12].

Commented [A6]: I cannot agree with all these statements without any evidence!

Analyze the F test first using RBD; if there are significant differences, then follow by Tukey's Test or DMRT or others!

Commented [A7]: Please look at the previous comment! The same item!

The data on the cultivation costs and gross returns for each treatment suggested that the treatments T₅ and T₄ have the higher gross returns (Rs. 1,43,313/ha and Rs. 1,40,141/ha respectively). On the other hand, treatments T₆ and T₇ have comparatively lower gross returns (Rs. 1,38,980/ha and Rs. 1,29,451/ha respectively). These results highlight the economic aspects of different treatments and their impact on the profitability of finger millet cultivation. Further analysis and interpretation of the data can provide valuable insights into the cost-effectiveness and financial viability of various nutrient management strategies in finger millet production. Increased biomass accumulation and efficient nutrient translocation to the area of reproduction, provided possibly by an adequate food supply, and the contributing factors to the development of higher yield, which attributes consequently, the agricultural production experienced better gross returns. Patil *et al.* (2015) [13] and Pallavi *et al.* (2016) [14].

The higher net return is substantially reported in T₅-50% neem coated urea + 50% nano urea + P and K of about 88247 Rs/ha¹, which is followed by T₄ (85040 Rs/ha). Whereas a higher benefit cost ratio was observed with the application of T₅ (2.60) which was followed by T₄ (2.54). The higher benefit-cost ratio could be due to lower cultivation costs and improved grain and straw yield. The fluctuations observed in economic returns across different years can be attributed to the varying performance of respective crops in terms of grain yield when implementing improved practices in frontline demonstrations. Thakur *et al.*, (2017) [15] also reported higher net returns and benefit-cost ratio in finger millet crops, when implementing better practices in primary demonstrations.

4. CONCLUSION

The findings of the present study well demonstrated the positive effects of neem coated urea and nano urea on various growth and yield parameters of finger millet with a combination of T₅ (50% Neem coated urea + 50% Nano urea + P and K) were found to be more productive and economically feasible. On the other hand, treatment T₄ (75% Neem coated urea + 25% Nano urea + P and K) may be suggested for a good yield. This treatment has exhibited several advantages, including enhanced nutrient absorption, robust plant growth, and increased yield.

5. FUTURE SCOPE

A comparative study can investigate innovative approaches to control the release of nutrients from nano urea and neem-coated urea, ensuring a sustained and balanced nutrient supply to finger millet plants throughout the growth stages. This can enhance fertilizer use efficiency and minimize nutrient losses to the environment. Further research can focus on refining the formulations of nano urea and neem coated urea specifically for finger millet.

REFERENCE

Commented [A8]: This result suddenly appears, without explaining the method to calculate/analyze it!

Commented [A9]: The conclusion will not be valid if the data analysis is done wrong!

