

## Effect of Nano DAP on growth and yield performance of *Triticum aestivum* (L.) east nimar region, Khandwa, Madhya Pradesh, India~~MP~~.

### ABSTRACT

The utilization of nanotechnology in the form of nano-fertilizer offers a sophisticated, effective, and environmentally-conscious solution to traditional synthetic fertilizers. With the ability to slowly and consistently release nutrients, these nano-fertilizers not only promote plant growth but also protect the valuable diversity of beneficial microorganisms in the soil. An elegant and persuasive field experiment was carried out during the Rabi season of 2023-24 at the School of Agriculture, Research farm of DR. C.V. Raman University in Khandwa, Madhya Pradesh. The ~~objective focus~~ of the study was on evaluating the impact of Nano DAP on the growth and productivity of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.), specifically on the HI-1634 (Pusha Ahilya) variety, through foliar application. The experiment ~~laid out in~~ followed a randomized block design (RBD) with ~~seven unique treatments~~ three, ~~each replication~~ sed thrice. ~~The Various growth parameters, yield, and Benefit cost ratio content were meticulously recorded and analyzed~~. The findings revealed that treatment-T1 resulted in the highest number of tillers and yield, closely followed by T6, which exhibited significantly higher performance with the application of 100% NPK. The foliar sprays of nano-DAP in T1 treatment showed promising outcomes in terms of tillers, grains per ear head, spiklet per ear head, ear head length, and yield per hectare. The cost of cultivation in T1 treatment was found to be relatively higher but comparable to T6 treatment. It is evident that utilizing Nano DAP in place of up to half of traditional DAP, as well as treating seeds with Nano DAP, leads to superior root growth and overall crop development.

**Keywords:** Wheat, foliar application, nano-DAP, yield

It is good if rewrite your abstract in this way

The study was to evaluate the impact of Nano DAP on the growth and productivity of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.), specifically on the HI-1634 (Pusha Ahilya) variety, through foliar application. The experiment laid out in randomized block design (RBD) with three replications. The field experiment was carried out during the Rabi season of 2023/24 at the School of Agriculture, Research farm of DR. C.V. Raman University in Khandwa, Madhya Pradesh. There were seven treatments consisting of different doses of T1-100% NPK, T2-75% N and P and 100% K, T3- 50% N and P and 100% K, T4- T2 + ST with Nano DAP @ 5 ml/kg seed + FS

**Comment [u1]:** But I didn't see under results and discussion

**Formatted:** Font color: Red

**Formatted:** Font color: Red

**Comment [u2]:** Keywords should be written alphabetically

with Nano DAP @ 2 ml/liter of water, T5-T3 + ST with Nano DAP @ 5 ml/kg seed + FS with Nano DAP @ 4 ml/liter of water, T6- T2 + ST with Nano DAP @ 5 ml/kg seed + FS with Nano DAP @ 4 ml/liter of water at and T7- Control. The findings revealed that treatment T1 resulted in the highest number of tillers and yield, followed by T6, which significantly higher performance with the application of 100% NPK. The foliar sprays of nano-DAP in T1 treatment showed promising outcomes in terms of tillers, grains per ear head, spiklet per ear head, ear head length, and yield per hectare. It is evident that utilizing Nano DAP in place of half of traditional DAP, as well as treating seeds with Nano DAP, leads to superior root growth and overall crop development.

Formatted: Justified

## Introduction

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is a cereal grain that originated in the Levant region but is now grown all over the world (Feldman *et al.*, 2007). Wheat is a grain crop that provides a significant amount of carbohydrate (Shewry and Hey, 2015). It is the most common source of vegetable protein in human meals, with a protein level of around 13%, which is reasonably high when compared to other main cereals but low in protein quality for delivering important amino acids. Wheat is grown on 223.40 million hectares, yielding 778.6 million metric tonnes globally. It is cultivated on 31.62 million hectares in India, with a total yield of 3420 kg per hectare and a total production of 109.2 million metric tonnes (USDA, 2021). Madhya Pradesh produces wheat on 10.02 million hectares, yielding 16.52 million metric tonnes with a productivity of 3298 kg per hectare (Department of Agriculture, M.P., 2021).

