Original Research Article

EFFECT OF LIQUID NANO UREA FERTILIZER ON PERIODICAL GROWTH AND YIELD OF SUGARCANE

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was carried out during *rabi* of 2021-22 as plant crop and 2022-23 as ratoon crop, at Navsari, Gujarat. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design including treatment comprising of nitrogen levels for soil application with foliar spray of nano urea and urea in both plant-ratoon system of sugarcane. The results recorded in respect to the periodical plant height and dry matter yield (DMY) from 90 to 180 days after planting (DAP) of plant crop and days after ratooning (DAR) of ratoon crop were significantly higher with the application of 100 % RDN (T_2) which was at par with treatments T_3 and T_4. However, at 210 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop as well as at harvest plant height and DMY were recorded significantly higher with the application of 75% RDN + 2 spray of liquid nano urea at 90 and 180 DAP which was at par with T_2 and T_4. In case of No. of tillers/hill at 180 DAP of plant and DAR of ratoon crop was significantly higher when with 75% RDN + 2 spray of liquid nano urea at 90 and 180 DAP which was at par with T_2 and T_4. In plant crop and ratoon crop of sugarcane, millable cane yield and green top yield were found to be significant highest with the application of 75% RDN + 2 spray of liquid nano urea at 90 and 180 DAP which was at par with T_2 and T_4.Based on the results, it concluded that for achieving higher growth and yield in sugarcane plant-ratoon cultivation should be fertilized with 100 % of recommended P_2O_5 and K_2O + 75 % RDN + two sprays of either liquid nano urea @ 4 ml/L or 2 % urea at 90 and 180

DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop. This application effectively replaces the 25% of recommended dose of nitrogen while matching the performance of the 100% RDN treatment.

Keywords: Growth, IFFCO nano urea, Plant-ratoon sugarcane, Sugarcane, Yield

1 Introduction:

Excessive use of chemical fertilizers in modern agriculture has raised significant concerns due to its detrimental impact on soil health and the environment. Over-application leads to soil degradation, nutrient imbalances and disruption of microbial ecosystems, compromising long-term soil fertility (Ju*et al*., 2006; Lal, 2015). Runoff into water bodies causes algal blooms and oxygen depletion, harming aquatic ecosystems (Rabalais*et al*., 2010; Carpenter and Bennett, 2011). Nitrogenous compounds from fertilizers contribute to air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions (Davidson *et al*., 2000). Sustainable and precision nutrient management practices are essential to address these challenges. Nanotechnology offers a promising solution by improving nutrient delivery efficiency, minimizing wastage and reducing environmental impact. Nano-fertilizers enhance nutrient uptake, reduce soil degradation and balance microbial ecosystems (Thul*et al*., 2013). They also decrease nutrient runoff and atmospheric nitrogen release. Nano nitrogen for example, reduces urea losses and increases nutrient uptake efficiency, leading to higher yields with lower nitrogen deficiency (Yogendra*et al*., 2020). IFFCO's patented nano-urea features particles 20-80 nm in size, enhancing surface area and particle number, with a shelf life of about 2 years (Kumar *et al*., 2021). However, thorough research on nanomaterials' environmental and health implications is crucial for safe use.

IFFCO's liquid nano urea represents a transformative shift in fertilizer technology, leveraging nanoscale properties for enhanced nutrient absorption and efficiency. This formulation offers sustainable agriculture benefits by reducing environmental impact and addressing conventional urea challenges (Kumar and Gopal, 2023). Nano urea's precision application, with over 80% efficiency, is an eco-friendly nitrogen source for crops. Studies show nano urea's nanoscale formulation improves nutrient absorption, plant health and productivity, with controlled release minimizing nutrient losses (El-Ramady*et al.*, 2018). This technology reduces nitrogen runoff and proves economically viable for farmers due to lower application rates and enhanced efficacy. Sugarcane (*Saccharumofficinarum*L.), a crucial global crop, is cultivated primarily for its high sugar content. India, the largest sugar producer, cultivates sugarcane on 5.15 million hectares, producing 431.81 million tonnes (Anon., 2022a). In Gujarat, sugarcane covers 0.22 million hectares, with significant production in districts like Surat and Navsari (Anon., 2022b). Effective fertilizer management especially nitrogen, is vital for sugarcane growth and yield. Nitrogen supports key physiological processes and increases cane weight and sugar content. Foliar application of nano urea enhances nutrient uptake, photosynthesis and yields, offering an efficient, sustainable solution (Upadhyay*et al.*, 2023). Thus, study aims to investigate the effect of liquid nano urea fertilizer on growth and yield of sugarcane.