1. Anonymous, 2020. Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmers Welfare First Advance Estimates of Production of Food grains for 2020-21. https://eands.dacnet.nic.in/Advance_Estimates.htm.
2. Murthy, V.R.K. 2016. Principles and Practices of Agricultural Disaster Management. B.S.Publications, Sultan Bazar, Hyderabad.
3. REKHA, D. L. M., LAKSHMIPATHY, R. AND GOPAL, G. A., 2018, Effect of integrated use of bio-fertilizers, chemical fertilizers, and farmyard manure on soil health parameters of pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum L.*). *J. Soil. Sci. Plant. Health*, 2(2).
4. Baboo, P. (2021). Nano Urea the Philosophy of Future. ResearchGate. Retrieved May 10, 2023, from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353260539>.
5. Ahmad, R., Arshad, M., Khalid, A., & Zahir, Z. A. (2008). Effectiveness of organic-/bio-fertilizer supplemented with chemical fertilizers for improving soil water retention, aggregate stability, growth and nutrient uptake of maize (*Zea mays L.*). *Journal of sustainable agriculture*, 31(4), 57-77.
6. Abdullahi R, Sheriff HH, Buba A. Effect of biofertilizer and organic manure on growth and nutrients content of pearl millet. *ARPN J Agric. Biolog. Sci.* 2014; 9:351- 355.
7. Hebbal N., Ramachandrappa, B. K., Mudalairiyappa, B. P. and Thimmegouda, M. N. 2018. Yield and economics of finger millet with establishment methods under different planting geometry and nutrient source. *Indian Journal of Dryland Agricultural Research and Development*. 33(1): 54-58.
8. Revathi, T. 2016. Agro-climatic indices for prediction of growth and yield of finger millet (*Eleusine Coracana L.*) M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University Guntur, Andhra Pradesh.
9. Patil PP, Shinde AK, Gadhave PM, Chavan AP. Effect of sowing methods, nutrient management and seed priming on seed yield and yield attributes of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana L.*). *Advanced Agricultural Research and Technology Journal* 2018;2(1):12-17.
10. Kumari G, Chaudhary SK. Influence of neem coated urea and micronutrients on performance of Rice under aerobic conditions. *International Journal of Current Microbial Applied Science*. 2018;7(5):2024-2035.
11. Samanta, S., Maitra, S., Shankar, T., Gaikwad, D., Sagar, L., Panda, M., & Samui, S. (2022). Comparative performance of foliar application of urea and nano urea on finger millet (*Eleusine coracana L. Gaertn.*). *Crop Research*, 57(3), 166-170.
12. Camara, K. M., Payne, W. A. and Rasmussen, P. E. (2003). Long-term effects of tillage, nitrogen, and rainfall on winter wheat yields in the Pacific north-west. *Agron. J.* 95: 828-35.
13. Patil, S.V., Bhosale, A.S. and Khambal, P.D. 2015. Effect of various levels of fertilizers on growth and yield of finger millet. *IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science*, 8: 49-52.
14. Pallavi, Ch., Joseph, B., Aariff Khan, M.A. and Hemalatha, S. 2016. Economic evaluation of finger millet under different nutrient management practices. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 5(8): 690-698.

15. Thakur, A. K., Kumar P. and Yadav, S. C., Impact of Front line Demonstration (FLD) on the Yield and Economics of Small Millet on Bastar District of Chhattisgarh, India. *Int. J. Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci.* 6(9): 1489-1497 (2017).

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 1. Effect of Nitrogen on plant growth of finger millet

Treatments	Plant height(cm)	Leaf area index	Dry matter production (kg ha ⁻¹)	No of tillers m ⁻²	productive tillers m ⁻²
T ₁ – Control	83.2	2.84	4574	128.65	69.3
T ₂ - P and K alone	84.5	2.96	4645	135.26	75.7
T ₃ - 100% Neem coated urea + P and K	87.7	3.54	5645	148.26	81.3
T ₄ - 75% Neem coated urea + 25% Nano urea + P and K	89.0	3.75	6231	158.25	92.5
T ₅ - 50% Neem coated urea + 50% Nano urea + P and K	93.7	3.95	6443	161.24	94.2
T ₆ - 25% Neem coated urea + 75% Nano urea + P and K	89.4	3.65	5446	155.20	88.2
T ₇ - 100% Nano urea + P and K	86.1	3.25	4821	142.56	79.6
Mean	87.6	3.42	5401	147.1	83.0
SEd	2.09	0.073	102	3.39	1.52
CD (p=0.05)	4.38	0.153	213	7.08	3.17

Commented [A10]: This is not an RBD analysis! Interpretation of this data will be misleading!

Table 2. Effect of nitrogenous fertilizers yield and economics of finger millet

Commented [A11]: This is not an RBD analysis. Interpretation of this data will be misleading!

Treatments	Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Straw yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Gross return (Rs. ha ⁻¹)	Net return (Rs. ha ⁻¹)	B: C ratio
T ₁ – Control	3958	4967	113020	74870	2.25
T ₂ - P and K alone	3985	5054	126231	71868	2.32
T ₃ - 100% Neem coated urea + P and K	4157	5680	134050	78904	2.43
T ₄ - 75% Neem coated urea + 25% Nano urea + P and K	4325	5798	140147	85040	2.54
T ₅ - 50% Neem coated urea + 50% Nano urea + P and K	4350	5829	143313	88247	2.60
T ₆ - 25% Neem coated urea + 75% Nano urea + P and K	4280	5687	138980	83956	2.52
T ₇ - 100% Nano urea + P and K	4058	5254	129451	74463	2.35
Mean	4159	5467	-	-	-
SEd	67.1	131.1	-	-	-
CD (p=0.05)	140.2	273.8	-	-	-

Fig. 1. Effect of nitrogenous fertilizers on the economics of finger millet

Commented [A12]: How is an analysis done for this subject? I can't find the purpose and the method of this subject!

