Effect of nitrogen and boron fertilization on nutrient content and uptake by Mustard crop in Chitrakoot area

Abstract

This study evaluated the effect of nitrogen (N) and boron (B) fertilization on yield, nutrient content, and nutrient uptake in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*) in the Chitrakoot area of Madhya Pradesh, India. A field experiment was conducted with 13 treatments, combining reduced nitrogen doses, nano-urea sprays, and varying boron applications, laid out in a randomized block design with three replications. Results revealed significant differences among treatments, with the highest seed yield recorded in treatment T_{12} [½ recommended dose of nitrogen (RDN) + two nano-urea sprays + 1.25 kg B ha^{-1}], which yielded 1523.81 kg ha^{-1}, compared to 958.73 kg ha^{-1} in the control (100 % NPK as per RDF). Nutrient content also peaked in T_{12}, with nitrogen at 2.78 %, phosphorus at 0.482 %, and potassium at 0.74 %. Additionally, T_{12} exhibited the highest nutrient uptake with 42.36 kg ha^{-1} for nitrogen, 7.34 kg ha^{-1} for phosphorus, and 11.28 kg ha^{-1} for potassium. These findings suggest that combined application of nano-urea sprays and boron supplementation, particularly at higher boron levels, can substantially enhance yield and nutrient uptake in mustard crops, making it a promising practice for sustainable agriculture in semi-arid regions.

Key words: *Nitrogen, Boron, Yield, Nutrient content, Nutrient uptake.*

Introduction

Mustard (*Brassica juncea* (L.)) is considered to be one of the most valuable oil-seed crops. It belongs to Brassicaceae (*Cruciferae*) family, with around 338 genera and 3709 species scattered worldwide. Mustard seeds are known by several names in different parts of the world, such as sarson, rai or raya, toria or lahi. While sarson and toria (lahi) are commonly referred to as rapeseed, rai, raya, or laha. Afghanistan and neighbouring countries (Central Asia) were the principal sites of origin, whereas central and western China, eastern India, and Asia were subsidiary centres of origin for Brassica **(Dey *et al.*, 2024).**

The oil is utilized for human consumption throughout northern India for cooking and frying purposes. The whole seed is used as condiment in the preparation of pickles and for flavouring curries and vegetables. The mustard oil is also used in preparing vegetable ghee, hair oil, medicines, soaps, lubricating oil and in tanning industries. The oil content in mustard seeds varies from 37-49 per cent. The seeds are highly nutritive containing 38-57% erucic acid, 5- 13 % linolic acid and 27 % oleic acid **(Dubey *et al.*, 2022).**

India ranks third in terms of area and production of rapeseed-mustard after Canada and China. Globally, the area and production of rapeseed-mustard is 36.81 million hectares and 72.61 million tonnes, respectively **(USDA, 2020).** Rapeseed mustard is the second most consumed edible oilseed crop in India, after soybean. India has 6.23 million hectares area under rapeseed mustard and 9.34 million tonnes production with average productivity of 1499 kg ha^{-1}, which is about three-fourth of the world's average productivity (1960 kg ha^{-1}) **(DAC & FW, 2020).** In the Madhya Pradesh, it is grown on an area 1038.15 thousand hectares with a production of 1.69 million tonnes **(Anonymous 2021-22).**

Nitrogen is central to plant growth due to its presence in nucleic acids, enzymes, chlorophyll proteins and hormones. However, nitrogen is the most limiting nutrient for crop production on a global scale, chiefly because of the soils' limited ability to supply available N. As such, man has always augmented soil nitrogen with inorganic fertilizers to improve crop productivity **(Maereka *et al.*, 2007).**