2 Materials and Methods

Field experiment was carried out for consecutive years during *rabi* of 2021-22 as plant crop and 2022-23 as ratoon crop at College Farm, N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, Gujarat.Geographically, the Navsari Agricultural University campus is positioned at 20˚ 57’ North latitude and 72˚ 54’ East longitude. The climate of this region is typically tropical monsoon type characterized by three well-defined seasons *viz.*, warm and humid monsoon with heavy rainfall, moderately cold winter and fairly hot and humid summer. The climate of Navsari remains mild throughout the year owing to its location near the sea.

Table 1: Experimental soil properties:	
Texture	Clayey
EC	0.46 dS/m, normal
pH	7.78, slightly alkaline
Available N	228.5 kg/ha, low
Available P_2O_5	37.62 kg/ha, medium
Available K_2O	350.5 kg/ha, high
Organic carbon	0.37 %, low

The experiment was laid out in randomized block design including treatment comprising from nitrogen levels for soil application with foliar spray of nano urea or urea in sugarcane plant-ratoon system.

Table 2: Details of treatments

T_1	**:**	Absolute control
T_2	**:**	100 % RDN
T_3	**:**	75% RDN + 2 spray of liquid nano urea (at 90 and 180 DAP)
T_4	**:**	75% RDN + 2 spray of 2 % urea (at 90 and 180DAP)
T_5	**:**	50% RDN + 4 spray of liquid nano urea (at 90, 120, 150 and 180 DAP)
T_6	**:**	50% RDN + 4 spray of 2 % Urea (at 90, 120, 150 and 180 DAP)
T_7	**:**	25 % RDN + 6 spray of liquid nano urea (at 60, 90, 120, 150, 165 and 180 DAP)
T_8	**:**	25 % RDN + 6 spray of 2 % urea (at 60, 90, 120,150, 165 and 180 DAP)

Amount of N was added through each treatments:

Treatments		**Soil application**		**Foliar spray**
		N in **plant crop** (2021-22)	N in **ratoon crop** (2022-23)	Nano urea (L/ha) or 2% urea (kg/ha)
T_1	**:**	0	0.00	0.0
T_2	**:**	250.00	300.00	0.0
T_3	**:**	187.50	225.00	2.8 L/ha
T_4	**:**	187.50	225.00	14 kg/ha
T_5	**:**	125.00	150.00	6.0 L/ha
T_6	**:**	125.00	150.00	30 kg/ha
T_7	**:**	62.50	75.00	8.8 L/ha
T_8	**:**	62.50	75.00	44 kg/ha

Note:
200 L/ha water required for foliar spray at 60 and 90 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop,
300 L/ha water required for foliar spray at 120 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop,
500 L/ha water required for foliar spray at 150, 165, 180 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop,

Each spray of IFFCO nano urea @ 4 ml/L of water. Combinations of these all treatments were applied in plant crop as well as at same interval in ratoon crop to study and their effect on growth behavior and yield were assessed and analyzed during both plant crop and ratoon crop.The recommended doses of N-P_2O_5-K_2O at 250-125-125 kg/ha for plant crop and 300-62.5-125 kg/ha for ratoon crop were computed based on the treatment specifications for each plot area. Phosphorus was applied through single superphosphate and potash was supplied *via*muriate of potash, were manually applied as basal dressing in furrows. Nitrogen was administered in the form of urea, divided into four splits in plant crop: 15% N at planting, 30% N at 60 days after planting, 20% N at 90 days after planting, and 35% N before the final earthing-up at 150 days after planting. For the ratoon crop three splits of nitrogen application (25% as basal, 50% at 90 DAR and 25 % at 150 days after ratooning (DAR) of ratoon, according to the treatment allocations for each plot area. During the crop period, agronomic practices are applied in a timely manner and in accordance with requirements. A random sample technique was applied throughout the experiment to record observations. Five plants per plot were randomly selected for height measurement in both the plant and ratoon crop seasons. Height, measured in centimeters from ground level to the topmost point, was recorded at 60, 90, 120, 150, 180, and 210 days after planting (DAP) and at harvest for the plant crop as well as for the ratoon crop after the first ratooning. The average height per plant was then calculated. The number of tillers was counted for five plants from the net plot at 90 and 180 DAP in plant crop and during ratoon crop it was counted at 90 and 180 DAR. The average was calculated to report as the number of tillers per hill from the net plot. The whole plant from ring area samples were collected by taking three plant crops from each treatment periodically at 60, 90, 120,150, 180 and 210 DAP and at harvest after planting to know the periodical dry matter yield of plant crop. In ratoon crop cultivation, dry matter yield was measured at the same intervals days after ratooning (DAR). The whole plant was cut in to small pieces and representative samples were drawn and oven dried at 65±5 ^{o}C till constant weight to record oven dry weight and converted in to kg/ha on the area basis. The fresh weight of green top for sugarcane was recorded from both plant and ratoon crops and converted to tonnes per hectare (t/ha). Each net plot was harvested separately, with the canes de-trashed and millable canes prepared by cutting the top portion. The weight of these millable canes was recorded in kilograms at harvest for both plant and ratoon crops, then converted to t/ha using a conversion factor.Pooled analysis in sugarcane plant-ratoon crop experiments enhances reliability and generalizability, determining consistent treatment effects across years. This robust approach ensures effective decision-making for crop management and improvement strategies.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Effect on Growth Parameters

