Effect of Different Nitrogen Levels and Nano Urea on Yield and Economics of Wheat under Mid Hills of Himachal Pradesh

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at Chamelti Agriculture Farm, Shoolini University of Biotechnology and Management Sciences, Solan during *rabi* season of 2023-24 to study the effect of different nitrogen levels and nano urea on yield and economics of wheat under mid hills of Himachal Pradesh. The soil of experimental field was sandy loam in texture, medium organic carbon, available nitrogen and potassium, high in phosphorous and neutral in reaction with EC in safer range. The field experiment was laid out in Split plot design consisting of four treatments in main plot and three treatments in sub plot. The treatments of main plot were comprising of four nitrogen levels *viz.,* Control, 50% RDN, 75% RDN and 100% RDN (recommended dose of nitrogen) and three foliar spray of Nano urea in sub plot *viz.,* at CRI stage, Tillering stage and Jointing stage. The recommended doses of fertilizers were applied in each plot. Phosphorous and potassium were applied as basal at the time of sowing through SSP and MOP. Nitrogen was applied in two split doses, half dose was applied through urea at the time of sowing as basal dose and remaining half dose was applied in two equal splits at the time of CRI and tillering stage. While, foliar application of nano urea was applied as per treatment @ 3 ml l^{-1} of water. Other operations were performed as per package of practices of this area. The results revealed that application of 100% RDN recorded significantly higher yield and economics. While, Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage resulted in significantly higher yield and economics of wheat *viz.,* grain yield (kg ha^{-1}), straw yield (kg ha^{-1}), biological yield (kg ha^{-1}), gross returns (₹ ha^{-1}) and net returns (₹ ha^{-1}).

Keywords: Wheat, Nitrogen levels, foliar application, Nano urea and tillering

Note

Commented [T1]: Note: Abstract should not include so many materials and methods, but more information about the results should be included.

Economic analysis should also be added to the keywords.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

INTRODUCTION

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum*. L) known as "king of cereals" belongs to family "Poaceae" and originated from South-West Asia. Wheat is also the world's most produced and consumed food crop which is being utilized by billions of people (Pathak and Shrivastav, 2015). It is one of the most important *rabi* season crop in India, covering about 50% total area under food crops and producing more than 70% of total food grain among *rabi* season crops. It is one of the most nutritive food grain crops, containing 60-68% carbohydrates, 8-15% protein, 1.5-2% fat, 2-3% sugar, 2-2.5% cellulose and 1.5-2% minerals (Singh *et al*., 2011). Wheat is high in amino acids like niacin and thiamine. Its high gluten content contributes to the structural framework of the spongy cellular structure of bread, chapati, and other baked items (Shewry *et al*., 2002).

Increasing wheat production is challenging due to climatic fluctuations, poor soil health and increased risk of diseases and insect infestations. To deal with these challenges, innovative technologies with the potential to increase the sustainability of current cropping systems must be included in modern agriculture. Among these technological advances, nanotechnology is gaining attention because of its wide range of application in agriculture. It is used for the development of numerous precise e-tools, including nano fertilizers, nano pesticides and nano herbicides (Jasrotia *et al*., 2018).

Nano urea has claimed to satisfy these goals by being a sound financial and economic investment. Because of numerous elements like the expanding population, soil nutrient depletion, limited land resources and climate change, more environmentally friendly and efficient inputs are required. Additionally, conventional fertilizers have an appallingly low nutrient use efficiency. According to reports between 40-70% of the nitrogen in applied fertilizer is lost to the environment and does not reach the plant, which results in large financial losses. We must use new agricultural inputs that produce more with less harm in order to combat this. One such resource that can be applies is nano-fertilizer. Traditional fertilizers are adapted into nano-fertilizers, which are based on nanotechnology (Ojha *et al*., 2023).

Commented [T2]: Is the whole paragraph by a single author?
Because some sentences in the paragraph require a citation. Please check.

Nano urea has high nitrogen efficiency and is environmentally friendly. This fertilizer is known as "smart fertilizer" as it reduces. Nitrous oxide

emission are primarily responsible for polluting soil, air and water bodies. It also helps to reduce global warming. These properties make it a promising alternative to conventional urea (Kannoj *et al*., 2022).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted during *rabi* season of 2023-24 at Chamelti Agriculture Farm, (latitude 30º 85'67.30 N and longitude 77º 13'20.38 E.). MS Swaminathan School of Agriculture, Shoolini University of Biotechnology and Management Sciences, Solan (H.P.).

The experiment was laid in split plot design with three replications. There were 12 treatment combinations consisting of four nitrogen levels (Control, 50% RDN, 75% RDN and 100% RDN) in main plot and three foliar sprays of nano urea (CRI stage, Tillering stage and Jointing stage) in sub plot. The soil of experimental field was sandy loam in texture, medium organic carbon, available nitrogen and potassium, high in phosphorous and neutral in reaction with EC in safer range. Recommended dose of N, P and K (120:60:30 kg ha^{-1}) was applied as per treatment. Full doses of phosphorous and potassium were applied as basal at the time of sowing through SSP and MOP. While, nitrogen was applied in two split doses, half dose was applied at the time of sowing as basal dose and remaining half dose was applied in two equal splits at the time of CRI and tillering stage. Foliar application of nano urea was applied as per treatment @ 3 ml l^{-1} of water. The crop was sown on 3rd November 2023 with row to row spacing of 20 cm. The total rainfall received during the crop season (November to May, 2023-24) was 209 mm. Observations were recorded as per standard procedure. Statistical analysis in Split Plot Design according to the method of Gomez and Gomez (1984). The critical difference was calculated to assess the significance of treatment mean wherever the 'F' test was found significant at a 5 percent level.

RESULTS

Effect on yield

Grain yield (kg ha^{-1}): Among the different nitrogen levels, significantly higher grain yield of wheat (2573 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded with the application of (N_4) 100% RDN which was statistically at par with (N_3) 75% RDN i.e., 2491 kg ha^{-1}. While, least grain yield (1764 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded under the treatment (N_1) Control.

In case of foliar spray of nano urea, significantly higher grain yield (2501 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded with the application of (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage which was statistically at par with the (F_3) Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage i.e., 2382 kg ha^{-1}. While, least grain yield (1903 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded under (F_1) Foliar spray of nano urea at CRI stage.

Straw yield (kg ha^{-1}): Significantly higher straw yield of wheat (4410 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded with the application of (N_4) 100% RDN which was statistically at par with (N_3) 75% RDN i.e., 4325 kg ha^{-1}. While, least straw yield (3378 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded under (N_1) Control.

Among the foliar spray of nano urea, significantly higher straw yield (4366 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded with the application of (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage which was statistically at par with (F_3) Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage i.e., 4255 kg ha^{-1}. While, least straw yield (3500 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded under (F_1) Foliar spray of nano urea at CRI stage.

Biological yield (kg ha^{-1}): The application of (N_4) 100% RDN recorded the significantly higher biological yield of wheat (6982 kg ha^{-1}) which was statistically at par with (N_3) 75% RDN i.e., 6816 kg ha^{-1}. While, least biological yield (5142 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded under (N_1) Control.

In case of foliar spray of nano urea, significantly higher biological yield (6867 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded with the treatment (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage which was statistically at par with (F_3) Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage i.e., 6637 kg ha^{-1}. While, least biological yield (5403 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded under (F_1) Foliar spray of nano urea at CRI stage.

Harvest index (%): Harvest index of wheat does not reach the level of significance. However, the maximum harvest index (36.87 %) was recorded with the application of (N_4) 100% RDN. While, least harvest index (34.59 %) was recorded under (N_1) Control.

In case of foliar spray of nano urea, the maximum harvest index (36.25 %) was recorded with the application of (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage. While, the least harvest index (35.45 %) was recorded under (F_1) Foliar spray of nano urea at CRI stage.

Economics

Cost of cultivation (₹ ha^{-1}): Cost of cultivation was higher with the application of (N_4) 100% RDN i.e., ₹ 36311 ha^{-1}. While, least cost of cultivation (₹ 34767 ha^{-1}) was recoded under (N_1) Control.

Among the foliar spray of nano urea, cost of cultivation was same among all the treatments i.e., ₹ 35636 ha^{-1}.

Gross returns (₹ ha^{-1}): In case of different nitrogen levels, significantly higher gross returns (₹ 8195 ha^{-1}) was recorded with the application of (N_4) 100% RDN which was statistically at par with (N_3) 75% RDN i.e., ₹ 79576 ha^{-1}. While, the least gross returns (₹ –57617 ha^{-1}) was recorded under (N_1) Control.

Commented [T12]: Please also indicate here as Table 1 or 2.

Commented [T13]: Please also indicate here as Table 1 or 2.

Commented [T3]: The description of RDN should be given in brackets. RDN should be given as (**Recommended dose of nitrogen).**

Commented [T4]: The description of CRI should be given in parentheses. It should be given as CRI (**critical stage for irrigation).**

Commented [T5]: The results of the analyses, if any, of the soil samples of the experimental area can be given as a table.

Commented [T6]: Explanation of SSP and MOP should be given in parentheses

Commented [T14]: Please also indicate here as Table 1 or 2.

Commented [T7]: The harvest date of the work must also be given.

Commented [T8]: Climatic data (temperature, precipitation, etc.) of the region during the research period should be given as a table. It is wrong to give with a single sentence. Because the distribution of rainfall or temperature in all periods of the plant is important.

Commented [T15]: Please also indicate here as Table 1 or 2.

Commented [T9]: Please also indicate here as Table 1 or 2.

Commented [T10]: The codes corresponding to nitrogen doses or applications (N1, N2, N3) should first be given in the materials and methods section with a picture or table. Such information should be clearly presented in the materials and methods.

Commented [T16]: Please also indicate here as Table 1 or 2.

Commented [T11]: Likewise, these codes should be given in detail in the material and method.

Among the foliar spray of nano urea, significantly higher gross returns (₹ 79543 ha^{-1}) was recorded with the application of (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage which was statistically at par with (F_3) Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage i.e., ₹ 77009 ha^{-1}. While, least gross returns (₹ 61573 ha^{-1}) were recorded under (F_1) Foliar spray of nano urea at CRI stage.

Net returns (₹ ha^{-1}): Application of (N_4) 100% RDN recorded the significantly higher net returns (₹ 45640 ha^{-1}) which was statistically at par with (N_3) 75% RDN i.e., ₹ 43650 ha^{-1}. While least net returns (₹ 22850 ha^{-1}) were recorded under (N_1) Control.

In case of the foliar spray of nano urea, significantly higher net returns (₹ 43907 ha^{-1}) were recorded with the application of (N_4) 100% RDN (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage which was statistically at par with (F_3) Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage i.e., ₹ 41374 ha^{-1}. While least net returns (₹ 25938 ha^{-1}) was recorded under (F_1) Foliar spray of nano urea at CRI stage.

B:C ratio: Among the different nitrogen levels, significantly higher B:C ratio (1.26) was recorded with the application of (N_4) 100% RDN which was statistically at par with (N_3) 75% RDN i.e., 1.22. While, least B:C ratio 0.66 was recorded under (N_1) Control.

In case of the foliar spray of nano urea, significantly higher B:C ratio (1.23) was recorded with the application of (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage which was statistically at par with (F_3) Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage i.e., 1.16. While, least B:C ratio (0.72) was recorded under (F_1) Foliar spray of nano urea at CRI stage.

DISCUSSION

Effect of nitrogen levels on yield

Grain yield is the economic part of harvest, which mirrors the resultant effect of all factors that are influenced by different treatments. Different treatments positively influenced crop growth parameters and yield attributes resulting in better yield. It is the function of like number of grains $spike^{-1}$, number of effective tillers and spike length.

A close examination of the data (Table 1) under different nitrogen levels revealed that significantly higher yield (grain, straw and biological) was observed with the application of (N_4) 100% RDN which was statistically at par with (N_3) 75% RDN. It might be due to that yield of crop is result of different yield attributes like number of effective tillers, spike length, grains $spike^{-1}$ which directly influenced the grain and straw yield. Higher the yield attributes higher the yield. Nitrogen influences biomass synthesis and use sun energy for productivity of the plant which enhance the yield and yield contributing parameters. Similar observations were recorded by the several earlier workers in wheat Abedi *et al*. (2013), Chauhan *et al*. (2014), Sikarwar *et al*. (2022) and Ullah *et al*. (2018).

Effect of nitrogen levels on economics

The data (Table 2) clearly showed that among the nitrogen levels, (N_4) 100% RDN recorded significantly higher gross returns, net returns and B:C ratio which was statistically at par with the (N_3) 75% RDN. It might be due to the higher grain and straw yield said in above treatments. Similar findings were observed by Kamble and Todmal (2020).

Effect of foliar spray of nano urea on yield

The data (Table 1) showed significantly higher yield (grain, straw and biological) was recorded with the application of (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage which was statistically at par with (F_3) Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage. It might be due to the size of one nano urea particle is 30 nm which is very small from the stomatal opening of leaves. Due to its small size and unique surface properties, liquid nano urea is absorbed more effectively by plants when sprayed on their leaves which improves yield of crop. Similar findings were found by Chudasama *et al*. (2024), Gangwar *et al*. (2022).

Effect of foliar spray of nano urea on economics

The data (Table 2) showed significantly higher gross returns, net returns and B:C ratio was recorded with the application of (F_2) Foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage which was statistically at par with (F_3) Foliar spray of nano urea at jointing stage. It might be due to nano urea improves crop growth, yield characteristics as well as source-sink interactions and active photosynthetic activities, all of which have direct impact on output. Lower cultivation costs made it possible by reduced urea treatment and effective foliar nano fertilizer application. This boosted grain and straw yield and eventually higher net returns. Similar findings were observed by Kumar *et al*. (2020), Mehta and Bharat (2017).

CONCLUSION

On the basis of one year experiment it is to be concluded that application of 100% RDN along with foliar spray of nano urea at tillering stage @ 3 ml l^{-1} of water exerted significant improvement in yield and economics of wheat under mid hills of Himachal Pradesh.

Commented [T17]: Please also indicate here as Table 1 or 2.

Commented [T18]: Please also indicate here as Table 1 or 2.

Commented [T19]: It must be indicated to whom the paragraph belongs. Citation should be used in sentences containing information.

Table 1: Effect of nitrogen levels and nano urea on yield (kg ha^{-1}) of wheat

Treatments	Yield (Kg ha^{-1})			Harvest index (%)
	Grain yield	Straw yield	Biological yield	
Nitrogen Levels				
N_1 : Control	1764	3378	5142	34.59
N_2 : 50% RDN	2220	4049	6269	35.46
N_3 : 75% RDN	2491	4325	6816	36.44
N_4 : 100% RDN	2573	4410	6982	36.87
SEm±	52	127	147	0.83
LSD (p=0.05)	179	439	507	NS
Foliar spray of Nano Urea				
F_1 : CRI stage	1903	3500	5403	35.45
F_2 : Tillering stage	2501	4366	6867	36.25
F_3 : Jointing stage	2382	4255	6637	35.82
SEm±	42	82	120	0.77
LSD (p=0.05)	126	245	360	NS
Interaction (N x F)	NS	NS	NS	NS

Table 2: Effect of nitrogen levels and nano urea on economics (₹ ha^{-1}) of wheat

Treatments	Economics (₹ ha^{-1})			B:C ratio
	Cost of cultivation	Gross returns	Net returns	
Nitrogen Levels				
N_1 : Control	34767	57617	22850	0.66
N_2 : 50% RDN	35539	71690	36151	1.02
N_3 : 75% RDN	35925	79576	43650	1.22
N_4 : 100% RDN	36311	81951	45640	1.26
SEm±	-	1525	1525	0.04
LSD (p=0.05)	-	5277	5277	0.13
Foliar spray of Nano Urea				
F_1 : CRI stage	35636	61573	25938	0.72
F_2 : Tillering stage	35636	79543	43907	1.23
F_3 : Jointing stage	35636	77009	41374	1.16
SEm±	-	1166	1166	0.03
LSD (p=0.05)	-	3495	3495	0.10
Interaction (N x F)	-	NS	NS	NS

Commented [T20]: Lettering and groupings obtained as a result of statistical analyses should be given in the table.

Commented [T21]: Explanations of abbreviated expressions (such as NS) should be given below the table.

Commented [T22]: Lettering and groupings obtained as a result of statistical analyses should be given in the table.

Commented [T23]: Explanations of abbreviated expressions (such as NS) should be given below the table.

REFERENCES

Abedi T, Alemzadeh A, Kazemeini SA. Wheat yield and grain protein response to nitrogen amount and timing. Australian Journal of Crop Science. 2011; 5(3): 330-6.

Agricultural Statistics at Glance. Department of Agriculture and Farmer Welfare (Pp - 48) 2022.

Chauhan TM, Ali J, Singh SP, Singh SB. Effect of nitrogen and zinc nutrition on yield, quality and uptake of nutrients by wheat. Annals of Plant and Soil Research. 2014; 16(2): 98-101.

Chudasama SD, Usadadia VP, Kaswala AR, Patel KK, Chaudhary BJ, Shiyal VN. Influence of Liquid Nano Urea Fertilizer on Growth and Yield of Summer Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) under South Gujarat Conditions. International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. 2024; 14(6): 355-64.

Gangwar S, Singh RP, Mishra PK, Ahmad R, Singh AK. Effect of foliar application of nano-fertilizers on growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestiv*um L.). Advances in Bioresearch. 2022; 13(3): 190-3.

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [T24]: Its place in the article is unclear.

Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research, IRRI. A Wiley Publication, New York. 1984; 199-201.

Jasrotia P, Kashyap PL, Bhardwaj AK, Kumar S, Singh GP. Scope and applications of nanotechnology for wheat production: A review of recent advances. Wheat Barley Research. 2018; 10(1): 1-4.

Kamble BM and Todmal SM. Effect of different levels and sources of nitrogen on soil properties, nutrient uptake, and yield of wheat grown on saline soil. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2020; 8(1): 687-93.

Kannoj J, Jain D, Tomar M, Patidar R, Choudhary R. Effect of Nano Urea vs Conventional Urea on the Nutrient Content, Uptake and Economics of Black Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) along with Biofertilizers. In *Biological Forum–An International Journal* 2022; 14(2): 499-504.

Kumar Y, Tiwari KN, Nayak RK, Rai A, Singh SP, Singh AN, *et al*. Nanofertilizers for increasing nutrient use efficiency, yield and economic returns in important winter season crops of Uttar Pradesh. Indian Journal of Fertilisers. 2020; 16(8): 772-86.

Mehta S, Bharat R. Effect of integrated use of nano and non-nano fertilizers on yield and yield attributes of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2019; 8(12): 598-606.

Ojha A, Singh R, Sinha J. Effect of Nano Urea and Foliar Spray of Urea on Growth and Yield of Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L). International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. 2023; 13: 474-81.

Pathak V, Shrivastav S. Biochemical studies on wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2015; 4(3): 171-175.

Shewry PR, Halford NG, Belton PS, Tatham AS. The structure and properties of gluten: An elastic protein from wheat grain. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2002; 357(1418): 133- 42.

Sikarwar BP, Gupta D, Singh L. Effect of varying nitrogen levels and varieties on productivity and profitability of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) under rainfed condition. Annals of Plant and Soil Research. 2018; 20(1): 58-62.

Singh CM, Sharma PK, Kishor P, Mishra PK, Singh AP, Verma R, Raha P. Impact of integrated nutrient management on Growth, Yield and Nutrient Uptake by Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Asian Journal of Agricultural Research. 2011; 5(1): 76-82.

Ullah I, Ali N, Durrani S, Shabaz MA, Hafeez A, Ameer H, *et al*. Effect of different nitrogen levels on growth, yield and yield contributing attributes of wheat. International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Research. 2018; 9(9): 595-602.