In order to improve N use efficiency, several slow/controlled release fertilizers like neem-coated urea, tar-coated urea, nano fertilizers have been studied extensively to enhance Nitrogen use efficiency. These formulations aim to extend the release of nitrogen over a prolonged period, thereby reducing nutrient loss through leaching or volatilization and ensuring a more efficient uptake by the plants. Nanotechnology involves manipulating materials at the atomic, molecular and macromolecular scales, which operate at 100 nm, their properties significantly differed from at a large scale **(Lal, 2008 and Sharma, 2008).** Nanofertilizers are designed to control the release of nutrients **(De Rosa *et al.*, 2010)** from the fertilizer granules, thereby improving nutrient use efficiency while minimizing losses to the environment **(Subramanian and Tarafdar, 2009)** and supply with a range of nutrients in desirable proportions. These fertilizers utilize nanomaterials to enhance nutrient delivery to plants, potentially increasing efficiency and reducing environmental impact compared to traditional fertilizers. The use of nano fertilizers has the potential to increase in nutrient use efficiency, reduces soil toxicity, minimizes the potential negative effects associated with over dosage and reduces the frequency of the application. **(Naderi and Danesh-Shahraki, 2013)**.

Widespread B deficiencies in soils have been reported from different parts of the world **(Niaz *et al.*, 2013).** Deficiency of B has been now emerged in Indian soils and crops, next to zinc primarily due to intensive cultivation using high yielding crop varieties that warrants for precise estimation of the B in soils. Studies on B in soils and plant are mostly confined to acid soils, neutral to alkaline and non-calcareous soils were well-supplied with B. However, in the post-Green revolution period, inadequacy or sufficiency of different nutrients, including B, in the soil depended mainly on its annual withdrawals under exhaustive cropping systems and replenishment through fertilizers, manures, crop residues and irrigation water **(Dwivedi and Dwivedi, 2007).** Continuous neglect of B replenishment over the years led to emergence of B deficiency across the soils and crops in India and with spread deficiencies are now noticed in the areas that were generally considered rich in B. Resent estimates suggested B deficiency in one-third of over 40 thousand soil samples analysed **(Shukla *et al*., 2019).**

Recent advances in B research have greatly improved an understanding for B uptake and transport processes **(Brown *et al.*, 2002)**, and roles of B in cell wall formation **(O, Neill *et al.*, 2004)**, cellular membrane functions **(Goldbach *et al.*, 2001)**, and anti-oxidative defense systems. Reproductive growth, especially flowering, fruit and seed set is more sensitive to boron (B) deficiency than vegetative growth. Thus, B fertilization is necessary for improvement of crop yield as well as nutritional quality. Mustard as a Brassica crop is very responsive to B application. There are numerous reports on the positive response of mustard to B fertilization **(Islam, 2005, and Saha *et al.*, 2003)**.

Method and materials

Method and materials

Experimental Sites

This experiment took place at the Rajaula Agriculture Farm, located within Mahatma Gandhi Chitrakoot Gramoday Vishwavidyalaya in Chitrakoot, Satna, Madhya Pradesh. The farm is situated in a semi-arid, sub-tropical region, positioned at 25.148° North latitude and 80.855° East longitude, with an elevation ranging from 190 to 210 meters above sea level.

Edaphic condition

The chemical properties of the experimental soil are summarized as follows: The soil pH was measured to be 7.4 using a glass electrode and pH meter, following the method described by **Jackson (1973).** Electrical conductivity (EC), determined using a conductivity bridge with a soil-water suspension ratio of 1:2.5, was found to be 0.34 dS/m **(Jackson, 1973).** Organic carbon content was relatively low at 0.31 %, as measured by the Wet Oxidation Method **(Walkley and Black, 1934).** The total nitrogen content of the soil was 97.68 kg ha^{-1}, assessed using the Kjeldahl Method **(Subbaih and Asija, 1956).** Available phosphorus was measured at 16.25 kg ha^{-1} using the colorimetric method **(Olsen *et al.*, 1954),** while available potash was relatively high at 292.90 kg ha^{-1}, determined by flame photometry following ammonium acetate extraction **(Hanway and Heidel, 1952).** The soil also had an available boron content of 0.38 mg kg^{-1}, as determined by the Azomethine-H method **(Berger and Troug, 1939).**

Crop Husbandry

Field preparation involved tractor-driven ploughing with a disc plough, followed by cross-harrowing and levelling. After the land was prepared, the experiment was set up according to the treatment plan across 39 plots. Each plot measured 5.0 x 4.0 meters (gross plot) with a net plot size of 4.5 x 3.5 meters. Farmyard manure (FYM) was applied as a basal dose at a rate of 10 q ha^{-1}. Fertilizers, weighed according to treatment recommendations, were evenly applied and mixed into the soil of each plot. The designated doses of Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Potassium (60:40:40 kg ha^{-1}) were supplied through Urea, DAP, and MOP, respectively, while boron was provided through borax at varying doses (0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.25 kg B ha^{-1}). Seeds were sown in rows created by narrow furrows, using a pointed wooden stick to achieve precise row spacing. The experiment was conducted without irrigation throughout the crop cycle. The crop reached physiological maturity on February 14, 2023, marked by yellowing leaves and more than 70% of the capsules fully matured. Harvesting occurred at this stage to minimize shattering losses

Detail of treatments and design

The 13 treatments combination of nutrient management practices. Experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with three replications.

Table-1: Treatment combination

Symbol	Treatment Combinations	Details of Treatment
T_0		100 % NPK as per RDF
T_1	N_0B_0	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 0.0 kg B)
T_2	N_1B_0	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} water spray + 0.0 kg B)
T_3	N_2B_0	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} nano-urea spray + 0.0 kg B)
T_4	N_0B_1	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 0.5 kg B)
T_5	N_1B_1	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} water spray + 0.5 kg B)
T_6	N_2B_1	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} nano-urea spray + 0.5 kg B)
T_7	N_0B_2	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 1.0 kg B)
T_8	N_1B_2	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} water spray + 1.0 kg B)

T_9	N_2B_2	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd nano-urea spray + 1.0 kg B)
T_{10}	N_0B_3	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 1.25 kg B)
T_{11}	N_1B_3	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd water spray + 1.25 kg B)
T_{12}	N_2B_3	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd nano-urea spray + 1.25 kg B)

Nutrient content and uptake

Nitrogen content (per cent) and uptake (kg ha $^{-1}$):

The nitrogen content in grain was determined by micro- kjeldahl's method (Jackson, 1973). The total nitrogen uptake was calculated by multiplying nitrogen content to the total dry weight to grain yield.

$$\text{N} - \text{uptake by grain (kg ha}^{-1}) = \frac{\text{N content in grain (\%)} \times \text{grain yield (kg ha}^{-1})}{100}$$

(ii) Phosphorous content (per cent) and uptake (kg ha^{-1}):

The phosphorous content was analyzed in grain separately to work out their uptake. Plant samples were dried in drier at 70± 5^{0}C for 72 hours and followed wet digestion, vanado-molybdo phosphoric acid yellow colour method (Jackson, 1973). The total phosphorous uptake was calculated as below.

$$\text{P} - \text{uptake by grain (kg ha}^{-1}) = \frac{\text{P content in grain (\%)} \times \text{grain yield (kg ha}^{-1})}{100}$$

(iii) Potassium content (per cent) and uptake (kg ha^{-1}):

Potassium content was analyzed by flame photometer and total potassium uptake by grain was worked out separately. The total potassium uptake was obtained by using following formula:

$$\text{K} - \text{uptake by grain (kg ha}^{-1}) = \frac{\text{K content in grain (\%)} \times \text{grain yield (kg ha}^{-1})}{100}$$

Statistical analysis: The growth parameters and yields were recorded and analyzed as per Gomez (1984) the tested at 5% level of significance to interpret the significant differences.

Result and discussion

Seed yield

The findings showed that mustard's total seed yield varied from 958.73 to 1523.81 kg ha^{-1} across the treatments, with all treatments showing significantly higher yields than T_0 (100 %

NPK based on RDF). The highest total seed yield (1523.81 kg ha^{-1}) was observed with the T_{12} treatment combination, which applied half the recommended dose of nitrogen (RDN) along with the first and second nano-urea sprays and 1.25 kg of boron. This was closely followed by the T_9 treatment, which involved half the RDN, the first and second nano-urea sprays, and 1.0 kg of boron, resulting in a yield of 1485.71 kg ha^{-1}. In contrast, the lowest yield (958.73 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded under T_0 (100 % NPK as per RDF). The yield increased significantly when boron was used in combination with 50% nitrogen or urea spray. The lowest recorded yield in this set of treatments was 1066.66 kg ha^{-1} for 0 kg B ha^{-1} + 50% RDN + N0 spray, while the highest was 1523.80 kg ha^{-1} for 1.25 kg B ha^{-1} + 50% RDN + N2 spray. Similar findings have been reported in studies by **Kumar *et al.* (2016), Sinha *et al.* (2022), and Kumar *et al.* (2022).**

Table-2: Effect of different treatment combination on number of total seed yield (kg ha^{-1})

Treatment	Treatment Combination	Total seed yield (kg ha^{-1})
T_0	100 % NPK as per RDF	958.73
T_1	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 0.0 kg B)	1009.52
T_2	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd water spray + 0.0 kg B)	1066.67
T_3	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd nano-urea spray + 0.0 kg B)	1155.55
T_4	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 0.5 kg B)	1117.46
T_5	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd water spray + 0.5 kg B)	1212.70
T_6	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd nano-urea spray + 0.5 kg B)	1346.03
T_7	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 1.0 kg B)	1295.24
T_8	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd water spray + 1.0 kg B)	1422.22
T_9	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd nano-urea spray + 1.0 kg B)	1485.71
T_{10}	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 1.25 kg B)	1384.13
T_{11}	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd water spray + 1.25 kg B)	1453.97
T_{12}	½ of RDN + (Ist nano-urea spray + 2nd nano-urea spray + 1.25 kg B)	1523.81
SEm ±		**3.64**
C.D. (P=0.05)		**10.75**

Nutrient content

The highest nitrogen content (2.78 %) was observed in treatment T_{12}, which used half of the recommended dose of nitrogen (RDN) along with two nano-urea sprays and 1.25 kg of boron (B). The lowest nitrogen content (2.51 %) was observed in T_1, which used half of the RDN and two water sprays without boron. The highest phosphorus content (0.482 %) was also observed in T_{12}, which combined half RDN, two nano-urea sprays, and 1.25 kg boron. The lowest phosphorus content (0.455 %) was found in T_0 (100 % NPK as per RDF), which lacked any boron or spray treatment. Potassium content peaked at 0.74 % in T_{12}, indicating the positive impact of combining nano-urea sprays with boron. Like nitrogen and phosphorus, potassium content was higher in treatments that included nano-urea sprays compared to water spray-only treatments. The lowest potassium content (0.55 %) was observed in T_0, which received only the standard NPK dose. Treatments that combined half the RDN, nano-urea sprays, and boron (especially at higher rates) produced the highest N, P, and K content, with T_{12} (½ RDN + two nano-urea sprays + 1.25 kg B) showing the greatest enhancement across all nutrients. Similar findings were reported by **Dhaliwal *et al.* (2022), Sharma *et al.* (2022) and Kumar *et al.* (2022).**

Nutrient uptake (kg ha^{-1})