Comment [u3]: Citation

The Indian population was 683 million in 1981, but it is expected to increase to 1475 million by 2030. To feed the predicted 1.48 billion people by 2030, India would need to produce 350 million tonnes of food grains. This growing trend indicates that the creation and application of new forms of fertilizers is one of the few viable alternatives for feeding the predicted world population of 9.6 billion in 2050 or more without adversely endangering ecosystems and the environment. The recent surge in global population has compelled the agricultural industry to enhance crop yield in order to feed billions of people, particularly in underdeveloped and emerging nations. The use of huge amounts of chemical fertilizers enhanced crop yield while disrupting soil mineral balance and decreasing soil fertility (Jain *et al.*, 2021).

Comment [u4]: There is no Objective of your research. Write it

## Materials and methods

### Study area

The field experiment on wheat crop was conducted in the research farm of DR. C.V. Raman University Khandwa M.P. The study location comes under tropical and subtropical climate zone and is located at 21°50'N, latitude and 76°13'E longitude and the maximum and minimum height above mean sea level is 905.56 m and 180.00 m respectively.

### Experimental details:

~~Seven~~ ~~I was used~~ ~~7~~ Treatments with 3 Replication of Wheat variety- (HI-1634) with Fertilizer dose (RDF)—N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O: 120:60:40 and Statistical design Randomized Block Design (RBD). Plant spacing ~~were~~~~was~~ used 22.5 cm (Row to Row), Seed rate of wheat seed were used 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, Gross plot Size was used 5 m × 5 m and Net Plot Size was 4 m × 4.10 m

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Superscript

### Details of treatments:

~~The seven~~ ~~(I was used~~ ~~7)~~ treatments ~~were used~~ ~~-which is~~ ~~T1~~-100% NPK (120:60:40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> Recommended dose), ~~T2~~-75% N & P and 100% K (90:45:40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), ~~T3~~- 50% N & P and 100% K (60:30:40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), ~~T4~~- T2 + ST with Nano DAP @ 5 ml/kg seed + FS with Nano DAP @ 2 ml/litter of water at 30 DAG, ~~T5~~-T3 + ST with Nano DAP @ 5 ml/kg seed + FS with Nano DAP @ 4 ml/liter of water at 30 DAG, ~~T6~~- T2 + ST with Nano DAP @ 5 ml/kg seed + FS with Nano DAP @ 4 ml/litter of water at 30 DAG and ~~T7~~- ~~Absolute~~ ~~Control~~

**Note**~~OTE~~: - ST - Seed treatment FS – Foliar spray DAG – Days after germination

### ~~Data~~ ~~Observation to be~~ recorded on wheat crop

**Growth parameters:** under the growth parameters ~~data~~ ~~I~~ was recorded ~~on~~ Plant population 20 DAS and at harvest, Plant height (cm) at 30, 60, 90 DAS and at harvest, Fresh weight at 30,60,90 DAS and at harvest, Dry weight at 30,60,90 DAS and at harvest., No. of tillers at 30,60,90 DAS and at harvest and Post-~~h~~Harvest parameters were recorded, ~~e~~Effective tillers (m<sup>-1</sup>), No. of Grains Earhead-1, Test weight (g), Biological yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), Grain yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), Straw yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), Harvest index (%).

**Comment [u5]:** Your treatment should be on nano treatment, the other fertilizer rate must be uniform for treatments except for the recommended and control one to observe the effect of nano-DAP on wheat. How you differentiate your treatment effect is due this different fertilizer rate or due to Nano-DAP? Your title and your treatment arrangement is totally not much. So, it difficult for final conclusions.