According to data presented in Table 3a and 3b,significantly higher plant height was recorded at 90, 120, 150 and 180 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop with the application of 100% RDN (T_2) which was at par with treatments T_3 and T_4, additionally T_5 at 120, 150 and 180 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop and T_6 at 120 and 150 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop at par with treatment T_2. However, at 60 days plant height in each plant crop and ratoon crop season was found to be non-significant. Furthermore, sugarcane plant height at 210 DAP and at harvest of plant crop as well as 210 DAR and at harvest of ratoon crop was recorded significantly higher with the application of 75% RDN + 2 spray of liquid nano urea at 90 and 180 DAP (T_3) which was at par with treatments T_2 and T_4.

In case of No. of tillers/hill at 90 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop (Table 4) was found non-significant however, at 180 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop was observed significantly higher with the treatment T_3 (7.40 and 9.07, respectively) which was at par with T_2 and T_4.

The results indicate that reducing the recommended nitrogen dose by 25% and applying nano urea and 2% urea at 90 and 180 DAP (T_3) can enhance sugarcane growth. This is because foliar application of nano urea at critical stages fulfills the fertilizer requirement. This finding aligns with studies by Bhargavi and Sundari (2023), Chinnappa *et al*. (2023), Singh *et al*. (2023), Srivastava *et al*. (2023), Upadhyay*et al*. (2023) and Gajbhiye *et al*. (2024). Nano fertilizers improve nutrient availability, solubility and dispersion, boosting metabolic processes and stimulating meristematic activities, leading to increased apical growth and expanded photosynthetic areas. Foliar spraying of nano nitrogen enhances growth attributes by facilitating nutrient availability through easy and direct penetration of nano N through leaf stomata (Midde*et al*., 2022; Navya*et al*., 2022). According to Sharma *et al*. (2022) and Upadhyay*et al*. (2023), nano fertilizers release nutrients over an extended period, ensuring sustained nutrient supply, positively impacting plant growth. Foliar application of nano nitrogen increases nitrogen uptake through leaves and roots, promoting the mobilization of synthesized carbohydrates into amino acids and proteins, stimulating rapid cell division and elongation (Anushka*et al*., 2023; Dhayalan*et al*., 2023). The number of tillers in sugarcane can be increased by foliar spraying of nano urea due to improved specific surface area and nutrient uptake (Midde*et al*., 2022; Sing *et al*., 2023). Nano fertilizers enhance chloroplast activity, rubisco, antioxidant enzyme system and nitrate reductase activity, promoting vigorous vegetative growth and tiller proliferation (Rawate*et al*., 2022; Bhargavi and Sundari, 2023; Choudhary*et al*., 2022). Additionally, nano urea formulations contain additives that improve nutrient solubility and dispersion, ensuring a sustained nitrogen supply and supporting continuous tiller development throughout the sugarcane growth cycle.

3.2 Effect on Yield attributes and Yield

Data presented in Table 5a and 5b, dry matter yield at 60 DAP of plant crop observed as non-significant while in ratoon crop season at 60 DAR dry matter yield found to be significantly higher with treatment T_2 which was at par with T_3, T_4, T_5 and T_6. However, dry matter yield at 90, 120, 150 and 180 DAP of plant crop and DAR of ratoon crop was found to be significant with treatment T_2 it was remained at par with T_3 and T_4. Whereas dry matter yield at 210 DAP and harvest of plant crop as well as 210 DAR and harvest of ratoon cane that was recorded significant higher with the application of 75% RDN + 2 spray of liquid nano urea at 90 and 180 DAP (T_3) which was at par with treatments T_2 and T_4.