The highest N uptake (42.36 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded in treatment T_{12} (½ RDN + two nano-urea sprays + 1.25 kg B). The lowest N uptake (24.93 kg ha^{-1}) was seen in T0 (100 % NPK as per RDF), indicating that reduced N application supplemented with nano-urea sprays can enhance N uptake. Treatment T_{12} also had the highest P uptake (7.34 kg ha^{-1}), demonstrating the positive impact of nano-urea and boron application on P absorption. The lowest P uptake (4.36 kg ha^{-1}) was observed in T_0, which lacked additional sprays or boron supplementation. Potassium uptake was highest (11.28 kg ha^{-1}) in T_{12}, confirming that the combination of nano-urea sprays and 1.25 kg boron significantly boosts K absorption. The lowest K uptake (5.27 kg ha^{-1}) was seen in T_0, indicating the baseline uptake without additional boron or spray interventions. Treatment T_{12}, with half RDN, two nano-urea sprays, and 1.25 kg boron, resulted in the highest N, P, and K uptake. This indicates that combining nano-urea sprays and boron application, especially at higher boron levels, significantly enhances nutrient uptake compared to conventional NPK treatment. Similar findings were reported by **Rana *et al.* (2005), Hossain *et al.* (2012) and Singh *et al.* (2017).**

Table-3: Effect of different treatment combination on nutrient content in mustard seed

Treatment	Treatment Combination	N content (%)	P content (%)	K content (%)
T_0	100 % NPK as per RDF	2.60	0.455	0.55
T_1	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 0.0 kg B)	2.51	0.458	0.58
T_2	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} water spray + 0.0 kg B)	2.62	0.464	0.65
T_3	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} nano-urea spray + 0.0 kg B)	2.71	0.472	0.70
T_4	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 0.5 kg B)	2.52	0.459	0.60
T_5	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} water spray + 0.5 kg B)	2.65	0.465	0.67
T_6	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} nano-urea spray + 0.5 kg B)	2.74	0.476	0.71
T_7	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 1.0 kg B)	2.55	0.461	0.62
T_8	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} water spray + 1.0 kg B)	2.67	0.467	0.68
T_9	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} nano-urea spray + 1.0 kg B)	2.76	0.479	0.73
T_{10}	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 1.25 kg B)	2.58	0.462	0.64
T_{11}	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} water spray + 1.25 kg B)	2.69	0.470	0.69
T_{12}	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} nano-urea spray + 1.25 kg B)	2.78	0.482	0.74
SEm ±		**0.002**	**0.001**	**0.001**
C.D. (P=0.05)		**0.005**	**0.003**	**0.004**

Table-4: Effect of different treatment combination on nutrient uptake by mustard seed

Treatment	Treatment Combination	N uptake (kg ha^{-1})	P uptake (kg ha^{-1})	K uptake (kg ha^{-1})
T_0	100 % NPK as per RDF	24.93	4.36	5.27
T_1	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 0.0 kg B)	25.34	4.62	5.86
T_2	½ of RDN + (I^{st} nano-urea spray + 2^{nd} water spray + 0.0 kg B)	27.95	4.95	6.93

T_3	½ of RDN + (I[st] nano-urea spray + 2[nd] nano-urea spray + 0.0 kg B)	31.32	5.45	8.09
T_4	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 0.5 kg B)	28.16	5.13	6.70
T_5	½ of RDN + (I[st] nano-urea spray + 2[nd] water spray + 0.5 kg B)	32.14	5.64	8.13
T_6	½ of RDN + (I[st] nano-urea spray + 2[nd] nano-urea spray + 0.5 kg B)	36.88	6.41	9.56
T_7	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 1.0 kg B)	33.03	5.97	8.03
T_8	½ of RDN + (I[st] nano-urea spray + 2[nd] water spray + 1.0 kg B)	37.97	6.64	9.67
T_9	½ of RDN + (I[st] nano-urea spray + 2[nd] nano-urea spray + 1.0 kg B)	41.01	7.12	10.85
T_{10}	½ of RDN + (2 water spray + 1.25 kg B)	35.71	6.39	8.86
T_{11}	½ of RDN + (I[st] nano-urea spray + 2[nd] water spray + 1.25 kg B)	39.11	6.83	10.03
T_{12}	½ of RDN + (I[st] nano-urea spray + 2[nd] nano-urea spray + 1.25 kg B)	42.36	7.34	11.28
SEm ±		**0.12**	**0.020**	**0.039**
C.D. (P=0.05)		**0.35**	**0.060**	**0.114**

Conclusion

The optimized treatment not only boosted yield but also enhanced nutrient content in the seeds, showing the highest percentages of nitrogen (2.78 %), phosphorus (0.482 %), and potassium (0.74%). Nutrient uptake in this treatment was similarly robust, with 42.36 kg ha^{-1} for nitrogen, 7.34 kg ha^{-1} for phosphorus, and 11.28 kg ha^{-1} for potassium. These findings underscore the effectiveness of integrating nano-urea and boron in mustard cultivation to enhance productivity and nutrient efficiency, suggesting that such tailored fertilization practices can support sustainable agricultural practices, especially in semi-arid regions.

References

Berger, K. C., & Truog, E. (1939). Boron determination in soils and plants. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Analytical Edition*, *11*(10), 540-545.

Brown, P. H., Bellaloui, N., Wimmer, M. A., Bassil, E. S., Ruiz, J., Hu, H., & Römheld, V. (2002). Boron in plant biology. *Plant biology*, *4*(02), 205-223.

DeRosa, M. C., Monreal, C., Schnitzer, M., Walsh, R., & Sultan, Y. (2010). Nanotechnology in fertilizers. *Nature nanotechnology*, *5*(2), 91-91.

Dey, B., Bhatt, P., Sharma, R. K., Sharma, D., & Mandal, S. (2024). Optimization of Chemical Fertilizer through Integrated Nutrient Management (INM) Approach and its Effect on Growth and Yield of Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, *10*(1), 64-74.

Dhaliwal, S. S., Sharma, V., Shukla, A. K., Kaur, M., Verma, V., Sandhu, P. S., ... & Hossain, A. (2022). Biofortification of oil quality, yield, and nutrient uptake in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) by foliar application of boron and nitrogen. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *13*, 976391.

Dubey, S., Singh, A. K., Verma, R., & Maurya, S. (2022). Response of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) to sources and levels of sulphur on growth, yield and yield attributes. *The Pharma Innovation Journal* 2022; 11(1): 1368-1373

Dwivedi, B. S., & Dwivedi, V. (2007). Monitoring soil health for higher productivity. *Indian Journal of Fertilisers*, *3*(1), 11.

Goldbach, H. E., Yu, Q., Wingender, R., Schulz, M., Wimmer, M., Findeklee, P., & Baluška, F. (2001). Rapid response reactions of roots to boron deprivation. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, *164*(2), 173-181.

Gomez, K. A. (1984). Statistical procedures for agricultural research. *John NewYork: Wiley and Sons*.

Hanway, J.J; and Heidel, H. (1952). Soil analysis methods as used in Iowa State College, Soil Testing Laboratory. *Iowa Agriculture* **54**: 1-31.

Hossain, M. N., Hossain, M. M., & Yesmin, S. (2012). Effect of nitrogen and boron on nutrients and protein content in seeds of mustard. *Int. J. Sustain. Agric. Technol*, *8*, 1-5.

Islam, M. B. (2005). Requirement of boron for mustard, wheat and chickpea based rice cropping patterns. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Soil Science, Bangladesh Agriculture University Mymensingh.

Jackson, M.L. (1973). Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.

Kumar, A., Singh, K., Verma, P., Singh, O., Panwar, A., Singh, T., Kumar, Y. and Raliya, R. (2022). Effect of nitrogen and zinc nano fertilizer with the organic farming practices on cereal and oil seed crops. *Scientific reports*. Apr 28;12(1):1-7.

Kumar, V., Kandpal, B.K., Dwivedi, A., Kumar, S.V., Kumar, V. and Sharma, D.K. (2016). Effect of nitrogen and zinc fertilizer rates on growth, quality and yield of Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *International Journal of Agril. Sci.* 8(06) 1031-1035.

Lal, R. (2008). Soils and Indias Food Security.

Maereka, E. K., Madakadze, R. M., Mashingaidze, A. B., Kageler, S., & Nyakanda, C. (2007). Effect of nitrogen fertilization and timing of harvesting on leaf nitrate content and taste in mustard rape (*Brassica juncea* L. Czern). *Journal of food agriculture and environment*, *5*(3/4), 288.

Naderi, M.R. and Danesh-Shahraki, A. (2013). Nano fertilizers and their roles in sustainable agriculture. *International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences* 5, 2229–2232.

Niaz, A., Ahmad, W., Zia, M. H., & Malhi, S. S. (2013). Relationship of soil extractable and fertilizer boron to some soil properties, crop yields, and total boron in cotton and wheat plants on selected soils of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of plant nutrition*, *36*(3), 343-356.

Olsen, S.R, Cole, C.V., Watanable, F. S. and Dean, L. A. (1954). Estimation of available phosphorous in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. *USDA, Cric*. **930**:19- 23

O'Neill, M. A., T. Ishii., P. Albersheim and A. G. Darvill (2004). Rhmnogalacturonm II: structure and function of borate cross linked cell wall pectic polysaccharide. *Ann. Review Plant Biol*. 55:109-139.

Rana, K. S., Rana, D. S., & Gautam, R. C. (2005). Influence of phosphorus, sulphur and boron on growth, yield, nutrient uptake and economics of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*) under rainfed conditions. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, *50*(4), 314-316.

Saha, P. K., Saleque, M. A., Zaman, S. K. and Bhujiyan, N. J. (2003). Response of mustard to S, Zn and B in calcareous soil. Bangladesh *J. Agril. Res*., 28(4):633-636.

Sharma, M., Alam, M. S., & Patel, J. N. (2024). Impact of NPKS and Foliar Nano Fertilizer Application of Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) Growth in Himachal Pradesh's Mid Hill Region. *Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology*, *27*(9), 807-819.

Sharma, P. D. (2008). Nutrient management–Challenges and options. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*, *56*(4), 395-403.

Sharma, S., Chaudhray, S., & Singh, R. (2020). Effect of boron and sulphur on growth, yield and nutrient uptake of mustard *(Brassica juncea* L.). *International Journal of Chemical Studies*, *8*(4), 1998-2001.

Shukla, A. K., & Behera, S. K. (2019). All India coordinated research project on micro-and secondary nutrients and pollutant elements in soils and plants: Research achievements and future thrusts. *Indian Journal of Fertilisers*, *15*(5), 522-543.

Singh, R., Singh, Y., & Singh, S. (2017). Yield, quality and nutrient uptake of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*) under sulphur and boron nutrition. *Annals of Plant and Soil Research*, *19*(2), 227-231.

Sinha, T., Mishra, A., Mishra, U. S., Sachan, R., & Singh, D. (2022). Interaction effect of sulphur and boron on growth characteristics, yield components and productivity parameters of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under rainfed condition of Chitrakoot Region. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*, *34*(22), 1329-1336.

Subbiah, B.V. and Asija, C.L. (1956). A rapid procedure for the estimation of available N in Soil. *Curr. Sci.* **25**:259-260.

Subramanian, K. S., & Tarafdar, J. C. (2009). Nanotechnology in soil science. *Proceedings of the Indian society of soil science-platinum jubilee celebration, December*, 22-25.

USDA. (2020). Oilseeds: world markets and trade. United Stated of Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service. Available at Usdagov / psdonline / circulars / oilseeds.

Walkley, A. and Black, C. S.A. (1934). Old piper, S.S. soil and plant analysis. Soil Sci. 37:29-38.