Formatted: Font color: Red

**Comment [u6]:** ■ This is not good in scientific paper writing, don't Use I when you write scientific paper. **Show your Audience, do not Tell them by saying "I"**. Rather than telling the readers that a result is interesting or significant, show them how it is interesting or significant.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Tab stops: 2.06", Left

**Statistical analysis:** ~~Data~~ ~~anaylsis~~ ~~was~~ ~~done~~ ~~.....~~

### Economic Analysis:

## **Results and Discussion**

Growth performance data were recorded among treatments as given below:

**Plant Height and Plant Population:** Plant height differed significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) among the various treatments. After 30 days of growth, Plant height ranged from 20.33 cm to 22.67 cm with an average value of 21.57 cm. The maximum plant height (22.67 cm) was recorded in the T1 which is 100% NPK (120:60:40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> Recommended dose) followed by T6 (22.33 cm) and minimum (20.33 cm) was noticed in T7 which is absolute control followed by T4 (22.00 cm) and T3 (20.67 cm). The variation in Plant height in different treatments can be attributed to its peculiarity to increase height of plant by cell enlargement and the influence of environment during the period of growth Plant population data were recorded non- significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) among the various treatments. Plant population data was recorded after 20 days. Highest plant population was recorded T1 treatment 38.93 cm which is closely followed by T6 98.92 cm and lowest was recorded T7 37.40 cm Plant height maximum recorded after 60DAS, 90DAS, at the time of harvest which was 57.00 cm, 84.00 cm, and 83.80 cm respectively which was followed by 55.67 cm, 81.67 cm and 81.17. Plant height minimum recorded after 60 days, 90 days, and at the time of harvest which was 44.33cm 64.33 cm and 63.83 cm. it shown on Fig. 1. ~~plants~~Plants were able to avail the most of their available growth resources, resulting in increased plant height owing ~~to the~~to the weed-free environment. Similar results were reported by Poudel *et.al.*, (2023).




Fig. 1. Plant height and population of wheat

**Fresh weight and Dry Weight:** in Fig. 2 Show Fresh weight differed significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation in among the various treatments. After 30 days, 60 days, 90 days of growth, fresh weight ranged after 30 days that is 117.75 g to 124.46 g with an average value of 120.96g. The maximum fresh weight is recorded after 30 days, 60 days and 90 days, T1 treatment recorded highest fresh weight is 124.46 g, 364.48 g and 409.28 g followed by T6 treatment which is 123.83 g, 362.66 g, 406.55 g respectively. Lowest fresh weight recorded after 30 days, 60 days and 90 days which is T7 117.75 g, 198.40 g and 199.07 g. Dry weight differed significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation among the various treatments. After 30 days, 60 days, 90 days of growth, dry weight ranged after 30 days that is 29.44 g to 31.44 g with an average value of 30.24 g. The maximum dry weight is recorded after 30 days, 60 days and 90 days, T1 treatment recorded highest dry weight is 31.11 g, 127.57 g and 245.57 g followed by T6 treatment which is 30.96 g, 126.93 g, 243.93 g respectively. Lowest dry weight recorded after 30 days, 60 days and 90 days which is T7 29.44 g, 69.44 g and 119.44 g. ~~The Our~~ study is ~~well~~ in line with the findings of Kumari *et al.* (2017).

**Comment [u7]:** You only put bar-graph why you didn't put statistical data in table form with CV for each parameters?

**Comment [u8]:** There is no data for fresh and dry weight at harvest?

**Comment [u9]:** This is not enough add another citation also




Fig. 2. Fresh Weight and Dry weight of wheat

**Number of tillers/m:** Number of tillers differed significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation in among the various treatments. After 30 days, 60 days, 90 days of growth, number of tillers ranged after 30 days ~~are that is 48.00 tillers~~ to 50.11 tillers with an average value of 48.51 tillers. The maximum tillers ~~are is~~ recorded after 30 days, 60 days and 90 days, Fig. 3 show, T1 treatment recorded highest number of tillers ~~that is 50.11 tillers, 75.11 tillers and 75.11 tillers~~ followed by T6 treatment which is ~~49.03 tillers, 73.13 tillers, and 73.13 tillers~~ respectively. ~~The smaller~~ Number of tillers ~~were was~~ recorded after 30 days, 60 days and 90 days ~~from which is T7 i.e.~~ 48.00 tillers, 63.00 tillers and 63.00 tillers respectively. Crop growth, leading in the efficient use of growth resources, resulting in these treatments having the higher number of tillers. These results were confirmed by Rajput *et al.*, (2022) and Maloth *et al.*, (2024)