A summary of the data presented in Table 6showed that different treatments had a significant effect on millable cane yield and green top yield in plant crop and ratoon crop. Data clearly showed that significantly higher millable cane yield (130.45 and 108.88 t/ha during the years 2021-22 and 2022-23, respectively) of sugarcane was recorded in treatment T_3 (75% RDN + 2 spray of liquid nano urea at 90 and 180 DAP. However treatment T_3 was remained statistically at par with treatments T_2 and T_4 in terms of millable cane yield. Same trends were observed in plant-ratoon cycle. Whereas significantly lower millable can yield (77.99 and 55.33 t/ha during the years 2021-22 and 2022-23, respectively) was found with treatment T_1 (absolute control). However, as compare to absolute control,millable cane yield significantly increased 67.25%, 62.62% and 52.53% during plant crop season, 96.78%, 93.19% and 78.89% during ratoon crop season with the treatments T_3, T_2 and T_4, respectively. Furthermore, treatments T_5, T_6, T_7 and T_8 increased the millable cane yield as compared to absolute control but it was not statistically significant. The response of different treatments in millablecane yield (t/ha) of sugarcane was in order $T_3 > T_2 > T_4 > T_5 > T_6 > T_7 > T_8 > T_1$.

The data presented in Table 6 clearly demonstrates that various treatments had a significant impact on green top yield in both plant crop and ratoon crop. The findings for green top yield closely mirrored those of millable cane yield. Significantly maximum green top yield was obtained under treatment T_3 and it was statistically at par with treatments T_2 and T_4 during both year 2021-22 (plant crop) and 2022-23 (ratoon crop). While the lowest green top yield in treatment T_1 (absolute control). However, treatments T_5, T_6, T_7 and T_8 did not significant increased the green top yield as compared to absolute control.

The results indicate that combining conventional and nano fertilizers significantly enhances nutrient absorption and utilization in sugarcane. This finding is consistent with several studies, including Navya*et al*. (2022), Rawate*et al*. (2022), Sharma *et al*. (2022), Chinnappa *et al*. (2023) and Dhayalan*et al*. (2023). Bhargavi and Sundari (2023) emphasized that higher crop yields depend on total dry matter production and efficient translocation of photosynthates. The combined application boosts chlorophyll production and leaf greening, enhancing photosynthesis and overall plant growth.Singh *et al*. (2023) noted that nano fertilizers increase plant height, tillers per row meter and leaf area index, contributing to dry matter accumulation. The enhanced leaf area index improves nutrient utilization and solar radiation absorption, crucial for dry matter production. The observed yield increase in both plant and ratoon crops is attributed to liquid nano urea optimizing nutrient availability throughout sugarcane's growth stages, facilitating better nutrient absorption and nitrogen utilization.Foliar application of nano urea enhances photosynthesis and carbohydrate metabolism, leading to increased photosynthate translocation and total dry matter production. This includes higher chlorophyll production and prolonged leaf greening, resulting in increased dry matter yield. Nano urea's effects on chloroplast activity, rubisco and antioxidant enzyme systems also promote growth and development, notably increasing tiller numbers, which is crucial for yield.Nano urea's controlled-release properties ensure sustained nitrogen supply, supporting continuous tiller development and overall growth. The enhanced nutrient uptake, facilitated by nano urea's penetration through leaf stomata, promotes carbohydrate mobilization into amino acids and proteins, stimulating cell division and elongation. This results in increased plant height, tillers, cane weight, millable canes and cane girth.Improved nutrient use efficiency, as measured by agronomic nutrient efficiency, partial factor productivity and nitrogen apparent recovery efficiency, highlights the superior effectiveness of combined nano and conventional urea applications. This approach consistently outperformed the sole application of 100% recommended nitrogen (RDN), as noted by Alimohammadi*et al*. (2020) and Kumar *et al*. (2023).The combined application of conventional and nano urea fertilizers, particularly treatment T_3, significantly increases sugarcane yield by optimizing nutrient availability, enhancing photosynthesis and promoting growth. These outcomes align with studies in maize, rice, mustard and wheat, such as those by Salama and Badry (2020), Ninama*et al*. (2023), Sahu*et al*. (2022), Bhargavi and Sundari (2023), Dhyalan*et al*. (2023), Gajbhiye *et al*. (2024), Navya*et al*. (2022), Pandav*et al*. (2022) and Rawate*et al*. (2022).

4 CONCLUSION

Based on the results of two years of experimentation, it concluded that for achieving higher growth and yield in sugarcane plant-ratoon cultivation should be fertilized with 100 % of recommended P_2O_5 and K_2O + 75 % RDN combined with two sprays of either liquid nano urea @4 ml/L or 2 % urea at 90 and 180 days after planting (DAP) of plant crop as well as 90 and 180 days after ratooning (DAR) of ratoon crop. This application effectively replaces the 25% of recommended dose of nitrogen while matching the performance of the 100% RDN treatment.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etchave been used during writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

1.

2.

3.

REFERENCES

Alimohammadi, M.; Panahpour, E. and Naseri, A. (2020). Assessing the effects of urea and nano-nitrogen chelate fertilizers on sugarcane yield and dynamic of nitrate in soil. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.*,**66** (2) : 352-359.

Anonymous (2022a). Agricultural Statistics at a Glance 2022. Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Department of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare Economics and Statistics Division Government of India. **p.62**

Anonymous (2022b). Directorate of Agriculture, District-wise area, production and yield of important food and non-food crops in Gujarat state. **p.34**

Anushka, A.S.; Kumar, S.G.; Sritharan, N.; Radhamani, S. and Maragatham, S. (2023). Studies on the effect of nano urea on growth, yield and nutrient use efficiency in transplanted rice. *Int. J. Environ. Clim. Change.*, **13** (10) : 1547-1554.

Bhargavi, G. and Sundari, A. (2023). Effect of nano urea on the growth and yield of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) under SRI in the Cauvery delta zone of Tamil Nadu. *Crop Research*, **58** (2) : 12-17.

Carpenter, S.R. and Bennett, E.M. (2011). Reconsideration of the planetary boundary for phosphorus. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **6** : 014009 (12pp).

Chinnappa, S.A.; Krishnamurthy, D.; Ajaykumar, M.Y.; Ramesha, Y.M. and Ravi, S. (2023). Response of nano fertilizers on growth, yield and economics of *kharif*sorghum. *Pharma innov.*,**12** (9) : 761-765.

Choudhary, K.J.; Jain, D.; Tomar, M.; Patidar, R. and Choudhary, R. (2022). Effect of nano urea vs conventional urea on the nutrient content, uptake and economics of black wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) along with biofertilizers. *BFAIJ*, **14** (2a) : 499-504.

Davidson, E.A.; Keller, M.; Erickson, H.E.; Verchot, L.V. and Veldkamp, E. (2000). Testing a conceptual model of soil emissions of nitrous and nitric oxides. *BioScience*, **50** (8): 667-680.

Dhayalan, S.A.; Davamani, V.; Maheswari, M.; Maragatham, S. and Rahale, S.C. (2023). Influence of nano urea on growth and microbial population in paddy ecosystem. *Int. J. Environ. Clim. Change.*, **13** (10) : 1239-1247.

El-Ramady, H.; Abdalla, N.; Alshaal, T.; El-Henawy, A.; Elmahrouk, M.; Bayoumi, Y.; Shalaby, T.; Amer, M.; Shehata, S.; Fari, M.; Eva, D.; Attila, S.; Prokisch, J.; Elizabeth, A.H.P.; Pilon, M.; Selmar, D.; Haneklaus, S. and Schnug, E. (2018). Plant Nano-nutrition: Perspectives and challenges (Springer International Publishing AG 2018). "Nanotechnology, Food Security and Water Treatment, Environmental Chemistry for a Sustainable World", pp. 129-161.

Gajbhiye, M.; Agrawal, K.K.; Jha, A.K. and Kumar, N. (2024). Combined application of inorganic fertilizer and organic manure with nano urea on growth and yield of scented rice. *Int. j. plant soil sci.*, **36** (5) : 293-300.

Ju, X.; Kou, C.; Zhang, F. and Christie, P. (2006). Nitrogen balance and groundwater nitrate contamination: Comparison among three intensive cropping systems on the North China Plain. *Environ. Pollut.*,**143** (1): 117-125.

Kumar, G.N. and Gopal, D. (2023). IFFCO nano urea: Transforming agriculture for a more sustainable future. *New Era Agriculture Magazine*, **2** (2): 49-51.

Kumar, N.; Rana, L. and Singh, A.K. (2023). Assessing the effects of liquid nano urea on growth, yield and quality of sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp. hybrid complex). In: *Proc. XXII Biennial National Symposium of Indian Society of Agronomy, 22–24 November, 2023* at ICAR-CCARI, Ela, Goa.

Kumar, Y.; Tiwari, K.N.; Singh, T. and Raliya, R. (2021). Nanofertilizers and their role in sustainable agriculture. *Ann. plant soil res.*, **23** (3) : 238–255.

Lal, R. (2015). Restoring soil quality to mitigate soil degradation. *Sustainability*, **7** : 5875-5895.

Midde, S.K.; Perumal, M.S.; Murugan, G.; Sudhagar, R.; Mattepally, V.S. and Bada, M.R. (2022). Evaluation of nano urea on growth and yield attributes of rice (*OryzaSativa* L.). *Chem. sci. rev. lett.*,**11** (42) : 211-214.

Navya, K.; Sai Kumar, R.; Krishna, Chaitanya, A. and Sampath, O. (2022). Effect of nano nitrogen in conjunction with urea on growth and yield of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) in Northemn Telangana Zone. *BFAIJ*, **14** (3) : 95-99.

Ninama, J.; Debbarma, V.; Bhakher, R. and Meena, R.K. (2023). Response of Zinc and Nano Urea on Growth and Yield of Maize (*Zea mays* L.). *BFAIJ*, **13** (9) : 1046-1052.

Pandav, D.M.; Talathi, M.S.; Bodake, P.S.; Chavan, V.G.; More, S.S.; Pethe, U.B.; Rajemahadik, V.A.; Ghodake, S.S. and Mote, G.K. (2022). Response of nitrogen level and nano urea on mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under Konkan condition. *Pharma innov.*,**11** (12) : 2055-2061.

Rabalais, N.N.; Díaz, R.J.; Levin, L.A.; Turner, R.E.; Gilbert, D. and Zhang, J. (2010). Dynamics and distribution of natural and human-caused hypoxia. *Biogeosciences*, **7** : 585-619.

Rawate, D.; Patel, J.R.; Agrawal, A.P.; Agrawal, H.P.; Pandey, D.; Patel, C.R.; Verma, P.; Chandravanshi, M.; Hetran and Kumar A. (2022). Effect of nano urea on productivity of wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) under irrigated condition. *Pharma innov.*, **11** (9) : 1279-1282.

Sahu, T.K.; Kumar, M.; Kumar, N.; Chandrakar, T. and Singh, D.P. (2022). Effect of nano urea application on growth and productivity of rice (*Oryzasativa* L.) under midland situation of Bastar region. *Pharma innov.*,**11** (6) : 185-187.

Salama, H.S.A. and Badry, H.H. (2020). Effect of partial substitution of bulk urea by nano particle urea fertilizer on productivity and nutritive value of teosinate varieties. *Agron. Rese.*,**18**(4) : 2568-2580.

Sharma, S.K.; Sharma, P.K.; Mandeewal, R.L.; Sharma, V.; Chaudhary, R.; Pandey, R. and Gupta, S. (2022). Effect of foliar application of nano urea under different nitrogen levels on growth and nutrient content of pearl millet (*Pennisetumglaucum* L.). *Int. j. plant soil sci.*, **34** (20) : 149-155.

Singh, Y. K.; Ram, N.; Tiwari, V.K.; Singh, B.; Sharma, U.; Supriya, and Katiyar, D. (2023). Performance of wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) influenced by the application of nanofertilizers. *Int. j. plant soil sci.,* **35** (13): 262-270.

Srivastava, A.; Singh, R.; Choudhary, D.; Pradhan, A.; Roy, S.; Pandey, S. and Anand, S. (2023). Effect of nitrogen rates and foliar spray of urea application and nano urea on yield and economics of *rabi* maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Int. J. Environ. Clim. Change.*, **13** (10) : 555-561.

Thul, S.T.; Sarangi, B.K. and Pandey, R.A. (2013). Nanotechnology in agroecosystem: Implications on plant productivity and its soil environment. *Expert opinion environ. biol.*,**2** (1): 1-7.

Upadhyay, P.K.; Dey, A.; Singh, V.K.; Dwivedi, B.S.; Singh, T.; Rajanna, G.A.; Babu, S.; Rathore, S.S.; Singh, R.K.; Shekhawat, K.; Rangot, M.; Kumar, P.; Yadav, D.; Singh, D.P.; Dasgupta, D. and Shukla, G. (2023). Conjoint application of nano-urea with conventional fertilizers: An energy efficient and environmentally robust approach for sustainable crop production. *PLoS One*, **18** (7): 1-21.

Yogendra, K.; Tiwari, K.N.; Singh, T.; Sain, N.K.; Laxmi, S.; Verma, R.; Sharma, G. C. and Raliya, R. (2020). Nanofertilizers of enhancing nutrient use efficiency, crop productivity and economic returns in winter season crops of Rajasthan. *Ann. Plant Soil Res.*, **22** (4) : 324-335.

Table 3a: Periodical plant height (cm) as influenced by different treatments in plant (2021-22) and ratoon (2022-23) sugarcane as well as in pooled data

Treatments		Plant height (cm)											
		60			90			120			150		
		DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon	Pooled	DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon	Pooled	DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon	Pooled	DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon	Pooled
T_1		69.40	63.22	66.31	76.01	66.13	71.07	97.76	95.96	96.86	130.07	121.59	125.83
T_2		76.35	72.04	74.20	99.97	93.71	96.84	132.48	128.25	130.36	170.67	161.02	165.85
T_3		75.08	70.11	72.60	95.51	88.96	92.24	129.28	125.46	127.37	160.96	154.38	157.67
T_4		73.19	68.86	71.02	93.68	88.22	90.95	125.75	124.96	125.35	154.52	152.71	153.61
T_5		73.08	68.01	70.55	86.14	78.25	82.19	119.63	112.79	116.21	151.67	145.23	148.45
T_6		71.60	67.74	69.67	86.87	78.01	82.44	117.36	112.68	115.02	150.03	143.35	146.69
T_7		71.59	66.19	68.89	84.47	75.08	79.78	112.33	111.50	111.91	143.04	136.71	139.88
T_8		71.42	65.33	68.38	83.12	72.36	77.74	111.96	111.16	111.56	142.55	136.23	139.39
SEm±		3.27	3.16	2.28	3.86	3.97	2.77	6.40	5.28	4.15	7.14	6.10	4.70
CD(P=0.05)		NS	NS	NS	11.69	12.03	8.01	19.43	16.02	12.03	21.66	18.51	13.61
CV %		7.80	8.09	7.94	7.57	8.58	8.05	9.38	7.93	8.70	8.22	7.35	7.82
Y	SEm±	-	-	1.14	-	-	1.38	-	-	2.08	-	-	2.35
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	3.30	-	-	4.01	-	-	NS	-	-	NS
YXT	SEm±	-	-	3.22	-	-	3.91	-	-	5.87	-	-	6.64
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	NS	-	-	NS	-	-	NS

Table 3b: Periodical plant height (cm) as influenced by different treatments in plant (2021-22) and ratoon (2022-23) sugarcane as well as in pooled data

Treatments		Plant height (cm)								
		180		Pooled	210		Pooled	At harvest		
		DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon		DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon		Plant	Ratoon	Pooled
T_1		149.67	146.63	148.15	203.60	185.67	194.64	295.50	284.95	290.23
T_2		207.29	191.57	199.43	263.25	241.07	252.16	372.61	354.76	363.69
T_3		198.67	188.10	193.39	265.65	245.10	255.37	380.77	360.56	370.67
T_4		196.88	184.00	190.44	258.84	239.87	249.35	364.80	350.14	357.47
T_5		178.35	170.53	174.44	230.86	211.67	221.26	328.79	318.67	323.73
T_6		174.29	167.60	170.94	229.20	210.27	219.73	319.53	317.33	318.43
T_7		171.19	165.30	168.25	224.54	206.57	215.55	321.38	311.91	316.65
T_8		168.56	163.37	165.96	220.36	202.40	211.38	312.10	307.13	309.61
SEm±		9.63	7.29	6.04	11.28	10.56	7.73	16.10	13.30	10.44
CD(P=0.05)		29.21	22.11	17.49	34.22	32.02	22.38	48.83	40.34	30.25
CV %		9.23	7.33	8.39	8.24	8.40	8.32	8.28	7.07	7.72
Y	SEm±	-	-	3.02	-	-	3.86	-	-	5.22
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	11.19	-	-	NS
YXT	SEm±	-	-	8.54	-	-	10.93	-	-	14.77
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	NS	-	-	NS

Table 4: Periodical number of tillers/hill as influenced by different treatments in plant (2021-22) and ratoon (2022-23) sugarcaneas well as in pooled data

Treatments		Number of tillers/hill					
		90		Pooled	180		Pooled
		DAP	DAR		DAP	DAR	
T_1		2.80	4.27	3.53	4.87	5.00	4.93
T_2		3.27	5.67	4.47	6.93	7.73	7.33
T_3		3.20	5.53	4.37	7.00	7.87	7.43
T_4		3.13	5.47	4.30	6.80	7.40	7.10
T_5		3.07	5.33	4.20	6.00	6.40	6.20
T_6		3.00	5.27	4.13	5.93	6.27	6.10
T_7		2.97	5.13	4.05	5.93	6.13	6.03
T_8		2.93	5.07	4.00	5.73	5.73	5.73
	SEm±	0.19	0.29	0.17	0.33	0.46	0.28
	CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	0.50	0.99	1.39	0.81
	CV%	10.70	9.54	10.19	9.16	12.07	10.81
Y	SEm±	-	-	0.09	-	-	0.14
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	0.25	-	-	0.41
YXT	SEm±	-	-	0.24	-	-	0.40
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	NS

Table 5a: Periodical dry matter yield (kg/ha) as influenced by different treatments in plant (2021-22) and ratoon (2022-23) sugarcane as well as in pooled data

Treatments		Dry matter yield (kg/ha)											
		60		Pooled	90		Pooled	120		Pooled	150		Pooled
		DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon		DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon		DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon		DAP Plant	DAR Ratoon	
T_1		292	266	279	597	616	607	1143	1145	1144	2796	2635	2716
T_2		312	332	322	818	872	845	1665	1700	1683	4157	3973	4065
T_3		306	325	316	771	817	794	1623	1681	1652	4021	3910	3965
T_4		304	320	312	767	813	790	1604	1643	1623	3864	3873	3868
T_5		302	302	302	706	757	732	1449	1469	1459	3645	3420	3532
T_6		302	298	300	708	756	732	1453	1455	1454	3639	3302	3471
T_7		295	284	290	678	745	711	1419	1429	1424	3622	3218	3420
T_8		293	279	286	667	738	703	1400	1408	1404	3614	3229	3422
SEm±		11.8	14.2	9.2	34.3	33.6	24.0	68.3	73.9	50.3	156	169	115
CD(P=0.05)		NS	43	26	104	102	69	207	224	146	473	514	334
CV %		6.8	8.2	7.5	8.3	7.6	8.0	8.0	8.6	8.33	7.4	8.5	7.93
Y	SEm±	-	-	4.61	-	-	12.0	-	-	25.2	-	-	57.6
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	34.7	-	-	NS	-	-	167
YXT	SEm±	-	-	13.0	-	-	33.9	-	-	71.2	-	-	163
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	NS	-	-	NS	-	-	NS

Table 5b: Periodical dry matter yield (kg/ha) as influenced by different treatments in plant (2021-22) and ratoon (2022-23) sugarcane as well as in pooled data

Treatments		Dry matter yield (kg/ha)											
		180		Pooled	210		Pooled	At harvest cane			At harvest trash		
		DAP	DAR		DAP	DAR							
		Plant	Ratoon		Plant	Ratoon		Plant	Ratoon	Pooled	Plant	Ratoon	Pooled
T_1		6918	6584	6751	10407	9726	10067	18495	14983	16739	5064	4474	4769
T_2		10215	9927	10071	15405	14865	15135	29904	28121	29012	7989	7454	7722
T_3		9905	9813	9859	15826	15200	15513	30525	28661	29593	8115	7614	7865
T_4		9509	9644	9576	15031	14771	14901	28673	27609	28141	7704	7046	7375
T_5		9070	8697	8883	13576	13017	13296	26400	25039	25720	7016	6618	6817
T_6		9005	8568	8786	13528	12935	13232	24805	23660	24232	6585	6200	6392
T_7		8772	8469	8620	13475	12699	13087	23069	21364	22216	6104	5588	5846
T_8		8730	8385	8558	13274	12485	12879	21987	20315	21151	5841	5428	5634
SEm±		357	390	264	736	711	512	1220	1123	829	340	289	223
CD(P=0.05)		1083	1182	766	2233	2157	1483	3700	3405	2401	1030	876	646
CV %		6.9	7.7	7.3	9.2	9.3	9.3	8.3	8.2	8.3	8.7	7.9	8.3
Y	SEm±	-	-	132	-	-	256	-	-	414	-	-	111
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	NS	-	-	1201	-	-	323
YXT	SEm±	-	-	374	-	-	724	-	-	1172	-	-	315
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	NS	-	-	NS	-	-	NS

Table 6: Yield as influenced by different treatments in plant (2021-22) and ratoon (2022-23) sugarcane as well as in pooled data

Treatments		Millable cane yield (t/ha)				Green top yield (t/ha)			
		Plant	Ratoon	Pooled	Plant-Ratoon cycle	Plant	Ratoon	Pooled	Plant-Ratoon cycle
T_1		77.99	55.33	66.66	133.32	13.72	11.79	12.76	25.51
T_2		126.83	106.89	116.86	233.73	23.61	21.46	22.54	45.07
T_3		130.45	108.88	119.66	239.33	23.93	21.71	22.82	45.64
T_4		118.96	98.98	108.97	217.94	21.17	19.99	20.58	41.17
T_5		104.86	86.58	95.72	191.44	20.28	18.87	19.58	39.15
T_6		100.97	83.29	92.13	184.25	19.86	18.60	19.23	38.46
T_7		97.59	79.28	88.43	176.87	18.43	16.32	17.38	34.75
T_8		92.59	75.19	83.89	167.78	17.64	15.86	16.75	33.50
SEm±		6.07	6.47	4.43	11.34	1.16	0.88	0.73	2.05
CD (P=0.05)		18.40	19.61	12.84	34.41	3.53	2.68	2.12	6.21
CV %		9.89	12.90	11.25	10.18	10.17	8.48	9.45	9.36
Y	SEm±	-	-	2.22	-	-	-	0.37	-
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	6.42	-	-	-	1.06	-
Y X T	SEm±	-	-	6.27	-	-	-	1.03	-
	CD (P=0.05)	-	-	NS	-	-	-	NS	-