Nanotech for Fertilizers and Nutrients - Improving nutrient use efficiency with nano-enabled fertilizers

Abstract

The development of nano-enabled fertilizers presents new opportunities to improve crop nutrient use efficiency and reduce environmental impacts of agriculture. Nanoparticles, nanocapsules, and nanoclays can be engineered to control the release rate of nutrients to better match crop demands over time. Slow-release nanofertilizers may enhance nutrient absorption by plants while mitigating nutrient losses to the environment. Additionally, nanofertilizers can facilitate co-delivery of nutrients, growth regulators, and pesticides, allowing for more precise crop management practices. This review synthesizes current research on synthesis techniques, characterization methods, and agronomic testing results for a range of nanofertilizer products. Key nutrient carriers reviewed include mesoporous silica nanoparticles, layered double hydroxides, cellulose nanocrystals, and halloysite nanotubes loaded with nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, and micronutrients. Release kinetics depend on nanofertilizer composition, size, and shape, as well as environmental conditions. Field studies indicate positive impacts of nanofertilizers on crop yield, nutrient use efficiency, and pest resistance compared to conventional fertilizer formulations. However, questions remain regarding large-scale feasibility, economic viability, environmental fate, and biological impacts of nano-enabled fertilizers. Ongoing interdisciplinary research across the domains of materials science, agronomy, ecology, and economics is required to develop nanofertilizers that maximize production efficiency while minimizing risks.

Keywords:Nanofertilizers, Nutrient Use Efficiency, Slow Release, Nanoparticle Carriers, Crop Yield

Introduction

Fertilizers play a critical role in achieving the crop yields needed to feed the world's growing population. It is estimated that fertilizers are responsible for supporting almost half of the global population (1). However, conventional fertilizer use faces major efficiency issues; less than 50% of applied nitrogen is taken up by crops, while the remainder accumulates in soils or losses occur through leaching, denitrification, volatilization and surface runoff, contributing to environmental problems such as eutrophication, groundwater pollution, soil acidification and climate change (2). There are also concerns over long-term phosphorus security and micronutrient deficiencies in over 50% of soils globally (3).

Nanotechnology presents opportunities to engineer smart fertilizer systems that can overcome some of these challenges. Nano-enabled fertilizers aim to enhance nutrient use efficiencies by controlling the release rate and timing to better match crop demands over the growing season (4). This includes nano-encapsulations, nanoparticles, nanoclays and polymer coatings that regulate solubility and provide triggered or sustained nutrient release in response to moisture, pH, temperature or other stimuli (5). Site-specific placement and minimizing undesirable transformations of nutrients may also reduce losses to the environment (6). Additionally, nanofertilizers can facilitate co-delivery with other agrochemicals, growth regulators and bio-stimulants for precision crop management (7).

This review synthesizes current research on synthesis techniques, characterization methods and testing of a range of nanofertilizer carriers and composites. Key materials investigated include mesoporous silica nanoparticles (8), halloysite nanotubes (9), layered double hydroxides (10), cellulose nanocrystals (11), starch nanocomposites (12) and carbon nanotubes loaded with macronutrients, micronutrients and fungicides/pesticides. We analyze release kinetics, nutrient availability, yield impacts and cost-effectiveness for different nano-enabled fertilizers across laboratory, greenhouse and field studies. Questions also remain regarding large-scale feasibility, environmental fate and biological impacts which much be addressed through ongoing interdisciplinary research across agronomy, soil science, ecology and economics (13).

Factors contributing to low nutrient use efficiency

Conventional fertilizer formulations suffer from very low nutrient use efficiency, with less than 50% of applied nitrogen and 25% of applied phosphorus taken up by crops (14). The remainder accumulates in soils, leaches into groundwater, or gets lost to the atmosphere via volatilization and denitrification (15). This represents not only an economic loss for farmers but causes wider environmental damage.

A key factor underlying poor fertilizer efficiency is the mismatch between the timing and quantity of nutrient release versus crop demand over the growing season (16). Soluble inorganic fertilizers like urea and ammonium phosphates rapidly dissociate when applied to soils (17). Up to 60% of nitrogen can volatilize as ammonia within days, which also acidifies soils upon nitrification (18). Such large fluxes exceed the nutrient absorption capacity of developing crop root systems (19). Water infiltration through soils likewise leads to leaching losses of highly mobile nitrate anions and cations like potassium down the soil profile beyond the rhizosphere region (20). As crop growth plateaus or during fallow periods, residual nutrients remain susceptible to further environmental losses rather than being stored in soils (21).

Environmental impacts of nutrient runoff and leaching

Excess nitrogen and phosphorus from fertilizers entering ground and surface waters is the primary driver of eutrophication, hypoxia and harmful algal blooms globally (22). This includes iconic systems like the Gulf of Mexico’s “Dead Zone” as well as degradation of 64% of U.S. estuaries (23). Phosphorus is also responsible for freshwater toxic cyanobacteria blooms affecting drinking water safety for over 180 million Americans annually (24). Elevated nitrate levels in drinking water from fertilizers likewise pose health threats and require expensive treatment to meet federal safety standards, costing over $1.7 billion annually in the U.S. Corn Belt alone (25). In terms of gaseous losses, fertilizer nitrous oxide emissions represent 5% of total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions as this compound possesses 300 times the heat-trapping potential of carbon dioxide (26).

Ongoing reactive nitrogen pollution poses one of the most urgent global change issues. Halving nitrogen waste by 2050 is essential to meet international climate and biodiversity goals as well as water quality objectives like the U.S Clean Water Act (27,28). Yet increasing agricultural productivity to feed 10 billion people by 2050 may require a 20% increase in global nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizer use (29). This underscores the imperative to develop smarter fertilizer technologies that radically improve nutrient use efficiencies.

List 1. Major environmental impacts linked to nutrient runoff/leaching from fertilizers

Environmental impact	**Primary cause**	**Key effects**
Coastal eutrophication and hypoxia	Nitrogen and phosphorus enrichment	Gulf of Mexico “Dead Zone,” degradation of 64% of US estuaries
Freshwater harmful algal blooms	Phosphorus enrichment	Toxic cyanobacterial blooms, drinking water contamination
Nitrate contamination of drinking water	Nitrate leaching	Threats to human health, removal costs >$1.7 billion annually in US Corn Belt
Soil acidification	Ammonia volatilization and nitrification	Reduced crop productivity, aluminum mobilization
Climate change	Nitrous oxide emissions	300 times the heat-trapping potential of carbon dioxide
Biodiversity loss	Nitrogen deposition, aquatic toxicity from algae	Disruption of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems

Size, shape and surface functionality

The nanoscale dimensions and tailored surface chemistries of engineered nanoparticles enable more effective delivery and utilization of nutrient payloads compared to traditional fertilizers (30). Nanoparticles refer to materials with at least one dimension between 1-100 nm. At this minute scale, a high specific surface area to volume ratio allows for increased loading, reactivity and mobility (31). Manipulating size also impacts release kinetics. For example, mesoporous silica nanoparticles just 50 nm in diameter demonstrated over 90% nutrient release in soils within 4 days, while 150 nm particles of the same composition released only 50% over 30+ days (32).

Nanoparticle morphology likewise plays a key role. Rod-shaped nanofertilizers can better penetrate plant cell walls and membranes compared to spheres, enhancing uptake and utilization within tissues (33). Layered double hydroxide (LDH) platelet nanoclays also orient parallel to cell surfaces for efficient ion exchange of nutrients like nitrate (34). High aspect ratio nanotubes and nanofibers similarly allow directed movement through porous media like soils as well as access to fine regions of plant roots hairs and vasculature (35).

Surface functionalization of nanoparticles enables both active targeting and triggered release capabilities (36). Bio-inspired functional groups like amino acids and polysaccharides provide selective binding and transport through cell membranes, while also stabilizing particles against agglomeration (37). pH-responsive polymer coatings serve as gatekeepers that swell open with acidification during root exudation or lysosomal uptake, providing targeted intracellular delivery (38). Redox-sensitive linkers likewise release nutrients via cleavage in the presence of reactive oxygen species during seed germination and early growth stages (39). Overall the advanced design space of nano-enabled fertilizers provides dynamic control mechanisms difficult to achieve with conventional fertilizers.

Encapsulation methods and controlled nutrient release

Core-shell morphologies containing nutrients encapsulated within a protective outer layer offer key advantages for controlled release applications (40). The shell shields inner payload, allowing tailored diffusion or stimulated delivery. Layer thickness directly influences the release duration and kinetics. For example, a 5 nm coating of ethyl cellulose on phosphorus nanoparticles enabled 30 days of linear sustained release in soils with high mobility, while uncoated particles fully dissolve in just 2 days (41). Conformal polymer layers also reduce particle agglomeration and interactions with soil constituents to prevent nutrient immobilization or toxicity issues (42).

Various bio-compatible and/or biodegradable polymers utilized in drug delivery systems including poly(lactic acid) (PLA), poly-ε-caprolactone (PCL), chitosan and alginate have been investigated to generate nanofertilizers with sustained release profiles over 30-90 days (43). Layer-by-layer deposition likewise allows shells with tailored permeability, including clay-polymer nanocomposites with diffusion tuned by layer number, order and cross-linking (44). Metallic coatings such as Zn on boron particles also provide pH-triggered release, as the shell slowly dissolves exposing the core in acidic environments (45).

The encapsulation of nutrients into nanocarriers enables protection from undesirable processing within soils while extending availability to crop roots. Programmed release further matches nutrient supply with physiological demand over the critical early growth stages, lowering losses and improving fertilizer efficiency (46). Nanoparticles likewise facilitate combined delivery of immiscible nutrient ions, growth promoters, and agrochemicals for more balanced and responsive crop nutrition and soil management (47).

Nano-coated fertilizers

Nano-coated fertilizers involve the encapsulation of traditional soluble fertilizers within protective nanoparticle shells to temporarily prevent nutrient release. Coatings provide a physical barrier to control solubilization until environmental triggers like moisture, temperature or pH cause shell dissolution or swelling (48). Nano-coatings can also minimize undesirable fertilizer transformations after soil application (49). Common coating materials include sulfur, synthetic polymers, plant biopolymers, silica, and mineral clays applied via techniques like hydrothermal treatment, sol-gel synthesis, electrostatic complexation and co-precipitation onto fertilizer surfaces (50).

Sulfur nano-coatings represent the most widely commercialized class of nano-coated fertilizers with products such as Sulf-N® and K-Ensure® S dominating U.S. and Chinese markets (51). A 50-150 nm sulfur skin allows gradual dissolution driven by microbial oxidation and soil respiratory CO2 over 30-100 days post-application versus just 1-7 days for uncoated urea (52). Field trials show 30-40% increases in nitrogen uptake efficiency and crop yields for rice, wheat and corn with reductions in nitrous oxide emissions up to 80% (53).

Synthetic polymer nano-coatings similarly enable controlled nutrient release by hindering diffusion or deteriorating at predetermined rates in soil environments (54). Materials like polyethylene glycol (PEG), polyurethane and polyacrylic acids generally biodegrade over periods of weeks to months (55). However, many petroleum-based polymers accumulate or release non-biodegradable byproducts during decomposition with potential toxicity issues (56). As such, bio-based coatings from polysaccharides, proteins, lipids offer more sustainable options (57). Chitosan nano-layers around urea secondary granules for instance increased maize yields by 25% while halving ammonia volatilization and nitrate leaching losses (58).

Inorganic coatings also show promise. Silica gels delay phosphate dissolution up to 20 days post-soil injection based on coating thickness, allowing better distribution in the root zone before precipitation reactions can occur (59). Acid-treated clay films similarly provided 30 day controlled release of potassium and micronutrients from composts (60). pH-responsive zinc oxide nano-coatings on boron particles likewise inhibit nutrient availability during storage but degrade with rhizosphere acidification (61). Overall protective encapsulation of fertilizers into nanomaterials provides passive release mechanisms geared toward solving issues with excessive nutrient loss pathways.

Nano-composite fertilizers

Nano-composites integrate nanoparticles themselves as nutrient carriers rather than just surface coatings. High porosity nano-carriers act as reservoirs to hosting fertilizer ions or molecules within structural cavities or chemically in lattices, expanding controlled release duration from weeks to potential years (62). Diverse organic and inorganic nanomaterials demonstrate favorable properties as composite plant nutrient vehicles.

Layered double hydroxides (LDHs) show particular promise for anionic nutrients like nitrates, phosphates and sulfates (63). LDHs comprise positively charged metal hydroxide nano-sheet layers with exchangeable charge-balancing anions in interlayer pores. Ion exchange allows for extremely high nitrate payloads exceeding 50% by weight in optimized MgAl-NO3 LDHs—5-10 times conventional fertilizers (64). Gradual displacement reactions from pores then provide constant nitrate diffusion fluxes tailorable from days to years by tuning LDH layer chemistry, crystallite size, interlayer spacing and purity (65). LDH nano-composites also enable stacking of supplements like nutrients Mo, Zn or Cu along with nitrates or phosphates for synergistic and balanced delivery (66).

Silica nano-composites similarly utilize a porous structure with incredibly high 600-1000 m2/g internal surface areas and 1-10 nm tunable pore diameters to capture soluble fertilizer ions (67). Mesoporous and hollow silica particles act as a floating nutrient reservoir upon soil application, steadily releasing cargo over 30-90 days matched with plant uptake rates. Tailoring glass chemistry, pore sizes/volumes and pH responsiveness through organo-functionalization allows programmable multi-cycle or target-triggered fertilizer release (68). Silica composites also stabilize against nutrient leaching. Urea-silica particles decreased nitrogen losses over 90% versus unmodified urea in flooded rice soils owing to slowed hydrolysis (69).

Organic nanomaterials like hydrogels and biopolymers offer additional environmentally friendly nano-carrier options (70). Cross-linked proteins or polysaccharides form polymer networks with fertilizers entrapped internally then exhibit swelling and shrinking responses to soil moisture changes for diffusion controlled release over 40-60 days (71). Nanocellulose fibers similarly act as scaffolds for ammonium/nitrate adsorption and retention, reducing leaching by 60% or more (72). Researchers are also engineering plant virus capsid shells, which naturally encapsulate and spread genetic material, as tunable nutrient transport vectors programmed to recognize and penetrate plant root tissues (73).

Nanocapsule based fertilizers

Core-shell nanocapsules represent an emerging direction for nano-enabled fertilizers taking inspiration from drug delivery systems. Unique from nano-coated particles that simply overlay traditional crystals, nanocapsules engineer specialized carrier and shell chemistries tailored for agrochemical loading, protection and programmed nutrient release functionalities (74). Common core materials include lipids, biodegradable polymers like poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) and liquid emulsions loaded with water soluble nutrients. Shells then consist of additional polymer layers, silica or metallic oxide diffusion barriers.

Lipid-based nano-fertilizers utilize molecules similar to cell membranes in nature for high biocompatibility and timed deterioriation (75). Formulations containing phospholipids, cholesterol and cationic oily phases self-assemble into colloidal structures like micelles, emulsions and liposomes with capacities for both hydrophilic and hydrophobic agrochemical payloads. Hydrophobic pesticide nanocapsule suspensions demonstrated 70% efficiency at 1/20th standard dosage, owing to preferential diffusion through plant cuticle layers (76). Loading multiple nutrients or supplementing micronutrients like Zn also helps overcome low solubility limitations (77). Programmed shell oxidation, enzyme/light-triggered cleavage or pH-induced charge shifts further enable precisely controlled nutrient release from weeks to months after soil or foliar application (78). However, economic feasibility given lipid source and purification costs could limit commercial potential.

Synthetic polymer capsules similarly utilize customized shells to govern cargo release rates and environmental protection. For instance, liquid urea ammonium nitrate solutions encapsulated in 1-10 μm polyurethane shells exhibited linear nitrogen release over 100 days—twice the longevity of leading polymer coated urea fertilizers (79). Fortifying shells with reactive titanium dioxide provided remote triggered release capabilities. Water shell decomposition then exposes nanopores for active diffusion tailored to crop demands and timing (80). Owing to mild preparation conditions and adaptable raw materials, polymeric nano-capsules present simple fabrication potential. But targeted efforts may still be needed to prevent persistence or accumulation from non-biodegradable breakdown products (81).

Nanofertilizers for nitrate ions

Nitrate represents the primary nitrogen source in most fertilizers, yet its mobility facilitates rapid leaching losses before utilization by crops. Encapsulating nitrates into nano-carriers can greatly enhance retention and plant availability in soils. High anion exchange capacity nanoclays for example reduced leaching of nitrates up to 300% versus standard nitrate salts

(82). Gradual interlayer displacement into soils then allows sustained release over 30-90 days matched to crop demand (83). Organo-modified nanoclays also enable co-delivery with micronutrients like zinc or copper to balance supply (84).

Silica nano-composites present another promising approach to control nitrate delivery kinetics. Mesoporous and hollow silica particlesloaded with potassium nitrate demonstrated 80-90% nutrient retention after 3 days exposure to leaching rain events (85). Pore structure tailoring further enabled linear or triggered nitrate release over 30-90 days growth periods. Coating degradation via sunlight or soil enzymes also promoted secondary bursts after initial loading to recharge root zones (86).

Chitosan nano-hydrogels similarly provided sustained nitrate release with high crop utilization. Crosslinking chitosan polymer chains with nutrients entrapped inside generated colloidal gels injectable as a soil amendment (87). Subsequent swelling in soil moisture allows diffusion of cargo over 40+ days (88). Chitosan nano-composites are also biodegradable and derive from waste shrimp shells for environmentally friendly sourcing (89).

Nano-enabled nitrate fertilizers additionally demonstrated yield, nitrogen efficiency and environmental enhancements versus traditional formulations in field studies. Maize treated with nitrate loaded mesoporous silica nanoparticles for example achieved 20% higher yields and 30% greater nitrogen accumulation using 70% less overall fertilizer inputs (90). LDH nano-composites also reduced nitrous oxide emissions from soil bacterial nitrification up to 65% compared to ammonium nitrate treatments (91). Realizing such agronomic and ecological benefits at commercial scales however requires additional translational research.

Ammonium nanoparticles

In contrast to mobile nitrates requiring controlled release carriers, ammonium cations readily adsorb to negatively charged soil particles, preventing leaching but also limiting availability in the root zone. Protecting ammonium ions in nanoparticle reservoirs can facilitate greater mobility and balanced delivery to match crop nitrogen needs over growth stages (92). For instance, nano-zeolites increased corn yield and nitrogen utilization over 50% more than conventionally complexed ammonium fertilizers (93). Micropores within the aluminosilicate crystal structure protected ammonium ions from soil fixation and degradation reactions (94). Programmed pore loading concentrations and sizes also enabled release tailoring from 10-60 days (95).

Polymer coated ammonium phosphate nanoparticles provided both controlled solubilization and reduced losses from acid soil generation. Slow hydrolysis of the urea component inside nanocapsules provided extended nitrogen delivery to wheat roots with particle shells preventing soil interactions and volatilization during the month-long crop trial (96). Field testing at scaled production levels remains needed to confirm consistent enhancements.

Use of ammonia gas directly offers additional opportunities as nanoparticles can temporarily capture the compound for soil delivery. Porous nano-carrier adsorption prevents gas loss while converting feeds like anhydrous ammonia into transportable solid forms (97). Materials including nano-vermiculates, biochars and nanocellulose demonstrate capacity for binding 10-30% of their mass as ammonia for controlled discharge in moist soils over 30-90 days

(98). Managing hazards from pressurized ammonia requires extensive safety precautions however.

Table 1. Comparison of nano-enabled and traditional nitrogen fertilizers

Nutrient form	**Release duration**	**Leaching losses**	**Volatilization**	**Crop utilization**
Soluble (NO3-, NH4+)	Rapid (1-7 days)	High	Moderate	Low
Polymer coatings	Intermediate (1-3 months)	Moderate	Low	Intermediate
Nano-composites	Slow (1-3 months)	Low	Minimal	High
Nano-capsules	Very slow (3-12 months)	Very low	Minimal	Potentially high

Phosphorus nanocapsules and nanocomposites

Unlike more mobile nitrogen forms, soluble phosphates rapidly precipitate after soil application into poorly available compounds. Protecting phosphorus inside nanocarriers can thus improve crop uptake while also reducing algal-fueling runoff to surface waters. Encapsulation within biodegradable polymer shells enables extended mineralization to free phosphorus over 30-90 days vs. hours for bare particles (99). Natural polymers like alginate, chitosan and lignin demonstrate particular promise as shell materials given low ecotoxicity (100). Liquid emulsions containing up to 40% phosphorus by mass likewise utilize nanodroplet carriers for retention and resistance against soil sorption/leaching (101).

Layered double hydroxide (LDH) nanoclays also emerged recently as efficient phosphorus nano-carriers leveraging high anion exchange capacity (102). Interlayer phosphate incorporation exceeding 50% by weight prevents precipitation reactions for sustained soil mobility and bioavailability over months (103). Positive impacts on tomato growth, yield and phosphorus content resulted from LDH nanoclay treatments under pot trials (104). Field demonstration is still needed given unoptimized hydrothermal synthesis methods.

Silica nano-composites present additional options for enhanced phosphorus retention and efficiency. Hollow mesoporous silica microspheres stored nearly double the phosphate load versus traditional triple super phosphate particles (105). Gradual diffusion from inside pores alongside pH responsive gatekeepers to trigger cargo release increased soil phosphorus levels almost three-fold through 40 days versus bare fertilizers (106). Up to 40% yield gains resulted for wheat and corn crops in repeated greenhouse studies (107). Scaling remains key to eventually realize such large improvements commercially at justifiable input costs.

Nano-enabled integration of typically incompatible nutrient ions also promotes synergistic uptake. Potassium orthophosphates notoriously precipitate when blended with soluble nitrate, calcium or magnesium sources (108). However encapsulation within silica nanoparticles enabled stable combined formulations with simultaneous phosphorus and nitrogen release profiles in soil column trials (109). Co-delivery of phosphorus and insecticides likewise boosted pest resistance and yield outcomes due to preferential nanoparticle penetration through protective leaf cuticles (110). Continued research should explore diverse multi-functional nutrient payload opportunities.

Table 2. Select nanocarriers investigated for enhanced phosphorus fertilizers

Nanoparticle	**Payload**	**Release duration**	**Field studies?**
Poly lactic-co-glycolic acid	40% by weight	30-90 days	Greenhouse
Layered double hydroxides	50% by weight	Months	Pending
Silica (hollow, mesoporous)	Up to 95% by weight	Months	Greenhouse
Lipid vesicles emulsions	30% by weight	Weeks	Pending

Micronutrient nanocarriers

While macronutrients nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium dominate fertilizer formulations by mass, adequate micronutrient levels also remain essential for balanced plant nutrition. However micronutrients including iron, zinc, copper and manganese demonstrate low mobility and bioavailability in soils (111). As well, direct soil applications face rapid immobilization reactions or precipitation into biologically unusable forms (112). Encapsulating micronutrients into nano-carriers helps address these challenges through enhanced stability, mobility and controlled release properties (113).

Polymer nanocapsules, nano-emulsions and layer-by-layer assembled nano-coatings show particular promise to boost micronutrient utilization (114). Negatively charged phosphonate polymers bound to zinc ions or iron oxide nanoparticles for example prevented metal precipitation after soil addition (115). Gradual polymer degradation subsequently freed micronutrients for sustained plant uptake over 30 days with 2-3 times more bioaccumulation than chloride salts (116). Chitosan nano-coatings similarly boosted iron nanoparticle mobility in model plant growth assays (117). Such shell protection maintains nutrients in bioavailable states between application and assimilation into root tissues.

Inorganic nano-composites also effectively elevate micronutrient use efficiency. Porous silica reservoirs concentrated zinc fertilizer levels 10-fold over conventional inputs to overcome low solubility limitations after soil dispersal (118). Mesopores further stabilized zinc ions against reactions while enabling moisture-triggered diffusion into root zones (119). Zinc-silica nanofertilizers correspondingly elevated wheat shoot biomass and grain zinc content 2-3 times over zinc sulfate treatments (120). As nano-enabled co-formulations with macronutrients additionally demonstrate synergistic plant responses, optimizing blended nano-micronutrient carriers should remain an active area of investigation (121).

Table 3. Nanocarriers researched for enhancing micronutrient fertilizers

Nanomaterial	**Micronutrients**	**Plant Yield Boost**

Nanomaterial	**Micronutrients**	**Plant Yield Boost**
Polyphosphonate polymers	Zn, Fe	2-3x higher
Silica particles	Zn	2-3x higher
Layered double hydroxides	Cu, Mn	30-40% higher
Chitosan coatings	Fe	60% higher

Stimuli-responsive mechanisms

Rather than just slow release carriers, emerging smart nanofertilizers utilize built-in sensors and triggers to actively detect plant demands and environmental conditions for targeted cargo delivery. Bio-inspired response mechanisms enable nutrient discharge on-demand from nanocarriers that protect against undesirable soil losses (122). Materials including polymers, lipids and hydrogels demonstrate pronounced property changes in reaction to moisture, temperature, pH or other external stimuli (123). Remote activation by light, ultrasound or magnetic fields further extends precise spatiotemporal control over nanofertilizer activation and nutrient availability tailored to growth requirements (124).

Hydrogel nano-composites specifically hold great potential for intelligent nutrient release capabilities (125). Networks of crosslinked hydrophilic polymer chains form colloidal gels encapsulating fertilizer molecules while remaining injectable as concentrated liquids for field dispersal (126). Subsequent swelling induced by soil moisture infiltration then expands meshes for diffusion controlled cargo discharge over weeks. Further tuning hydrogel thickness, degradation rate and stimulus responsiveness facilitates optimization to soil type and crop needs (127). Ammonium polyacrylate nano-hydrogels for example enabled two moisture-triggered nitrogen bursts activated by natural rainfall patterns in rice paddies—delivering nutrients on-demand at key growth stages (128).

Liposomes present another bio-inspired approach using phospholipids to form nano-vesicles for triggered nutrient release (129). Fusion of cationic vesicles under acidic rhizosphere conditions provides pH-gated discharge after root uptake (130). Oxidation responsive chemical linkers installed in vesicle shells also showed cleavage when exposed to plant-secreted enzymes or root exudates (131). Resultant bursting released phosphorus nanoparticles for timed assimilation during early growth. Cationic liposomes further hold promise for direct foliar adhesion and penetration through leaf cuticles for systemic transport (132). Combined pesticide loading additionally boosted bioactivity and yield outcomes due to preferential diffusion (133). Such multi-functional nutrient-pesticide nano-formulations should see continued development (134).

Remote stimulus mechanisms permit more precise spatial control over where and when nano-fertilizers activate across entire fields (135). For instance, near infrared-absorbing carbon nanotube composites embedded in silica microparticles generated microscopic internal heating sufficient to melt polymer gates blocking pores and trigger nutrient discharge (136). Scan-line application at targeted crop rows then unlocked encapsulated nitrogen with minimal losses. Engineers also demonstrated reversible magnetization of iron oxide doped nano-composites by external alternating fields (137). This capability could concentrate dynamic nano-fertilizers in plant root zones then retrieve remnants post-harvest for recycling (138). Further adoption of external triggers should progress as research continues.

Table 4. Stimulus-responsive mechanisms for smart nano-fertilizers

Activation trigger	Nanomaterial	Control precision	Field testing?
Soil moisture	Hydrogels	Low	Demonstrated
Temperature	Polymers	Low	Pending
pH	Liposomes	Intermediate	Pot trials
Enzymes	Nanoparticles	Intermediate	Pending
Light	Composites	High	Demonstrated
Magnetic fields	Doped films	High	Small studies

Nanoscale interactions in the rhizosphere

Despite the many benefits highlighted thus far, questions remain regarding the environmental fate and biological impacts of engineered nanomaterials in agroecosystems (139). Rhizosphere interactions between nano-fertilizers and soil biogeochemistry, plant genes, and microbiota govern mobility, uptake efficiencies and toxicity risks (140). Elucidating such mechanisms in realistic soils could promote safer by design principles to guide this technology forward.

Key processes requiring further study include sorption mechanisms regulating nanoparticle retention versus bioavailability in bulk/rhizosphere soils (141). Surface coatings for instance strongly dictate soil adhesion, with cationic polymers demonstrating much greater immobilization than anionic or neutral forms (142). Soil organic matter content and pH also greatly impacted mesoporous silica nano-composite mobility—highlighting the role of electrostatic conditions (143). Interestingly, one study found engineered nanoparticles accumulated in plant root tissues at 10-50 times higher levels relative to shoots, suggesting possible active transport processes from soils driven by plant molecular recognition (144).

Microbial interactions further mediate nano-enabled fertilizer dissolution, precipitation, redox状态 and ultimate bioavailability for crop utilization (145). Synergies with plant growth promoting rhizobacteria could enhance nutrient acquisition efficiencies (146). But toxicity issues are also possible if nanoparticles disrupt essential soil biota. Silver nanoparticles for example reduced soil enzymatic activity and respiration at just 1-100 mg/kg levels (147). Appropriate risk screening should thus cover realistic exposure doses and soil types given high sensitivity (148). On the flip side, nano-encapsulation of pesticides/herbicides inside triggered release carriers may lessen ecosystem impacts associated with excessive agrochemical application (149).

Testing uptake and phytotoxicity

Standardized protocols are critically needed evaluate nano-enabled fertilizer uptake, translocation, accumulation and potential toxicity in crops (150). Greenhouse studies allow detailed investigation of compatibility with soil conditions and plant varieties under controlled settings (151). radiolabeling nanoparticles with isotopic tracers facilitates tracking distribution and transformations between soil pore water, root tissues and shoots (152). Analytical imaging of plant cell ultrastructure also reveals intracellular trafficking mechanisms or organelle disruption signaling toxicity issues (153).

Multiple indicators should be assessed over full growth cycles to cover acute, chronic and delayed impacts on central processes like germination, biomass, yield, photosynthesis and nutritional quality (154). Oxidative stress markers similarly diagnose sub-lethal effects from reactive oxygen species that may impair long term plant health without initial visible symptoms (155). As toxicity pathways likely depend on nanomaterial identity, size and surface properties, high throughput screening platforms offer opportunities to survey broad formulation variants with future machine learning to optimize safety (156). Finally ongoing monitoring following harvest will determine residual accumulation and broader ecosystem contamination risks that could inhibit adoption even for highly beneficial nano-fertilizers. Robust field trials are ultimately essential to validate safety and efficacy (157).

Table 5. Metrics for nano-enabled fertilizer bio-compatibility testing

Assay	**Measures**	**Technique**
Seed germination	Viability	Grow out study
Biomass	Yield precursor	Gravimetry
Plant height	Development	Image analysis
Chlorophyll	Photosynthesis	Pigment extraction
Nutrient content	Uptake	ICP-MS, MRI
ROS markers	Oxidative stress	Histology, gene expression
Microbiome	Soil health	Amplicon sequencing

Design Considerations for Targeted Crops

Tailoring nanofertilizers for major crop types

Realizing the potential of nano-enabled fertilizers ultimately requires customization to meet the nutrient demands, soil interactions and plant uptake pathways unique to each crop. Controlled release profiles should match timing for critical growth windows while avoiding toxicity at germination (158). Nanoparticle physical properties like size, shape and surface chemistry additionally govern soil retention, biocompatibility and movement through vascular tissues (159). As such, here we highlight nano-fertilizer engineering opportunities tailored to several major staple crops and plantation species.

Rice accounts for over 20% of global caloric intake, though intensive flooding leads to high nitrogen losses (160). Ammonium loaded zeolites demonstrated 50% higher nitrogen efficiency and 20% yield gains in rice by stabilizing availability between flooding periods (161). Lipid vesicles similarly enabled precise nutrient timing activated by water infiltrations

(162). Up to 40% phosphorus nano-fertilizer reductions also maintained yields, benefitting water quality (163).

Wheat meets 20% of food energy demands but viruses impart billions in annual losses (164). Silica nanoparticles carrying fungicidal payloads alongside nutrients in a single delivery system boosted yield by 15% and enhanced disease resistance six-fold better than sequential fertilizer and pesticide applications (165). Controlled release also reduced leaching into groundwater supplies.

Soybean fixes nitrogen but requires phosphorus amendments for vigorous growth. Phytase enzymes encapsulated in plant virus capsids maintained catalytic activity in soils for 30 days while steadily liberating organic phosphorus and micronutrients otherwise inaccessible to crops (166). Enzyme-powered nano-bioreactors hence present self-sufficient nutrient production.

Potatoes rank fourth for global food consumption though clays and nutrient deficits lower yields (167). Cationic polymer coatings enabled amended positively charged iron and zinc to bind otherwise repulsive soil particles (168). This prevented leaching while placing nutrients within plant root access zones rather than irreversibly absorbed onto clay surfaces.

Coffee trees demand nitrogen and potassium but steep slopes cause runoff issues (169). Hydrogel nano-composite injections administered just 20% of normal fertilizer volumes yet sustained release over 90 days enabled 30% higher nutrient recovery (170). Positive yield and size outcomes resulted with just 10% of typical fertilizer inputs.

Sugarcane supplies 80% of global sugar but soils accumulate toxic aluminum ions limiting productivity (171). Programmed release nano-coatings concentrated corrective calcium and magnesium minerals at developing root zones over months while excluding immobilization or precipitation in soils (172). This alleviated toxicity and boosted sugar yields over 20% in acidic soils.

Citrus fruits show perpetual harvests but salinity reduces size and quality (173). Polymer encapsulated gibberellic acid enhanced peel color and fruit weight by 50-60% via sustained plant hormone activity regulating development and stress factors (174). Nutrient loaded nanoparticles also counteracted chloride impacts.

Overall tailoring size, charge, shell properties and loaded cargoes to crop-specific fertilization challenges and rhizosphere interactions remains critical to translate nano-enabled strategies from initial proofs of concept towards eventual widespread adoption.

Table 6. Nanotech opportunities aligned with major crops

Crop	**Key issues**	**Nano-enabled solutions**
Rice	Flood induced leaching	Zeolite ammonium carriers
Wheat	Pest damage, leaching	Silica fungicide composites
Soybean	Low organic phosphorus	Enzyme nano-bioreactors
Potato	Clay immobilization	Polymer coated micronutrients

Crop	Key issues	Nano-enabled solutions
Coffee	Slope runoff	Hydrogel nano-composites
Sugarcane	Al toxicity	Programmed nano-coatings
Citrus	Salinity stress	Polymer growth regulator capsules

Manufacturing and commercialization pathways for nano-enabled fertilizers:

Scalable production methods

Realizing the promise of nano-enhanced crop nutrition requires economical and sustainable large-scale manufacturing methods. Lab-based proof of concept synthesis techniques frequently utilize expensive reagents, caustic solvents and low batch yields unsuitable for commercial volumes. Cross-disciplinary collaborations with chemical engineers now seek greener nano-fertilizer fabrication amenable to scale up (175).

Supercritical CO2 offers a non-toxic processing medium supporting 10-1000x higher nanoparticle yields under gentle temperature and pressure conditions (176). Bio-derived compounds also replace petroleum feedstocks as surfactants for particle size and shape control (177). Additional green chemistry approaches utilize plant extracts or waste materials like chitosan as benign capping agents (178).

Flash nanoprecipitation similarly enables nanoparticle self-assembly by rapidly mixing precursors streams then extracting particles from continuous flows without intensive post-processing (179). Photocatalysis methods driven by sunlight also avoid electricity demands while leveraging renewable feedstocks (180). Electrospinning constitutes another efficient technique utilizing electric fields to continuously spin polymer nanofibers loaded with agrochemicals from liquid precursors (181).

Modular reactors correspondingly allow precise tuning of synthesis conditions like temperature, flow rates and ingredient mixing crucial for particle uniformity (182). Inline sensors further grant real-time feedback for quality control alongside machine learning algorithms optimizing configurations (183). These adaptable plant designs will rapidly translate scaling calculations from batch to continuous throughput.

Combined top-down and bottom-up manufacturing steps additionally augment productivity. High shear fluid processors first break down macroscale fertilizer particles then reconstitute uniform nanoscale composites (184). Layer-by-layer assembly also enables automation of surface coatings tailored to desired functionality (185). Integration with existing infrastructure likewise minimizes costs. Spray drying nano-fertilizer emulsions onto traditional granules imparts enhanced behaviours leveraging accessible technology (186).

Economic feasibility analysis

Technoeconomic modelling predicts nano-enabled fertilizers could achieve break-even costs between \$0.55-0.85 per kg at only 3% market adoption if synthesizing 10 thousand metric tons annually via the above scalable methods combined with modest product pricing increases over conventional alternatives (187). Reduced nutrient losses and improved fertilizer efficiency should also bolster farm profits to offset higher input costs. Net global economic benefits may reach $10-20 billion annually by 2030 alongside food security and sustainability gains based on market uptake modelling (188).

However uncertainties remain regarding true cost factors and agronomic value. Sourcing adequate nano-processed material quantities poses challenges (189). Complex quality control and safety evaluations similarly add expenses versus traditional fertilizers (190). Few analyses consider full environmental life cycles covering resource demands through end-of-life. As regulations evolve, treatment as pesticide-like specialty products could limit applications (191). Market surveys also indicate grower hesitations citing perceived usage difficulties or insufficient field trial demonstrations at this nascent stage (192).

Public acceptance constitutes an additional hurdle if negative perceptions spread regarding nanotechnology without proper messaging (193). Engaging stakeholders across value chains from innovators to farmers to consumers can align advances with needs and priorities (194). Inclusive communication of realistic benefits and risks remains vital so that nano-enabled fertilizers avoid past controversies like GMOs (195). Careful advancement guided by transparency principles provides routes to responsible commercial translation.

Table 7. Pitch for nano-enhanced fertilizer products

Benefit	**Evidence**
Reduced losses	50% lower leaching/runoff
Improved efficiency	20-40% greater nutrient usage
Higher yields	10-30% observed in trials
Cost savings	20-50% lower inputs
Environmental	Less eutrophication
User convenience	Single application, season-long release

Policy and Regulatory Landscape

Registration and approval processes

While offering immense promise, questions have emerged around oversight to ensure nano-enabled fertilizers and pesticides undergo adequate safety evaluations prior to market release. Regulators face challenges handling materials not squarely addressed by existing chemical or product categories (196). For instance in the U.S., the EPA regulates conventional fertilizers as general use items while pesticides require formal registration analyzing risks (197). Whether nanoscale engineering confers sufficient novelty to mandate additional procedures remains debated.

Most jurisdictions currently apply nano-specific modifications to established processes (198). The EU's plant protection products regulations for instance require formal submission of nanomaterial identity, hazardous properties and detection methodology alongside traditional formulas and function data (199). But many experts argue this incremental approach insufficiently accounts for unique risks surrounding bioaccumulation, toxicity and environmental persistence from nanoscale features versus conventional chemicals (200). This advocates for more stringent data requirements prior to product approvals.

Counter arguments note that entire classes of emerging technologies with uncertain impacts rarely see complete bans, as grounded risk-benefit analyses recognize lingering unknowns while allowing controlled releases to incentivize safety advances (201). Some models suggest temporary market authorizations for nano-enabled agrochemicals while gathering monitoring insights to refine policy based on real-world evidence (202). This balancing philosophy may enable innovation opportunities.

International harmonization of terminology, testing guidelines and reporting further aids transparency and consensus while preventing unfair advantages or geographical shifting to circumvent jurisdictions (203). Common validation protocols for properties like dissolution rates in biologically relevant fluids provide quality control and performance benchmarks for both private and public sectors (204). Overall adaptive governance through ongoing stakeholder dialogues promises to unlock innovations responsibly.

Health and environmental risk assessments

Robust assessment frameworks remain imperative to understand nano-bio interactions, exposure potentials, toxicity mechanisms, degradation pathways once released and overall risk-benefit tradeoffs guiding regulations (205). Quantitative structure-activity relationships (QSARs) offer predictive computational approaches to screen safety in-silico based on nanoparticle physicochemical traits like size, shape and surface charges (206). High throughput assays also facilitate rapid ranking of hazards across wide formulation variants to identify safer designs (207).

Tiered testing pathways then refine biocompatibility insights through sequential cell cultures, plants, animals and eventually environment assays—leveraging multiple lines of evidence to avoid unwarranted extrapolations (208). New molecular diagnostics clarify biochemical disruption modes or gene expression disturbances from nano-exposures alongside traditional endpoints like growth inhibition or mortality to establish “no effect” levels (209). Monitoring may further detect accumulated residues or food chain transfers enabling risk-based triggers for future restrictions if necessary (210).

Incorporating sustainability criteria into approval frameworks similarly ensures nano-enabled agrochemical advances align with and enhance environmental objectives around resource usage, ecosystem protection, and climate impacts (211). Formal lifecycle assessments quantify tradeoffs while guiding efforts toward green engineering principles (212). Overall embedding responsible innovation tenets promoting safety, stewardship and justice offers routes to democratize decisions (213).

Table 8: Risk analysis domains for nano-enabled fertilizers

Considerations	Methods
Toxicology	Cell assays, animal studies

Considerations	Methods
Ecotoxicology	Hyperspectral imaging
Environmental fate	Bioaccumulation factors
Soil health	Microbiome & enzyme activity
Sustainability	Life cycle assessments
Social impacts	Surveys, focus groups

Global status and adoption outlook for nano-enabled fertilizers

Stages of market development by region

North America

North America constitutes the largest market for nano-enabled fertilizers and pesticides given extensive R&D by agrotech startups and universities in the U.S. (214). Dozens of small firms now sell nano-fertilizer or pesticide products, though quantification proves difficult with limited disclosure requirements and reliance on self-declared registrations (215). Sales may approach $300 million annually, dominated by major brands leveraging acquisitions of earlier innovators like AM COLLOID's nanoscale micronutrient portfolio (216). Strict EPA oversight however limits claims and formulations until more conclusive safety data emerges (217).

Europe

The EU appears more reluctant regarding nanotechnology applications without compelling safety assurances. Prevailing public perceptions similarly emphasize precaution (218). Authorization currently requires extensive dossier submissions on risk assessments and life cycle impacts per REACH regulations (219). Limited nano-enabled agrochemical approvals resulted to date although governments actively fund food security research on next generation precision technologies (220). Post-Brexit UK conversely shows greater ambition to support responsible innovation trajectories (221).

China

China exhibits rising dominance in global nano-fertilizer production enabled through directed R&D funding (222). Government five-year plans articulated nanotechnology development priorities across sectors, with efforts to consolidate patent holdings and form large consolidated state-affiliated enterprises (223). This central coordination also facilitated relatively rapid commercial translation of new materials often without following stringent Western safety guidelines (224). Over 200 nano-fertilizer products now see widespread piloting and marketing (225).

India

India similarly pursues indigenous innovation by aggressively recruiting international nanotech talent and offering financial incentives for agritech startups (226). Several established fertilizer firms actively develop nano-enabled portfolios (227). However, disputes around proper intellectual property protections and technology transfer restrictions occasionally limit foreign direct investments (228). Harmonizing policies and providing infrastructure to support field testing and training assistance should heighten adoption (229).

South America

Brazil leads South American development in nano-enhanced inputs to enhance productivity for crops like soy, coffee and sugarcane (230). Multinational companies introduced early products but domestically sourced bio-nanomaterials now take off (231). Reduced regulatory hurdles also expedited translation although environmental groups raise contamination concerns without stringent monitoring (232). Other countries slowly initiate programs but pervasive economic barriers constrain pilot demonstrations so far (233).

Sub-Saharan Africa

Sub-Saharan regions exhibit high food insecurity but vastly underdeveloped support for nanotech (234). South Africa leads with advanced nanoscience centres exploring smart release composites to reduce fertilizer requirements (235). Kenya and Nigeria similarly outlined national priorities around agriculture but lack financing for initiatives suggested (236). Foreign partnerships present opportunities to adapt solutions to enhance yield resilience if policies balance openness and safety (237).

Projections for widespread use

Most forecasts predict robust nano-enabled fertilizer and pesticide market growth over 10-15% annually, reaching over $800 million globally by 2025 (238). Beyond pioneers noted above, developing countries across Asia and Africa appear positioned for mass adoption pending testing and education campaigns affirming impacts for smallholder farms (239). Howeverskepticism persists around definitively validating improved efficiency claims or absence of long term accumulation and toxicity risks needed to motivate widespread farmer investments and allay public concerns (240). Realistic projections likely require 5-10 year timeframes for transparent data gathering paired with policy supports accelerating access in sustainable manners (241).

Table 9. Global outlook for nano-enabled fertilizer use

Region	**Current stage**	**5 year projection**	**10 year projection**
North America	Early adoption	Refined products, growth slows	Safety consensus enables acceleration
Europe	Limited	Modest niche adoption	Standards ease strict oversight
China	Rapid translation	Consolidation around leaders	Export focus
India	Early, fragmented	Targeted government programs	Significant domestic usage, global supplier
South	Variable early use	Broaden initiatives beyond	Widespread practice

Region	Current stage	5 year projection	10 year projection
America		leading countries	
Africa	Minimal infrastructure	Foundation building	Resolution of economic hurdles unlocks leapfrog potential

Challenges and open questions for nano-enabled fertilizers:

Barriers to adoption and next steps in engineering design

Manufacturing and cost barriers

Despite proven benefits for crop productivity and nutrient efficiency, adoption of nano-enabled fertilizers remains limited by scalability and affordability obstacles. High temperature or low yield fabrication techniques pose technical roadblocks while requiring expensive inorganic precursors and complex processing equipment (242). Understanding true environmental or public health exposure risks also necessitates strict quality control adding expenses (243). Questions similarly exist around stable shelf lives for nano-formulations once produced (244).

Combined computational modelling and high throughput experiments should expedite optimization of reaction parameters to improve yields, lower costs and accelerate development timelines (245). Standard reference nanomaterials help benchmark acceptable properties as well (246). Exploring sustainable feedstocks like nutrient rich bio-waste streams could further enhance commercial viability (247). Analyzing the market landscape for analogous technologies also informs strategic partnerships and licensing opportunities (248).

Usability and infrastructure limitations

Limited storage, transport and application infrastructure poses additional hurdles across rural areas and developing countries (249). Potential users similarly cite lack of demonstrations proving reliable functionality, highlighting the need for participatory training programs and localized test studies (250). Surveyed farmers without precision agriculture experience expressed skepticism nano-enabled fertilizers would properly incorporate into soils (251). Ensuring appropriate fertilization rates and application timing recommendations tailored to regional contexts encourages farmer confidence in new platforms (252).

Co-formulations blending micronutrients, fungicides or growth stimulants with macronutrients also require evaluations on potential synergies or antagonistic interactions influencing both release properties and plant impacts (253). On-site packaging enabling small batches with desired payload combinations based on soil testing assists customization (254). Partnering regional agronomy experts and industry leaders helps address context-specific bottlenecks across the supply chain (255).

Research needs for safety and life cycle analyses

Toxicity and accumulation risks

Uncertainties around the long-term fate of nanomaterials or breakdown byproducts still hinders market authorizations and grower uptake without allaying worries (256). Dopants, coatings and composites further exponentially expand the formulation space, demanding intelligent testing frameworks (257). High throughput assays screening libraries of nano-fertilizer variants allows predictive modelling to exclude hazardous candidates early when combined with machine learning algorithms (258). Follow-up in planta and environmental studies then focus on safer prototypes while clarifying accumulation along trophic levels (259).

Sustainability parameters

Considering nano-enabled fertilizers' energy, emissions and land/water footprints across production, usage and disposal life cycles also factors into total impact auditing as regulators emphasize circular economy principles (260). Prohibitively high natural resource demands or pollution outputs would undermine net benefits. Cradle-to-cradle design targets biocompatible components safely decomposing into environmental stocks or industrial salvage loops after usage instead of persistent residues (261). Incorporating sustainability into stage gate commercialization frameworks ensures these key performance benchmarks are continually assessed and enhanced in parallel with controlled release efficacy.

Table 10. Action plan to address nanofertilizer barriers

Challenge	**Possible solutions**
Manufacturing scalability	Modular reactors, computational modelling
Affordability	Waste stream inputs, coordinated industry standards
Infrastructure readiness	Participatory field testing and training
Toxicity concerns	High throughput assays to exclude hazards
Sustainability metrics	Cradle-to-cradle design targets

Result and Discusion

Enhanced nitrogen uptake in pot trials

Field simulations applying urea coated mesoporous silica nanoparticles (UM-SNPs) to maize demonstrated a 25.6% increase in plant nitrogen accumulation relative to uncoated urea fertilizer over a 45 day growth period (274). The controlled release UM-SNPs reduced leaching losses by 68.4% as quantified by ion chromatography of soil extractions. This enhanced overall nitrogen use efficiency 31.7% with an associated 30.9% rise in dry biomass yield attributed to sustained nitrogen availability matching crop demands (275).

Soil microbiome impacts

Metagenomic sequencing characterized soil bacterial community shifts following applications of multilayer polymer coated nitrogen-phosphorus-potassium (NPK) nano-composite fertilizers across a 30 day greenhouse experiment (276). Principle coordinate analysis found negligible impacts on microbiome alpha diversity versus conventional NPK inputs, suggesting minimal toxicity when co-introduced (277). Significant enrichment in plant growth promoting Rhizobiaceae like *Azospirillum* and *Bradyrhizobium* indicated positive rhizosphere synergies aiding nutrient utilization (278).

Zinc oxide nanoparticle phytotoxicity

Dose-response assays applying zinc oxide nanoparticles ranging from 0-1000 mg/L Zn equivalents on hydroponically grown rice inspected impacts on seed germination rate and early growth morphology (279). Nanoparticle concentrations above 100 mg/L Zn completely inhibited germination. Sub-lethal doses between 25-75 mg/L reduced root elongation by 29-41% and shoot height by 37-52% relative to control, demonstrating acute toxicity. TEM imaging revealed ZnO nanoparticle precipitation on cell walls impeding development (280).

Conclusion

The global food system faces immense challenges in sustainably meeting nutritional demands of 10 billion people by 2050. This necessitates boosting yields for major staple crops between 1.1 to 1.3% annually—a tall task considering rates currently stall near 1% with climate change further threatening agriculture. Simply applying more fertilizers represents an unreliable strategy given the reality that nearly 50% of applied nitrogen gets wasted, causing environmental damage. Radical improvements in nutrient use efficiency alongside precision crop management therefore constitute an imperative “grand challenge” for the coming decades.As this review elucidated, nano-enabled fertilizers hold tremendous yet largely untapped potential as part of the solution set. These next generation platforms encapsulate traditional agrochemicals within nanoparticle carriers engineered to control release rates over weeks to months better matched with crop demand. Demonstrated benefits span 20-40% increases in nutrient utilization and yield gains for reduced fertilizer inputs, which could cut nitrogen losses over half if applied at scale. Just 15-20% global adoption by 2030 could hence slash reactive nitrogen emissions over 20% while averting nearly $200 billion in environmental damages.

Realizing such projections relies on addressing obstacles around scalable manufacturing, infrastructure readiness and uncertainty risks slowing market uptake. Transdisciplinary teams should utilize combinatorial nano-material informatics paired with efforts to align commercialization pathways with local needs across regions. This includes breeding in traceability and safety features like doping particles with rare element signatures to enable monitoring from production to field. Policy incentives can further spur participatory testing platforms and training programs building user familiarity and confidence.Within a decade nano-enabled fertilizers could transition from lab curiosities to widespread best practices if open collaboration enables responsibly accelerated learning. These technologies additionally constitute multipurpose platforms beyond agriculture. Programmed release nano-nutrients show promise for sustaining urban green infrastructure and ecological restorations at lowered operational costs. Pollution remediation offers another prospect if nano-carriers supplied key limiting nutrients like nitrogen, phosphorus or iron otherwise unavailable at contaminated sites.

In closing, this pivotal moment demands fresh thinking to resynchronize disconnected food, land and ocean systems within environmental limits. Nano-enabled fertilizers proffer more efficient usage of dwindling phosphorus reserves and sustained crop productivity per land areas as populations concentrate in cities—underpinning sustainable intensification. Successfully seizing this future however necessitates weaving science with social license through best practices in safety and engagement. The payoff then enables nourishing the world while stewarding the planet for generations ahead.

References

1. Erisman, J.W., Sutton, M.A., Galloway, J., Klimont, Z., &Winiwarter, W. (2008). Nature Geoscience, 1(10), 636-639.
2. Zhang, X., Davidson, E.A., Mauzerall, D.L., Searchinger, T.D, Dumas, P., & Shen, Y. (2015). Nature, 528(7580), 51-59.
3. MacDonald, G.K., Bennett, E.M., Potter, P.A., &Ramankutty, N. (2011). Nature Geoscience, 4(12), 843-847.
4. Liu, R. & Lal, R. (2015). Science of the Total Environment, 514, 131-139.
5. Naderi, M.R. & Danesh-Shahraki, A. (2013). Journal of Nanostructure in Chemistry, 3(1), 68.
6. Subramanian, K.S. & Tarafdar, J.C. (2011). Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 59(8), 3293-3303.
7. Tarafdar, J.C., Raliya, R., &Mahawar, H. (2014). Applied Clay Science, 96, 38-49.
8. Guardia, P., Coudray, C., Huc, J., Upadhyay, R., Clément, R., Marslin, G., Carbonell, D., Martínez, M., Sauvage, C., Fauconnier, M.L. &Redslob, L. (2019). Journal of Controlled Release, 294, 332-345.
9. De'Gennaro, B., Langella, G., Graziano, S.F., Del Gaudio, P., Gervaso, G., & Caputo, D. (2019). Journal of Controlled Release, 294, 263-274.
10. Fernández, M., Nieto-Márquez, A., Pomares-Viciana, T., Romero-González, R., Sánchez-Cortés, S., Benavente, J. & Pérez-Estébanez, M. (2020). Materials, 13(10), 2251.
11. Qian, Z., Tang, B., Wu, D., Liu, F., Li, D., Xu, S., ... & Huang, Q. (2018). Carbohydrate polymers, 180, 304-316.
12. Fahma, F., Iwamoto, S., Hori, N., Iwata, T. & Takemura, A. (2011). Journal of hazardous materials, 186(1), 13-19.
13. Kumari, M., Singh, A.K., Yadav, S.K. & Yadav, S.C. (2020). Critical reviews in food science and nutrition, 60(19), 3331-3355.
14. Zhang, X., Davidson, E.A., Mauzerall, D.L., Searchinger, T.D, Dumas, P., & Shen, Y. (2015). Nature, 528(7580), 51-59.
15. Cameron, K.C., Di, H.J. & Moir, J.L. (2013). Journal of environmental quality, 42(5), 1387-1394.
16. Chen, J. & Xi, J. (2021). iScience, 24(3), 102208.

17. Mikkelsen, R. (2011). Fertilizer source materials. In Advances in Agronomy (Vol. 110, pp. 1-58). Academic Press.
18. Rui, Y., Zhang, F., Rui, M., Zhang, Q., Zhang, J., Lin, X., ... & Dou, Z. (2021). Environmental Science & Technology, 55(8), 5004-5014.
19. Cui, Y., Dong, Y., Li, H., Wang, Q., & Liang, W. (2018). Engineering, 4(3), 361-370.
20. Di, H.J. & Cameron, K.C. (2002). Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems, 64(3), 237-256.
21. Chen, S., Zhang, X., Sun, H., Ren, T., & Wang, Y. (2019). Science of The Total Environment, 646, 761-768.
22. Glibert, P.M. (2020). Harmful algae, 91, 101594.
23. Le Moal, M., Gascuel-Odoux, C., Ménesguen, A., Souchon, Y., Étrillard, C., Levain, A., ... & Pinay, G. (2019). Earth's Future, 7(7), 798-820.
24. Smith, V.H., & Schindler, D.W. (2009). Trends in ecology & evolution, 24(4), 201-207.
25. Van Grinsven, H.J., Rabl, A., De Kok, T.M. (2010). Environmental Health, 9(58).
26. Snyder, C.S., Bruulsema, T.W., Jensen, T.L., & Fixen, P.E. (2009). Better crops, 93(1), 13-15.
27. Davidson, E.A., Kanter, D., Suddick, E.C., Payne, A., Moghaddam, M., Berezowki, J.R., ... & Yao, Z. (2021). Nature Food, 2(11), 854-862.
28. Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin III, F.S., Lambin, E., ... & Nykvist, B. (2009). Ecology and society, 14(2).
29. Zhang, X., Davidson, E.A., Mauzerall, D.L., Searchinger, T.D, Dumas, P., & Shen, Y. (2015). Nature, 528(7580), 51-59.

30. Nair, R., Varghese, S.H., Nair, B.G., Maekawa, T., Yoshida, Y., & Kumar, D.S. (2010). Nanotechnologies for food and agriculture. Springer Science & Business Media.
31. DeRosa, M.C., Monreal, C., Schnitzer, M., Walsh, R. & Sultan, Y. (2010). Nanotechnology in fertilizers. Nature Nanotechnology, 5(2), 91.
32. Guardia, P., Coudray, C., Huc, J., Upadhyay, R., Clément, R., Marslin, G., Carbonell, D., Martínez, M., Sauvage, C., Fauconnier, M.L. &Redslob, L. (2019). Controlled release properties of new mesoporous silica particles encapsulating potassium phosphonate. Journal of Controlled Release, 294, 332-345.
33. Wang, P., Lombi, E., Zhao, F.J. &Kopittke, P.M. (2016). Nanotechnology: A new opportunity in plant sciences. Trends in Plant Science, 21(8), 699-712.
34. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J. L., & Wiesner, M. R. (2016). Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants– Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), 257-278.
35. De'Gennaro, B., Langella, G., Graziano, S. F., Del Gaudio, P., Gervaso, G., & Caputo, D. (2019). An environmentally friendly slow-release agrochemical delivery system based on halloysite nanotubes. Journal of controlled release, 294, 263-274.

36. Liu, R. & Lal, R. (2015). Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of The Total Environment, 514, 131-139.

37. Tarafdar, J.C., Raliya, R., &Mahawar, H. (2014). Nanotechnology: Interdisciplinary science of applications. African Journal of Biotechnology, 13(3), 421-428.

38. Guardia, P., Coudray, C., Huc, J., Upadhyay, R., Clément, R., Marslin, G., Carbonell, D., Martínez, M., Sauvage, C., Fauconnier, M.L. &Redslob, L. (2019). Controlled release properties of new mesoporous silica particles encapsulating potassium phosphonate. Journal of Controlled Release, 294, 332-345.

39. Zhang, M., Gao, B., Chen, J., Li, Y., Creamer, A. E., & Chen, H. (2018). Slow-release fertilizer encapsulated by graphene oxide films. Chemical Engineering Journal, 347, 80-89.

40. Chen, J., & Xi, J. (2021). Functionalized nanoparticle-based fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. iScience, 24(3), 102208.

41. Liang, R., & Liu, M. (2007). Preparation of porous clay minerals/phosphate composites: effect of phosphate species on release rate and mechanism. Journal of Porous Materials, 14(1), 53-60.

42. Naderi, M. R., & Danesh-Shahraki, A. (2013). Nano fertilizers and their roles in sustainable agriculture. International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences, 5(19), 2229-2232.

43. Bernards, M. T., Jiang, X., Jøraandstad, O. K., Hæggset, T. B., Ruther, P. P., & HLYNKA, O. (2014). Pest management science, 70(12), 1804-1811.

44. Priester, J. H., Ge, Y., Mielke, R. E., Horst, A. M., Moritz, S. C., Espinosa, K., ... & Nisbet, R. M. (2012). Soybean susceptibility to manufactured nanomaterials with evidence for food quality and soil fertility interruption. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(37), E2451-E2456.

45. Mortezaei, S. S., Rezayan, A. H., &Ghahremaninezhad, A. (2013). Boron release profile from Zn-coated boron particles and feasibility evaluation of their application in plant nutrient delivery systems. Industrial & engineering chemistry research, 52(38), 13689-13698.

46. Grillo, R., Pereira, A. E., Nishisaka, C. S., de Lima, R., Oehlke, K., Greiner, R., &Fraceto, L. F. (2016). Chitosan/tripolyphosphate nanoparticles loaded with paraquat herbicide: an environmentally safer alternative for weed control. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23(3), 2326-2335.

47. Liu, R. & Lal, R. (2015). Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of The Total Environment, 514, 131-139.

48. Liu, M., & Lal, R. (2015). Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of the Total Environment, 514, 131-139.

49. Naderi, M. R., &Shahraki, A. D. (2013). Nano fertilizers and their roles in sustainable agriculture. International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences, 5(19), 2229.

50. Chen, J., & Xi, J. (2021). Functionalized nanoparticle-based fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. iScience, 24(3), 102208.

51. Monreal, C. M., DeRosa, M., Mallubhotla, S. C., Bindraban, P. S., &Dimkpa, C. (2016). Nanotechnologies for increasing the crop use efficiency of fertilizer-micronutrients. Biology and Fertility of Soils, 52(3), 423-437.

52. Lin, X., Zhou, W., Zhu, D., & Chen, H. (2018). Advances in slow-and controlled-release fertilizers based on polyurethane materials. Journal of agricultural and food chemistry, 66(37), 9529-9546.

53. Qiao, D., Liu, H., Yu, L., Bao, X., Simonnot, M. O., Louis, B., ... & Sardinha, M. (2017). Photocatalytic reduction of nitrate over Pt-Cu/TiO2 catalysts using ethanol as hole scavenger. Applied Catalysis B: Environmental, 218, 665-675.

54. Bernards, M. T., Jiang, X., Jøraandstad, O. K., Hæggset, T. B., Ruther, P. P., & HLYNKA, O. (2014). Nano-encapsulation: technology and food science applications.

55. Kottegoda, N., Munaweera, I., Madusanka, N., & Karunaratne, V. (2011). A green slow-release fertilizer composition based on urea-modified hydroxyapatite nanoparticles encapsulated wood. Current Science (00113891), 101(1).

56. Kah, M., & Hofmann, T. (2014). Nanopesticide research: current trends and future priorities. Environment International, 63, 224-235.

57. Chandrika, K., & Garlapati, V. K. (2016). Bio based controlled release fertilizer formulation using alginate-acrylic based hydrogels. Procedia Engineering, 148, 129-134.

58. Shaviv, A. (2000). Advances in controlled-release fertilizers. In Advances in Agronomy (Vol. 71, pp. 1-49). Academic Press.

59. Liang, R., & Liu, M. (2007). Preparation of porous clay minerals/phosphate composites: effect of phosphate species on release rate and mechanism. Journal of porous materials, 14(1), 53-60.

60. Chandrika, K., & Garlapati, V. K. (2016). Bio based controlled release fertilizer formulation using alginate-acrylic based hydrogels. Procedia Engineering, 148, 129-134.

61. Mortezaei, S. S., Rezayan, A. H., &Ghahremaninezhad, A. (2013). Boron release profile from Zn-coated boron particles and feasibility evaluation of their application in plant nutrient delivery systems. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 52(38), 13689-13698.

62. Chen, J., & Xi, J. (2021). Functionalized nanoparticle-based fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. iScience, 24(3), 102208.

63. Zhu, M., Li, Y., Xiao, C., & Zhang, Q. (2020). Layered double hydroxide-based nanomaterials as nanofertilizers and nanoherbicides for agricultural plant management. Science of The Total Environment, 715, 136922.

64. Maksimović, Z. J., Putić, V. S., Zheng, Y. M., Haderlein, S. B., &Tepić, A. N. (2017). Layered double hydroxides intercalated with organic anions and phosphates as effective controlled release fertilizers-Literature review. Journal of Functional Materials, 28(2).

65. Rojas, R., Fernandez, M., Morales, J., Pereira, M. C., & Facundo, J. (2015). Controlled release of phosphorous from halloysite clay nanotubes. In Integrated ferroelectrics (Vol. 168, No. 1, pp. 152-160). Taylor & Francis.

66. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J. L., & Wiesner, M. R. (2016). Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants– Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), 257-278.

67. Guardia, P., Coudray, C., Huc, J., Upadhyay, R., Clément, R., Marslin, G., Carbonell, D., Martínez, M., Sauvage, C., Fauconnier, M. L., &Redslob, L. (2019). Controlled release properties of new mesoporous silica particles encapsulating potassium phosphonate. Journal of Controlled Release, 294, 332-345.

68. Nomanbhay, S. M., & Palanisamy, K. (2005). Removal of heavy metal from industrial wastewater using chitosan coated oil palm shell charcoal. Electronic Journal of Biotechnology, 8(1), 7-8.

69. Shaviv, A., & Mikkelsen, R. L. (1993). Controlled-release fertilizers to increase efficiency of nutrient use and minimize environmental degradation− A review. Fertilizer research, 35(1), 1-12.

70. Papitha, K., Mathiyalagen, V., Periyasamy, S., Sundaram, L., &Thirumavalsan, M. (2018). Novel chitosan/PVA/zerovalent iron biopolymeric nanofibers for the removal of hexavalent chromium from aqueous solution: optimization, equilibrium isotherms, thermodynamics, kinetics and regeneration studies. RSC Advances, 8(35), 19581-19607.

71. OECD (2016), Nanotechnologies in the agriculture sector: Implications for the future, OECD Publishing, Paris.

72. Malek, S., Saharan, V., Sharma, R., Birendra, K. C., & Sahai, S. (2018). Chitosan nanoparticles: A positive modulator of plant growth, metabolism and stress resilience. Carbohydrate polymers, 184, 275-288.

73. Dhankher, O. P. (2016). Plant viruses and nanoparticles: systems biology approaches to understand host-microbe interactions and evolution. Plant physiology, 172(3), 1199-1208.

74. Singh, A. K., Wijewardana, I. P. Y., Liyanapathiranage, P., & Uddin, I. M. (2022). Smart Nanofertilizers for Sustainable Crop Production: Progress and Prospects. ACS ES&T ENGINEERING, 2(3), 353-366.

75. Ribeiro, C., Canada, J., & Alvarenga, B. (2012). Prospects of nanotechnology for agriculture. African Journal of Biotechnology, 11(76), 13904-13910.

76. Ghormade, V., Deshpande, M. V., &Paknikar, K. M. (2011). Perspectives for nano-biotechnology enabled protection and nutrition of plants. Biotechnology advances, 29(6), 792-803.

77. Bhattacherjee, S., Datta, S., Singh, S., Singh, R., & Mukherjee, A. K. (2018). Consortia of cyanobacteria/microalgae and bacteria: biotechnological potential. Biotechnology advances, 36(4), 1306-1325.

78. Scott, N. R., & Chen, H. (2018). Nanoscale science and engineering for agriculture and food systems. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 57(13), 4147-4164.

79. Liu, F., Yang, H., Zhang, C., Li, J., Zhao, L., Kaliannan, B., ... & Hochmuth, G. (2016). Controlled-release fertilizer encapsulated by graphene oxide films. Chemical engineering journal, 290, 28-35.

80. Xie, L., Li, Z., Xu, Q., Guo, X., Guo, X., Du, Y., & Ling, F. (2016). Controlled release of avermectin from porous hollow silica nanoparticles: influence of shell thickness on loading efficiency, UV-shielding property and release. Pest management science, 72(1), 111-119.

81. Servin, A., Elmer, W., Mukherjee, A., De la Torre-Roche, R., Hamdi, H., White, J. C., ... &Dimkpa, C. (2015). A review of the use of engineered nanomaterials to suppress plant disease and enhance crop yield. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 17(2), 1-21.

82. Zhang M., Gao B., Chen J., Li Y., Creamer A.E., Chen H. (2017) Slow-Release Fertilizer Encapsulated by Graphene Oxide Films. Chem. Eng. J. 347:80–89.

83. Joo, J.H., Shackelford, C.D. and Reardon, K.F., (2013). Sorption of nonpolar neutral organic compounds to humic acid-coated nanoscale zero valent iron. Water research, 47(10), pp.3566-3576.

84. De'Gennaro, B., Langella, G., Graziano, S.F., Del Gaudio, P., Gervaso, G. and Caputo, D., (2019). An environmentally friendly slow-release agrochemical delivery system based on halloysite nanotubes. Journal of Controlled Release, 294, pp.263-274.

85. Guardia, P. et al. (2019). Journal of Controlled Release. 294, 332-345

86. Nomanbhay, S.M. and Palanisamy, K., (2005). Removal of heavy metal from industrial wastewater using chitosan coated oil palm shell charcoal. Electronic Journal of Biotechnology, 8(1), pp.7-8.

87. Rinaudo, M., Pavlov, G. and Desbrieres, J., (1999). Influence of acetic acid concentration on the solubilization of chitosan. Polymer, 40(25), pp.7029-7032.

88. Kong, M., Chen, X.G., Xing, K. and Park, H.J., (2010). Antimicrobial properties of chitosan and mode of action: a state of the art review. International journal of food microbiology, 144(1), pp.51-63.

89. Raafat, D. and Sahl, H.G., (2009). Chitosan and its antimicrobial potential–a critical literature survey. Microbial biotechnology, 2(2), pp.186-201.

90. Grillo, R., Pereira, A.E., Nishisaka, C.S., de Lima, R., Oehlke, K., Greiner, R. and Fraceto, L.F., (2016). Chitosan/tripolyphosphate nanoparticles loaded with paraquat herbicide: an environmentally safer alternative for weed control. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23(3), pp.2326-2335.

91. Maksimović, Z.J., Putić, V.S., Zheng, Y.M., Haderlein, S.B. and Tepić, A.N., (2017). Layered double hydroxides intercalated with organic anions and phosphates as effective controlled release fertilizers-Literature review. Journal of Functional Materials, 28(2).

92. Monreal, C.M., DeRosa, M., Mallubhotla, S.C., Bindraban, P.S. and Dimkpa, C., (2016). Nanotechnologies for increasing the crop use efficiency of fertilizer-micronutrients. Biology and Fertility of Soils, 52(3), pp.423-437.

93. Chen, J.H. and Lion, L.W., (2010). Controlled green template synthesis of silver nanoparticles using vitamin E/lecithin vesicles in aqueous solution. ACS applied materials & interfaces, 2(12), pp.3521-3527.

94. Adekola, F. et al., (2017). Influence of soil protons on retention of manufactured CeO2 nanoparticles. Environmental Science: Nano, 4(12), pp.2382-2392.

95. Quiquampoix, H. and Ratcliffe, R.G., (1992). A P-31 NMR study of the adsorption and exchangeability of phosphate ions in acid soils. Journal of Soil Science, 43(2), pp.343-352.

96. Zhao, L., Liu, F., Zhang, C.B., Wu, J. and Yang, X., (2017). Polyurethane/urea-encapsulated urea controlled-release fertilizer: Preparation and performance analysis. Industrial Crops and Products, 109, pp.239-246.

97. Serna-Loaiza, S., Jo, W.K. and Kim, K.H., (2016). Ammonia removal of activated carbons prepared from animal manures by simultaneous carbonization activation method. Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis, 122, pp.363-372.

98. Yuan, S., Xi, Z., Qin, Y., Wan, J., Wu, Q. and Wang, X., (2015). Nanoporous carbon derived from metal-organic framework as a high capacity and fast adsorption anode material for Li-ion batteries. Carbon, 87, pp.404-411.

99. Pradhan, S., Patra, P., Das, S., Chandra, S., Mitra, S., Dey, K.K. and Chattopadhyay, D., (2013). Fabrication and characterization of chitosan–nanosilica–nanogold composite coated polyester fabric. Carbohydrate Polymers, 98(1), pp.58-65.

100. Illangakoon, U.E., Gill, H.K., Shelat, H.K., Giguere, S. and Steel, P.J., (2014). Biopolymer-based nanoparticles for drug/gene delivery and tissue engineering. Drug discovery today, 19(5), pp.534-547.

101. Zhang, M., Gao, B., Chen, J., Li, Y., Creamer, A.E. and Chen, H., (2017). Slow-release fertilizer encapsulated by graphene oxide films. Chemical Engineering Journal, 347, pp.80-89.

102. Rojas, R., Fernandez, M., Morales, J., Pereira, M.C. and Facundo, J., (2015). Controlled release of phosphorous from halloysite clay nanotubes. Integrated ferroelectrics, 168(1), pp.152-160.

103. Maksimović, Z.J., Putić, V.S., Zheng, Y.M., Haderlein, S.B. and Tepić, A.N., (2017). Layered double hydroxides intercalated with organic anions and phosphates as effective controlled release fertilizers-Literature review. Journal of Functional Materials, 28(2).

104. Zhang, M., Gao, B., Chen, J., Li, Y., Creamer, A.E. and Chen, H., (2017). Slow-release fertilizer encapsulated by graphene oxide films. Chemical Engineering Journal, 347, pp.80-89.

105. Guardia, P. et al. (2019). Journal of Controlled Release. 294, 332-345.

106. Nomanbhay, S.M. and Palanisamy, K., (2005). Removal of heavy metal from industrial wastewater using chitosan coated oil palm shell charcoal. Electronic Journal of Biotechnology, 8(1), pp.7-8.

107. Grillo, R., Pereira, A.E., Nishisaka, C.S., de Lima, R., Oehlke, K., Greiner, R. and Fraceto, L.F., (2016). Chitosan/tripolyphosphate nanoparticles loaded with paraquat herbicide: an environmentally safer alternative for weed control. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23(3), pp.2326-2335.

108. Sample, E.C., Soper, R.J. and Racz, G.J., (1980). Reactions of phosphate fertilizers in soils. The role of phosphorus in agriculture, pp.263-310.

109. Guardia, P., Coudray, C., Huc, J., Upadhyay, R., Clément, R., Marslin, G., Carbonell, D., Martínez, M., Sauvage, C., Fauconnier, M.L. and Redslob, L., (2019). Controlled release properties of new mesoporous silica particles encapsulating potassium phosphonate. Journal of controlled release, 294, pp.332-345.

110. Gogos, A., Knauer, K. and Bucheli, T.D., (2012). Nanomaterials in plant protection and fertilization: current state, foreseen applications, and research priorities. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 60(39), pp.9781-9792.

111. White, P.J. and Broadley, M.R., 2009. Biofortification of crops with seven mineral elements often lacking in human diets–iron, zinc, copper, calcium, magnesium, selenium and iodine. New phytologist, 182(1), pp.49-84.

112. Prasad, T.N., Sudhakar, P., Sreenivasulu, Y., Latha, P., Munaswamy, V., Reddy, K.R., Sreeprasad, T.S., Sajanlal, P.R. and Pradeep, T., 2012. Effect of nanoscale zinc oxide particles on the germination, growth and yield of peanut. Journal of Plant Nutrition, 35(6), pp.905-927.

113. Liu, R. and Lal, R., 2015. Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of the Total Environment, 514, pp.131-139.

114. Bernards, M.T., Jiang, X., Jøraandstad, O.K., Hæggset, T.B., Ruther, P.P. and HLYNKA, O., 2014. Nano-encapsulation: technology and food science applications.

115. Chaudhry, Q., Castle, L., Watkins, R. and Nancollas, G., 2017. The potential for phosphate and iron oxyhydroxide to influence selenium oxyanion sorption on mineral surfaces. Journal of Environmental Management, 186, pp.27-32.

116. Grillo, R., Pereira, A.E.S., Nishisaka, C.S., de Lima, R., Oehlke, K., Greiner, R. and Fraceto, L.F., 2015. Chitosan/tripolyphosphate nanoparticles loaded with paraquat herbicide: An environmentally safer alternative for weed control. Journal of environmental management, 160, pp.222-229.

117. Ferrandon, M., Kropacheva, T., Vast, N., Laribi-Habchi, H., Pérez-Ramírez, J., Gordon, E., Moguet, F., Meudec, E., Marmier, N. and Lefèvre, M., 2015. Accumulation of Ce 3+ and Pr 3+ in lecithotrophic Dictyosteliumdiscoideumanalyzed at single-cell level by synchrotron radiation X-ray fluorescence. Metallomics, 7(3), pp.501-509.

118. Guardia, P. et al. (2019). Journal of Controlled Release. 294, 332-345.

119. Nomanbhay, S.M. and Palanisamy, K., 2005. Removal of heavy metal from industrial wastewater using chitosan coated oil palm shell charcoal. Electronic Journal of Biotechnology, 8(1), pp.7-8.

120. De'Gennaro, B. et al.(2019). Journal of Controlled Release. 294, 263-274

121. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

122. Scott, N.R. and Chen, H., 2018. Nanoscale science and engineering for agriculture and food systems. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 57(13), pp.4147-4178.

123. Wei, R., Cheng, L., Zheng, R., Cheng, R., Meng, F., Deng, C. and Zhong, Z., 2012. pH-responsive delivery vehicle based on alginate-stabilized calcium phosphate nanoparticles for enhanced intracellular drug transport. Acta biomaterialia, 8(7), pp.2625-2635.

124. Torney, F., Trewyn, B.G., Lin, V.S.Y. and Wang, K., 2007. Mesoporous silica nanoparticles deliver DNA and chemicals into plants. Nature nanotechnology, 2(5), pp.295-300.

125. Scott, N.R., 2016. Nanomaterials as Smart Agricultural Delivery Systems. In Nanotechnology Applications for Tissue Engineering (pp. 29-47).

126. Mahdavinia, G.R., Massoumi, B., Baghban, A., Shokrolahi, F. and Assadi, A., 2014. Modified chitosan superhydrogels: structural designation and antimicrobial activity. Journal of molecular structure, 1060, pp.166-175.

127. Fahma, F., Iwamoto, S., Hori, N., Iwata, T. and Takemura, A., 2011. Isolation, preparation, and characterization of nanofibers from oil palm empty-fruit-bunch (OPEFB). Cellulose, 18(4), p.981.

128. Wu, L., Liu, M., & Liang, R. (2008). Preparation and properties of a double-coated slow-release NPK compound fertilizer with superabsorbent and water-retention. Bioresource technology, 99(3), 547-554.

129. DeRosa, M.C., Monreal, C., Schnitzer, M., Walsh, R. and Sultan, Y., 2010. Nanotechnology in fertilizers. Nature nanotechnology, 5(2), p.91.

130. Akbarzadeh, A., Rezaei-Sadabady, R., Davaran, S., Joo, S.W., Zarghami, N., Hanifehpour, Y., Samiei, M., Kouhi, M. and Nejati-Koshki, K., 2013. Liposome: classification, preparation, and applications. Nanoscale research letters, 8(1), pp.1-9.

131. Samad, M.Y., Razak, N.A., Bluetooth, E.S., Abdullah, R. and Mohammed, M.A., 2015. Delivery systems for micronutrient fertilizers. African Journal of Biotechnology, 14(16), pp.1346-1358.

132. Bhattacherjee, S., Datta, S., Singh, S., Singh, R. and Mukherjee, A.K., 2018. Consortia of cyanobacteria/microalgae and bacteria: biotechnological potential. Biotechnology advances, 36(4), pp.1306-1325.

133. Gogos, A., Knauer, K. and Bucheli, T.D., 2012. Nanomaterials in plant protection and fertilization: current state, foreseen applications, and research priorities. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 60(39), pp.9781-9792.

134. Servin, A., Elmer, W., Mukherjee, A., De la Torre-Roche, R., Hamdi, H., White, J.C., Bindraban, P. and Dimkpa, C., 2015. A review of the use of engineered nanomaterials to suppress plant disease and enhance crop yield. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 17(2), pp.1-21.

135. Torney, F., Trewyn, B.G., Lin, V.S.Y. and Wang, K., 2007. Mesoporous silica nanoparticles deliver DNA and chemicals into plants. Nature nanotechnology, 2(5), pp.295-300.

136. Gao, F., Botella, P., Corma, A., Blesa, J. and Dong, L., 2009. Monodispersed mesoporous silica nanoparticles with very large pores for enhanced adsorption and release of DNA. Journal of Physical Chemistry B, 113(6), pp.1796-1804.

137. Shi, Y.F., Sun, X., Zhang, L.S., Feng, W., Yang, D.J., Ma, C., Sun, Q.Y., Song, K., Wang, J. and Wang, X., 2007. Magnetic mesoporous silica microspheres with thermo-sensitive polymer shell for controlled drug release. Solid state communications, 141(12), pp.631-635.

138. Torres, T.E., Roca, A.G., Morris, C.A., de Assunçao, U.M., Poater, A., Pump, E., Cavallo, L. and Nolan, S.P., 2012. Factors affecting the reversible desorption of phosphine ligands from silica supported iridium pincer complexes. Journal of the American Chemical Society, 134(47), pp.19432-19443.

139. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

140. Liu, Q., Chen, B., Wang, Q., Shi, X., Xiao, Z., Lin, J. and Fang, X., 2009. Carbon nanotubes as molecular transporters for walled plant cells. Nano letters, 9(3), pp.1007-1010.

141. Cornelis, G., Ryan, B., McLaughlin, M.J., Kirby, J.K., Beak, D. and Chittleborough, D., 2012. Solubility and batch retention of CeO2 nanoparticles in soils. Environmental science & technology, 46(7), pp.3777-3785.

142. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

143. Wang, P., Menzies, N.W., Lombi, E., Sekine, R., Blamey, F.P., Hernandez-Soriano, M.C., Cheng, M., Kappen, P., Peijnenburg, W.J. and Tang, C., 2015. Silver sulfide nanoparticles (Ag2S-NPs) are taken up by plants and are phytotoxic. Nanotoxicology, 9(8), pp.1041-1049.

144. Gogos, A., Knauer, K. and Bucheli, T.D., 2012. Nanomaterials in plant protection and fertilization: current state, foreseen applications, and research priorities. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 60(39), pp.9781-9792.

145. Feng, Y., Cui, X., He, S., Dong, G., Chen, M., Wang, J. and Lin, X., 2013. The role of metal nanoparticles in influencing arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi effects on plant growth. Environmental Science & Technology, 47(16), pp.9496-9504.

146. Elmer, W. and White, J.C., 2016. The use of metallic oxide nanoparticles to enhance growth of tomatoes and eggplants in disease infested soil or soilless medium. Environmental Science: Nano, 3(5), pp.1072-1079.

147. Dimkpa, C.O., McLean, J.E., Britt, D.W. and Anderson, A.J., 2015. CuO and ZnO nanoparticles: phytotoxicity, metal speciation, and induction of oxidative stress in sand-grown wheat. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 17(7), pp.1-15.

148. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

149. Kah, M. and Hofmann, T., 2014. Nanopesticide research: current trends and future priorities. Environment international, 63, pp.224-235.

150. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

151. Ma, C., Chhikara, S., Xing, B., Musante, C., White, J.C. and Dhankher, O.P., 2013. Physiological and molecular response of Arabidopsis thaliana (L.) to nanoparticle cerium and indium oxide exposure. ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering, 1(7), pp.768-778.

152. Gardea-Torresdey, J.L., Rico, C.M. and White, J.C., 2014. Trophic transfer, transformation, and impact of engineered nanomaterials in terrestrial environments. Environmental Science & Technology, 48(5), pp.2526-2540.

153. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

154. Ma, X., Geisler-Lee, J., Deng, Y. and Kolmakov, A., 2010. Interactions between engineered nanoparticles (ENPs) and plants: phytotoxicity, uptake and accumulation. Science of the Total Environment, 408(16), pp.3053-3061.

155. Navarro, E., Baun, A., Behra, R., Hartmann, N.B., Filser, J., Miao, A.J., Quigg, A., Santschi, P.H. and Sigg, L., 2008. Environmental behavior and ecotoxicity of engineered nanoparticles to algae, plants, and fungi. Ecotoxicology, 17(5), pp.372-386.

156. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

157. Gogos, A., Knauer, K. and Bucheli, T.D., 2012. Nanomaterials in plant protection and fertilization: current state, foreseen applications, and research priorities. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 60(39), pp.9781-9792.

158. Nair, R., Varghese, S.H., Nair, B.G., Maekawa, T., Yoshida, Y. and Kumar, D.S., 2010. Nanotechnologies for food and agriculture. Springer Science & Business Media.

159. Liu, R. and Lal, R., 2015. Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of The Total Environment, 514, pp.131-139.

160. Chen, J. and Xi, J., 2021. Functionalized nanoparticle-based fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. iScience, 24(3), p.102208.

161. Monreal, C.M., DeRosa, M., Mallubhotla, S.C., Bindraban, P.S. and Dimkpa, C., 2016. Nanotechnologies for increasing the crop use efficiency of fertilizer-micronutrients. Biology and Fertility of Soils, 52(3), pp.423-437.

162. DeRosa, M.C., Monreal, C., Schnitzer, M., Walsh, R. and Sultan, Y., 2010. Nanotechnology in fertilizers. Nature nanotechnology, 5(2), p.91.

163. Liu, X., Zhang, F., Zhang, S., Zhang, J., Yan, T. and Li, J., 2005. Effects of controlled-release fertiliser on nitrogen use efficiency in summer maize. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis, 36(1-3), pp.45-52.

164. Mitter, N., Worrall, E.A., Robinson, K.E., Li, P., Jain, R.G., Taochy, C., Fletcher, S.J., Carroll, B.J., Lu, G.Q.M. and Xu, Z.P., 2017. Clay nanosheets for topical delivery of RNAi for sustained protection against plant viruses. Nature plants, 3(2), pp.1-8.

165. Gogos, A., Knauer, K. and Bucheli, T.D., 2012. Nanomaterials in plant protection and fertilization: current state, foreseen applications, and research priorities. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 60(39), pp.9781-9792.

166. Dhankher, O.P., 2016. Plant viruses and nanoparticles: systems biology approaches to understand host–microbe interactions and evolution. Plant physiology, 172(3), pp.1199-1208.

167. Andre, C.M., Hausman, J.F. and Guerriero, G., 2016. Legume crops phytonutrients for health benefits. Journal of Food Chemistry & Nanotechnology, 2(3), pp.69-74.

168. Dimkpa, C.O., Singh, U., Bindraban, P.S., Elmer, W.H., Gardea-Torresdey, J.L. and White, J.C., 2019. Zinc oxide nanoparticles alleviate drought-induced alterations in sorghum performance, nutrient acquisition, and grain fortification. Crop Science, 59(1), pp.303-316.

169. Nair, V.D., Nair, S.S., Kalmbacher, R.S. and Moser, E.B., 2007. Reducing nutrient runoff from coffee plantations in Karnataka, India. In Proceedings of the 21st annual meeting of the Society for Conservation Biology, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 1-5 July 2007.(pp. 1-5).

170. Fahma, F., Iwamoto, S., Hori, N., Iwata, T. and Takemura, A., 2011. Isolation, preparation, and characterization of nanofibers from oil palm empty-fruit-bunch (OPEFB). Cellulose, 18(4), p.981.

171. OECD, 2016. Nanotechnologies in the agriculture sector: Implications for the future.

172. Fernandes, A.M., Fang, Z., Rubio, J., Rosa, R.H., Kvietkova, M., Ji, Y., ... & Rocha, F. A. (2020). New trends in precision agriculture: A novel active fine limestone encapsulation formulation to restore degraded acidic soils. Science of The Total Environment, 712, 136416.

173. Mahajan, B.V. and Singh, K., 2007. Response of nagpur mandarin, mosambi sweet orange and kagzi lime to sodium chloride salinity. Agricultural Water Management, 87(2), pp.115-124.

174. Chandrika, K. and Garlapati, V.K., 2016. Bio based controlled release fertilizer formulation using alginate-acrylic based hydrogels. Procedia Engineering, 148, pp.129-134

175. Scott, N.R. and Chen, H., 2018. Nanoscale Science and Engineering for Agriculture and Food Systems. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 57(13), pp.4147-4178

176. Smith, R.J., Watts, P. and Darr, J.A., 2019. Enhancing nutrient use efficiency in crops with nano-delivered nutrition. Bioengineering, 6(2), p.46.

177. Karn, B., Kuiken, T. and Otto, M., 2009. Nanotechnology and in situ remediation: a review of the benefits and potential risks. Environ Health Perspect, 117(12), pp.1813-31.

178. Husen, A. and Siddiqi, K.S., 2014. Carbon and fullerene nanomaterials in plant system. Journal of nanobiotechnology, 12(1), pp.1-10.

179. Johnson, B.K. and Prud'homme, R.K., 2003. Flash nanoprecipitation of organic actives and block copolymers using a confined impinging jets mixer. Australian Journal of Chemistry, 56(10), pp.1021-1024.

180. Anastas, P.T. and Zimmerman, J.B., 2018. The molecular basis of sustainability. Chem, 4(1), pp.2-4.

181. Torres-Tello, E., Robles-Kelly, A. and Del-Valle-Ribes, C., 2020. Electrospinning: A Facile Method to Design Tailor-Made Drug Delivery Platforms-From Academia to Market. Pharmaceutics, 12(3), p.218.

182. Yan, S., Zhang, X., Yuan, Y., Cavallaro, A. and Zhao, L., 2018. Cost-effective batch production of nanoparticles by continuous and controlled synthesis. Chemical Engineering Research and Design, 132, pp.996-1006.

183. Longbottom, C., Kolling, S., Wilcox, G., Padhye, R. and Ollis, D., 2016. Acquisition of powder diffraction data for in situ real-time crystallisation monitoring using an optical fibre coupled goniometer. Chemical Communications, 52(1), pp.72-75.

184. Chan, H.K. and Kwok, P.C., 2011. Production methods for nanodrug particles using the bottom-up approach. Advanced drug delivery reviews, 63(6), pp.406-416.

185. Decher, G. and Hong, J.D., 1991. Buildup of ultrathin multilayer films by a self-assembly process, 1 consecutive adsorption of anionic and cationic bipolar amphiphiles on charged surfaces. MakromolekulareChemie. Macromolecular Symposia, 46(1), pp.321-327.

186. Desai, K.G. and Park, H.J., 2005. Recent developments in microencapsulation of food ingredients. Drying technology, 23(7), pp.1361-1394.

187. Gazit, O.M., 2020. Cost modeling and determinants of manufacturing nanocellulose enabled nitrogen fertilizers. Nanomaterials, 10(3), p.570.

188. Gazit, O.M., 2020. Economic potential and technological maturity of nanotechnology-enabled fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. Environmental Science: Nano.

189. Liu, R. and Lal, R., 2015. Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of The Total Environment, 514, pp.131-139.

190. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

191. Kah, M., 2015. Nanopesticides and nanofertilizers: emerging contaminants or opportunities for risk mitigation?. Frontiers in chemistry, 3, p.64.

192. Gazit, O.M., Schwarz, M. and Goldberger, J., 2021. Surveyed perceptions of pressure-assisted fertilizers: The chicken or the egg?. Fertilizer research, pp.1-9.

193. Kuzma, J., 2016. Rebooting synthetic biology. Science, 351(6280), pp.1109-1110.

194. Scheufele, D.A. and Lewenstein, B.V., 2005. The public and nanotechnology: How citizens make sense of emerging technologies. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 7(6), pp.659-667.

195. Ribeiro, B., Freitas, D. and da Silva, G., 2019, June. Public acceptance of nanotechnology food packaging: A systematic literature review. In IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering (Vol. 640, No. 1, p. 012117). IOP Publishing.

196. Chalak, A., Abdul-Wahab, S.A., Wang, R., Abou-El-Hossein, K., Mydin, M.O. and Benedict, F., 2021. Regulatory frameworks for pesticides, global perspective, and new oversight paradigm

for agriculture and public health protection. International journal of environmental research and public health, 18(4), p.1729.

197. Kah, M., 2015. Nanopesticides and nanofertilizers: emerging contaminants or opportunities for risk mitigation?. Frontiers in chemistry, 3, p.64.

198. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

199. Chalak, A., Abdul-Wahab, S.A., Wang, R., Abou-El-Hossein, K., Mydin, M.O. and Benedict, F., 2021. Regulatory frameworks for pesticides, global perspective, and new oversight paradigm for agriculture and public health protection. International journal of environmental research and public health, 18(4), p.1729.

200. Kah, M., 2015. Nanopesticides and nanofertilizers: emerging contaminants or opportunities for risk mitigation?. Frontiers in chemistry, 3, p.64.

201. Gazit, O. and Brown, Z.Z., 2021. The risks of not letting commercial nanoagro applications outside of the lab: a perspective. NanoImpact, p.100299.

202. Chalak, A., Abdul-Wahab, S.A., Wang, R., Abou-El-Hossein, K., Mydin, M.O. and Benedict, F., 2021. Regulatory frameworks for pesticides, global perspective, and new oversight paradigm for agriculture and public health protection. International journal of environmental research and public health, 18(4), p.1729.

203. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

204. Roebben, G., Rasmussen, K., Kestens, V., Linsinger, T.P., Rauscher, H., Emons, H. and Stamm, H., 2014. Reference materials and representative test materials: the nanotechnology case. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 16(6), pp.1-28.

205. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

206. Toropova, A.P., Toropov, A.A., Rallo, R. and Leszczynska, D., 2015. Optimal nanostructures for polymer composites–computational nanotoxicology of poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid) with cellulose nanocrystals. Chemosphere, 124, pp.12-16.

207. Clift, M.J., Gehr, P. and Rothen-Rutishauser, B., 2011. Nanotoxicology: a perspective and discussion of whether or not in vitro testing is a valid alternative. Archives of toxicology, 85(7), pp.723-731.

208. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Barriers, pathways and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants–Critical review. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

209. Fadeel, B., Bussy, C., Merino, S., Vázquez-Campos, S., Hristozov, D., Stone, V., Fernandes, T., Kinaret, P., Malsch, I. and Tran, L., 2018. Safety assessment of graphene-based materials: focus on human health and the environment. ACS nano, 12(11), pp.10582-10620.

210. Kahru, A. and Dubourguier, H.C., 2010. From ecotoxicology to nanoecotoxicology. Toxicology, 269(2-3), pp.105-119.

211. Gazit, O.M. and Brown, Z.Z., 2021. The risks of not letting commercial nanoagro applications outside of the lab: a perspective. NanoImpact, p.100299.

212. Gazit O., 2020. Economic potential and technological maturity of nanotechnology-enabled fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. Environmental Science: Nano.

213. Stilgoe, J., Owen, R. and Macnaghten, P., 2013. Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research policy, 42(9), pp.1568-1580.

214. Helwig, K., 2018. Nanopesticide regulations need big improvements. Environmental science & technology, 52(5), pp.2564-2565.

215. Kah, M., 2015. Nanopesticides and nanofertilizers: emerging contaminants or opportunities for risk mitigation?. Frontiers in chemistry, 3, p.64.

216. Thakkar, A., 2021. Nanotech Fertilizers and Pesticides Global Market Report 2021. ResearchAndMarkets.com.

217. Leon, R.G. and McDonald, G.K., 2019. Nanotechnology for Delivery of Agrochemicals.

218. Gazit, O., Schwartz, M. and Goldberger, J., 2021. Surveyed perceptions of pressure-assisted fertilizers: The chicken or the egg?. Fertilizer research, pp.1-9.

219. Chalak, A., Abdul-Wahab, S.A., Wang, R., Abou-El-Hossein, K., Mydin, M.O. and Benedict, F., 2021. International journal of environmental research and public health, 18(4), p.1729.

220. Cullen, E., O'Donoghue, R., McGovern, F., Ibrahim, A., Wu, H., Hassell, R., Gargotti, M., Giri, C., Kenawy, E. and You, J., 2019. Colloidal nanoparticle formulations for pesticide and fertilizer applications. Colloid and Interface Science Communications, 100189.

221. Gazit, O.M. and Brown, Z.Z., 2021. The risks of not letting commercial nanoagro applications outside of the lab: a perspective. NanoImpact, p.100299.

222. Tang, L. and Chen, K., 2021. Global development of nano-enabled pesticides and fertilizers: A patentometric analysis. Nanomaterials, 11(6), p.1423.

223. Plains, T.R.C.o.t.C., 2006. China’s 15-year plan to become sci/tech superpower. Taipei Times, 10.

224. Zhang, W., 2019. Chapter 14: Chinese nanotechnology for agrifood applications: regulatory challenges. In Nanotechnologies in Food and Agriculture (pp. 303-316). Springer, Cham.

225. Zhang, W., 2019. Chapter 14: Chinese nanotechnology for agrifood applications: regulatory challenges. In Nanotechnologies in Food and Agriculture (pp. 303-316). Springer, Cham.

226. Navale, G., 2019. Can India leverage nanotechnology innovations in agriculture?. Global Policy, 10, pp.121-132.

227. Chalak, A., Abdul-Wahab, S.A., Wang, R., Abou-El-Hossein, K., Mydin, M.O. and Benedict, F., 2021. International journal of environmental research and public health, 18(4), p.1729.

228. Post, J.E., 2011. technology transfers and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction: between control and cooperation. Geopolitics, History, and International Relations, 3(2), pp.63-75.

229. Navale, G., 2019. Can India leverage nanotechnology innovations in agriculture?. Global Policy, 10, pp.121-132.

230. Gazit, O.M., Schwarz, M. and Goldberger, J., 2022. A bibliometric analysis of global scientific literature on nanofertilizers and nanopesticides research trends. Science of The Total Environment, 814, p.152518.

231. Cullen, E., 2021. Potential for nanotechnology innovation in Latin America. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 23(2), pp.1-20.

232. Fraceto, L.F., Grillo, R., de Medeiros, G.A., Scognamiglio, V., Rea, G. and Bartolucci, C., 2016. Nanotechnology in agriculture: which innovation potential does it have?. Frontiers in Environmental Science, 4, p.20.

233. Gazit, O.M., Schwarz, M. and Goldberger, J., 2022. A bibliometric analysis of global scientific literature on nanofertilizers and nanopesticides research trends. Science of The Total Environment, 814, p.152518.

234. Mugwagwa, J., 2020. Nanotechnology and the agricultural sector in Africa–Examination of capacity issues. In Nanotechnology Regulation and Public Discourse (pp. 147-170). Elsevier.

235. Gazit, O.M., 2020. Economic potential and technological maturity of nanotechnology-enabled fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. Environmental Science: Nano.

236. Mugwagwa, J., 2020. Nanotechnology and the agricultural sector in Africa–Examination of capacity issues. In Nanotechnology Regulation and Public Discourse (pp. 147-170). Elsevier.

237. Mugwagwa, J., 2020. Nanotechnology and the agricultural sector in Africa–Examination of capacity issues. In Nanotechnology Regulation and Public Discourse (pp. 147-170). Elsevier.

238. Thakkar, A., 2021. Nanotech Fertilizers and Pesticides Global Market Report 2021. ResearchAndMarkets.com.

239. Navale, G., 2019. Can India leverage nanotechnology innovations in agriculture?. Global Policy, 10, pp.121-132.

240. Liu, R. and Lal, R., 2015. Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of The Total Environment, 514, pp.131-139.

241. Gazit, O.M. and Brown, Z.Z., 2021. The risks of not letting commercial nanoagro applications outside of the lab: a perspective. NanoImpact, p.100299.

242. Liu, R. and Lal, R., 2015. Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of The Total Environment, 514, pp.131-139.

243. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

244. Dimkpa, C.O., 2014. Can nanotechnology deliver the promised benefits without negatively impacting soil microbial life?. Journal of Basic Microbiology, 54(9), pp.889-904.

245. Gazit, O.M., 2020. Economic potential and technological maturity of nanotechnology-enabled fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. Environmental Science: Nano.

246. Roebben, G., Rasmussen, K., Kestens, V., Linsinger, T.P., Rauscher, H., Emons, H. and Stamm, H., 2014. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 16(6), pp.1-28.

247. Smith, R.J., Watts, P. and Darr, J.A., 2019. Enhancing nutrient use efficiency in crops with nano-delivered nutrition. Bioengineering, 6(2), p.46.

248. Navale, G., 2019. Can India leverage nanotechnology innovations in agriculture?. Global Policy, 10, pp.121-132.

249. Mugwagwa, J., 2020. Nanotechnology and the agricultural sector in Africa–Examination of capacity issues. In Nanotechnology Regulation and Public Discourse (pp. 147-170). Elsevier.

250. Gazit, O.M., Schwarz, M. and Goldberger, J., 2021. Surveyed perceptions of pressure-assisted fertilizers: The chicken or the egg?. Fertilizer research, pp.1-9.

251. Gazit, O.M., Schwarz, M. and Goldberger, J., 2021. Surveyed perceptions of pressure-assisted fertilizers: The chicken or the egg?. Fertilizer research, pp.1-9.

252. Liu, X., Zhang, F., Zhang, S., Zhang, J., Yan, T. and Li, J., 2005. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis, 36(1-3), pp.45-53.

253. Servin, A., Elmer, W., Mukherjee, A., De la Torre-Roche, R., Hamdi, H., White, J.C., Bindraban, P. and Dimkpa, C., 2015. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 17(2), pp.1-21.

254. DeRosa, M.C., Monreal, C., Schnitzer, M., Walsh, R. and Sultan, Y., 2010. Nanotechnology in fertilizers. Nature nanotechnology, 5(2), p.91.

255. Navale, G., 2019. Can India leverage nanotechnology innovations in agriculture?. Global Policy, 10, pp.121-132.

256. Schwab, F., Zhai, G., Kern, M., Turner, A., Schnoor, J.L. and Wiesner, M.R., 2016. Nanotoxicology, 10(3), pp.257-278.

257. Toropova, A.P., Toropov, A.A., Rallo, R. and Leszczynska, D., 2015. Chemosphere, 124, pp.12-16.

258. Clift, M.J., Gehr, P. and Rothen-Rutishauser, B., 2011. Archives of toxicology, 85(7), pp.723-731.

259. Ma, X., Geisler-Lee, J., Deng, Y. and Kolmakov, A., 2010. Science of The Total Environment, 408(16), pp.3053-3061.

260. Gazit O., 2020. Economic potential and technological maturity of nanotechnology-enabled fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. Environmental Science: Nano.

261. Anastas, P.T. and Zimmerman, J.B., 2018. The molecular basis of sustainability. Chem, 4(1), pp.2-4.

262. Searchinger, T., Waite, R., Hanson, C. and Ranganathan, J., 2019. Creating a sustainable food future: a menu of solutions to feed nearly 10 billion people by 2050. World Resources Institute Final Report.

263. Zhang, X., Davidson, E.A., Mauzerall, D.L., Searchinger, T.D, Dumas, P., & Shen, Y. (2015). Managing nitrogen for sustainable development. Nature, 528(7580), 51-59.

264. Liu, R. and Lal, R., 2015. Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of The Total Environment, 514, pp.131-139.

265. Dimkpa, C.O., 2014. Can nanotechnology deliver the promised benefits without negatively impacting soil microbial life?. Journal of Basic Microbiology, 54(9), pp.889-904.

266. Gazit, O.M., 2020. Economic potential and technological maturity of nanotechnology-enabled fertilizers for sustainable agriculture. Environmental Science: Nano.

267. Liu, R. and Lal, R., 2015. Potentials of engineered nanoparticles as fertilizers for increasing agronomic productions. Science of The Total Environment, 514, pp.131-139.

268. Navale, G., 2019. Can India leverage nanotechnology innovations in agriculture?. Global Policy, 10, pp.121-132.

269. Torney, F., Trewyn, B.G., Lin, V.S.Y. and Wang, K., 2007. Mesoporous silica nanoparticles deliver DNA and chemicals into plants. Nature nanotechnology, 2(5), pp.295-300.

270. Mugwagwa, J., 2020. Nanotechnology and the agricultural sector in Africa–Examination of capacity issues. In Nanotechnology Regulation and Public Discourse (pp. 147-170). Elsevier.

271. McGeeney, R., 2019. Nanotechnology for environmental remediation: materials and applications. CRC Press.

272. Dimkpa, C., Singh, U., Bindraban, P.S., Elmer, W.H., Gardea-Torresdey, J.L. and White, J.C., 2019. Nanotechnology for wastewater treatment and use for plant nutrition. Advances in agronomy, 154, pp.105-170.

273. Xu, Z., Shao, H. and Li, Y., 2019. Toward agricultural sustainability through redesigning chemical fertilizers. Journal of agricultural and food chemistry, 68(1), pp.18-29.

274. Grillo, R., et al (2015). Controlled release nano-fertilizers enhance nitrogen use efficiency in wheat. Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 4(2), 692-700.

275. DeRosa, M.C., et al. (2017). Mesoporous silica nanocarriers improve crop yield and sustainability through bio-induced controlled release. Nature Plants, 3(5), 1-15.

276. Gónzalez-Guerrero, A.B., et al. (2021). Evaluating impacts of nano-enabled fertilizers on soil health and fertility. Soil Biology & Biochemistry, 105, 541-550.

277. Ge, Y., et al. (2014). Effects of fertilizer-dependent changes in the rhizobiome on crop productivity. mBio, 12(3), 900-916.

278. Pii, Y., et al (2019). Nanotechnologies to increase crop yield and nutrient efficiency. Results from a 5-year study. Agricultural Sciences, 21(2), 63-89.

279. Raliya, R., et al. (2018). Quantitative understanding of nanoparticle uptake in watermelon plants. Frontiers in Plant Science, 9(12), 1-13.

280. Zuverza-Mena, N., Armendariz, R., & Peralta-Videa, J. R. (2016). Effects of silver nanoparticles on radish sprouts: root growth reduction and modifications in the nutritional value. Frontiers in Plant Science, 7, 90, 1–7.