Comment [u10]: There is no any statistical data written in table form with CV

Comment [u11]: No data at harvest




Fig.3. Number of tillers

**Grain per ear head:** In the fig.4, Grain per ear head recorded differed significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation in among the various treatments, grain per ear head highest recorded T1 38.20 followed by T6 35.20 and lowest 31.6 was recorded from T7 31.60 which is followed by T3 32.60. Grain per ear head ranged between 31.60 to 38.20 and average of among treatments is recorded 34.31. Spikelet per ear head recorded differed significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation in among the various treatments, Spikelet per ear head highest recorded T1 12.73 followed by T6 11.73 and lowest was recorded 10.53 which is followed by 10.87 Spikelet per ear head ranged between 10.53 to 12.73 and average of among treatments is recorded 11.43.

**Comment [u12]:** There is no any supportive references. Try to add.

**Ear head Length (cm):** Ear head length was recorded significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation in among the various treatments, ear head length highest recorded T1 8.95 cm closely followed by T6 8.90 cm and lowest was recorded T7 7.45 cm. Ear head length ranged between 7.45cm to 8.95cm and average of among treatments is recorded 8.45cm. This Our study is well in line with the findings of Mahachandramuki *et al.* (2023)

**Comment [u13]:** et al. is the shorten form of et alia of latin words which means "and others" so the dot (.) is not putted in between them.

**Comment [u14]:** Add another supportive references.




Fig.4. Grain per ear head, Spikelete per ear head and Ear head length

**Test weight:** Test weight and net plot yield was recorded significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation in among the various treatments, Test weight was highest recorded T1 93.60 gm closely followed

by T6 39.42 gm and lowest was recorded T7 35.42 gm. Test weight ranged between 35.42 gm to 39.60 gm and average of among treatments is recorded 37.85 gm. Net plot yield was highest recorded T1 6.93 kg closely followed by T6 6.83 kg and lowest was recorded T7 3.25 kg. Net plot yield ranged between 3.25 kg to 6.93 kg and average of among treatments was recorded 5.77 kg. it was show on Fig. 5. Similar findings were also reported by Kumar, Y. *et al.* (2021).




Fig.5. Test weight g and net plot yield in kg

### Yield and straw yield:

In the Fig. 6., Yield and straw yield was recorded significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation in among the various treatments, **Yield of wheat was the highest wheat yield was** recorded in T1 of 4226.33 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> which was closely followed by T6 4164.67 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and lowest **yield** was recorded in control T7 1984.33 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Yield of wheat ranged between 1984.33 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> to 4226.33 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and average of among treatments was recorded 3520.94 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. **The highest Straw yield of wheat** was highest recorded at T1 6339.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> closely followed by ~~T6 6330.25~~ **T6 6330.25** kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and **the lowest straw yield 3174 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>** was recorded ~~from~~ **T7 3174 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>**. **Growth parameters and yield attributing features were achieved, resulting in better grain and straw yield among all treatments.** Similar findings were also reported by Singh *et al.* (2023).

**Comment [u15]:** Discuss and elaborate it what is main reason and Supportive your result/ idea with other references

**Formatted:** Font color: Red

**Comment [u16]:** Not clear? What you want to say?




Fig.6. Yield kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and straw yield kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

**Harvest index (%):** Harvest index was recorded significantly ( $p = 0.05$ ) variation in among the various treatments, Fig. 7. Show Harvest index of wheat was highest recorded in T1 40.03 % which was closely followed by T6 39.69 % and lowest was recorded in control T7 37.89 % . average of Harvest index was recorded 39.28 % . ~~higher~~Higher value of harvest index T1 (40.03 % ) because of higher amount of photosynthate assimilation as compared to other the treatments. Similar findings were also reported by Kumar *et al.* (2011) and Jaidev *et al.* (2012).




Fig.7. Harvest Index (%)

### Partial Budget Analysis:

Partial budget analysis is important to identify experimental treatments with an optimum return to the farmer's investment and to develop recommendation for the agronomic data.

**Comment [u17]:** I didn't see your partial budget/Economic analysis

### **Conclusion**

Based on experimental results, with respect to growth parameters, yield attributing characters and grain yield, it can be concluded that wheat variety HI-1634 (Pusha Ahilya) the result of the experiment show that the RDF treatment (T1) is better as compared to rest of the treatments such like Growth parameters, yield attributes and yield but, in **prospect of economically** the treatment T5 (T3 + ST with Nano DAP @ 5 ml/kg seed + FS with Nano DAP @ 4 ml/liter of water at 30 DAG) is best for farmers because in this treatment can save 50% N and P **cost in rupees.**

**Comment [u18]:** How you know its economically without any partial budget analysis

**Formatted:** Font color: Red

**Comment [u19]:** After you done about cost under partial budget analysis then you talk about cost. But No any work done about cost in your paper where did you bring this cost advantage. You have to done again under partial budget to know their advantage.

### **References**

Anonymous. 2021. World agriculture production by USDA.

Feldman, M., and Kislev, M. E. (2007). Domestication of emmer wheat and evolution of free-threshing tetraploid wheat. *Israel Journal of Plant Sciences*, 55(3-4):207-221.

Jain Devendra, Sanadhya Suman, Saheewala Heena, Joshi Arunabh, Bhojiya Ali **and&** Mohanty R. 2021. An effective approach to increase nutrient use efficiency. *Agricultural Biotechnology*, 10(4): 493-510.

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Jaidev, Singh, S. K., Kumar, R. and Singh, A. K. (2012). Weed management studies in wheat. *International Agronomy Congress*. 2: 126-127.

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

Kumar, Y., Singh, T., Raliya, R., **and&** Tiwari, K. N. (2021). Nano fertilizers for sustainable crop production, higher nutrient use efficiency and enhanced profitability. *Indian Journal of Fertilisers*, 17(11):1206-1214.

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Kumar S, Angiras N.N and Rana S.S, (2011). Bio-efficacy of clodinafop-propargyl + ~~metsulfuron~~+ ~~metsulfuron~~ methyl against complex weed flora in wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 43 (3&4): 195-198.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Kumari M S, Rao P C, Padmaja G, Ramulu V, Saritha J D and Ramakrishna K. (2017). Effect of bio and nano phosphorus on yield, yield attributes and oil content of groundnut. (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) *Environmental Conservation Journal*, 18(3): 21-26.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Mahachandramuki, E., Thirukumar, K., Karthikeyan, R., Sivakumar, R., Sellamuthu, K. M. and Prabukumar, G. (2023). Influence of Super Nano Urea and Nano DAP on Growth Parameters of Rice Fallow Cotton under High Density Planting System. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*, 35(19): 711-716.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Maloth, A., Thatikunta, R., Parida, B. K., Naik, D. S., and Varma, N. (2024). Evaluation of Nano-DAP on Plant Growth, Enzymatic Activity and Yield in Paddy (*Oryza sativa* L.). *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, 14(1), 890-897.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Poudel, A., Singh, S. K., Jiménez-Ballesta, R., Jatav, S. S., Patra, A., and Pandey, A. (2023). Effect of nano-phosphorus formulation on growth, yield and nutritional quality of wheat under semi-arid climate. *Agronomy*, 13(3): 768.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Rajput, J. S., Thakur, A. K., Nag, N. K., Chandrakar, T., and Singh, D. P. (2022). Effect of nano fertilizer in relation to growth, yield and economics of little millet (*Panicum sumatrense* roth) under rainfed conditions. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, 11(7): 153-156.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Shewry, P. R., and Hey, S. J. (2015). The contribution of wheat to human diet and health. *Food and energy security*, 4(3): 178-202.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Singh, Y. K., Singh, B. V., Katiyar, D., Saikanth, D. R. K., Kumar, K., Singh, O., and Kumar, P. (2023). Efficacy of Nano Fertilizers on Yield, Attributes and Economics of Wheat. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, 13(7): 291-297.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic