

Effect of NPKS and foliar application of nano-fertilizer on the performance of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under mid hill region of Himachal Pradesh

Abstract

The present study entitled “Effect of NPKS and foliar application of nano-fertilizer on the performance of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under mid hill region of Himachal Pradesh” was performed during kharif season of 2022-23 at Research Farm, School of Agriculture, Abhilashi University, Chail Chowk, Mandi (H.P.) India. The experimental design utilized a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with eight different treatments, replicated three times. T₁ was the absolute control with no fertilizers or chemicals. T₂ used 100% NPK and sulfur (S) with zinc (Zn) at 5 kg ha⁻¹. T₃ included 100% NPK and S with bio stimulants. T₄ applied 100% NPK and S with Nano Zn spray at 40 days after sowing (DAS). T₅ used 75% NPK and S with NPK consortia. T₆ applied 75% NPK and S with Nano nitrogen (N) spray at 40 DAS. T₇ combined 75% NPK and S with both Nano N and Nano Zn sprays at 40 DAS. T₈ used 75% NPK and S with NPK consortia and Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS. The results revealed significant variations in various parameters, including growth attribute, yield attributes, and yield, among the different treatments applied in this study. The highest values of such parameters including growth attribute viz. [highest plant height (cm), and dry matter accumulation (g m⁻²)] yield attributes and yield viz. [Number of siliquae plant⁻¹, Siliquae length (cm), Number of seed siliquae plant⁻¹, 1000 seed weight, weight of siliquae plant⁻¹, seed yield (q ha⁻¹), stover yield (q ha⁻¹) and biological yield (q ha⁻¹) was found under treatment-T₄ applied 100% NPK and S with Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS, While, some attributes namely- test weight (g), number of seed siliquae plant⁻¹ harvest index (%) was found non-significant. However, the lowest values for all parameters were observed under treatment T₁ (absolute control).

Keywords: Nano nitrogen, Nano zinc,

Comment [MF1]: Delete

Comment [MF2]: Which one of season?

Introduction

Brassica juncea, commonly known as brown mustard, Chinese mustard, Indian mustard, leaf mustard, oriental mustard and vegetable mustard, is a species of mustard plant. Mustard is belongin

Comment [MF3]: Must be more than five words

g to the family *Brassicaceae* (*Cruciferae*) and chromosome number of mustard is $2n=18$. Oilseeds *Brassica*, comprising eight different species viz. Indian mustard *Toria*, *Yellowsarson*, *Brownsarson*, *Gobhisarson*, *Karanrai*, *Blackmustard* and *Taramira*, are cultivated commercially in India. *Brassica juncea* (L.) Czernj and Cosson is mainly grown in the states of Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal and Gujarat. Rapeseed and mustard thrive well under both irrigated as well as rainfed conditions. Being more responsive to fertilizers, it offers better returns under irrigated conditions. The oil content and quality of oilseeds *Brassica* varies among the species with the management practices. The green leaves, seed and oil of oilseeds *Brassica* are used in preparation of various edible items including vegetables, pickles and flavouring agent (as condiments). Its oil is considered as one of the best edible oils for cooking purpose. Further its oil cake and green leaves are used as manure and cattle feed (Chauhan et al. (2011).

Comment [MF4]: Reference ?

Comment [MF5]: Reference ?

Comment [MF6]: Space between them

Comment [MF7]: Must be italic

Biostimulants are substances that promote plant growth when applied in small quantities. They are also known as metabolic enhancers. Components from seaweed, such as macro- and microelement nutrients, amino acids, vitamins, cytokinins, auxins, and abscisic acid (ABA)-like growth substances, affect cellular metabolism in treated plants, leading to enhanced growth and crop yield. (Zhang and Schmidt. 1997; Durand et al. 2003; Stirk et al. 2003; Ordog et al. 2004) Seaweed extracts are bioactive at low concentrations, diluted as 1:1000 or more (Crouch and van Staden, 1993). Although many of the various chemical components of seaweed extracts and their modes of action remain unknown, it is plausible that these components exhibit synergistic activity Fornes et al. (2002). It has been discovered that seaweed works well to increase crop output, insect resistance, and resilience to frost in cereals, oilseeds, vegetables, fruits, and flowers Vernieri et al. (2005).

Comment [MF8]: Italic

Comment [MF9]: Italic

Comment [MF10]: Italic

Comment [MF11]: Italic

Nano fertilizers have properties that improve plant performance, such as ultra-high absorption, increased production, and a rise in leaf surface area. Additionally, the controlled release of nutrients helps prevent eutrophication and pollution in water resources. Replacing traditional fertilizers with nano fertilizers is beneficial because they release nutrients into the soil steadily and in a controlled way, thus preventing water pollution Moaveni and Kheiri (2011). The use of nano fertilizers not only causes increased use efficiency through ultra-high absorption of the nutrients, increase in photosynthesis caused by expansion in surface area of the leaf but also reduce the toxicity generated due to over application in the soil as well as reduces the split application of fertilizer. Nano fertilizers and nanocomposites can be used to

control the release of nutrients from the fertilizer granules so as to improve the nutrient use efficiency while preventing the nutrient ions from either getting fixed or lost to the environment.

Comment [MF12]: Reference ?

Biofertilizers are grouped into different types on the basis of their functions and mode of action. The commonly used biofertilizers are nitrogen fixer (N-fixer), potassium solubilizer (K-solubilizer), phosphorus solubilizer (P-solubilizer), and plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR). Biofertilizers play an important role in improving soil fertility and enhancing crop yield. When applied to the soil, they participate in nutrient cycling and improve the soil structure and crop productivity. Biofertilizers, also called microbial inoculants, are organic products containing specific microorganisms, which are derived from plant roots and root zones. They have been shown to improve the growth and yield of the plant by 10–40%. Overuse of conventional fertilizers is a globally followed practice to meet plant nutrient needs. However, the efficiency of fertilizer use in crops rarely exceeds 30–35%, which is due to the loss of nutrient through leaching, evaporation and fixation (Mahmud et al. (2021)). Therefore, nano-fertilizers have gained momentum over the decade to make fertilizer use more efficient and facilitate fertilizer application. However, research has evolved over a decade from laboratory studies and concentric pot experiments. Few systematic studies have been conducted so far to demonstrate the effects of nano-fertilizers or the combination of nano-fertilizers with conventional fertilizers on crop yield and economics under the field conditions (Kah et al. (2018), Hu and Xianyu, (2021) Upadhyay et al. (2023)). Thus, accelerating plant growth and productivity by application of nano fertilizers can open new perspectives in agricultural practice

Comment [MF13]: Reference ?

Comment [MF14]: Italic

Comment [MF15]: Italic

Comment [MF16]: Italic

Materials and Methods

A present field experiment entitled “Effect of NPKS and foliar application of nano-fertilizer on the performance of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under mid hill region of Himachal Pradesh” was conducted during Rabi 2022-23 at the Research Farm, School of Agriculture, Abhilashi University, Mandi (H.P.) which is located at 77° East longitude and 31° North latitude and has an altitude of 1500 meters. The research was carried out in both the field and the lab in Abhilashi University's Department of Agronomy, School of Agriculture. Before the start of experiment, composite soil samples from a depth of 15 cm were collected from each of the three replications. These samples were subsequently processed and analyzed to determine their chemical properties. pH (1:2.5, soil: water suspension) was measured using the Potentiometric method as described by Jackson (1973). Electrical conductivity (dS m^{-1}) (1:2.5 soil: water extract) was determined using an EC

Comment [MF17]: Delete

Comment [MF18]: What's mean this word

Comment [MF19]: Laboratory

meter following Jackson (1973). Organic carbon (%) was analyzed using the Rapid titration method by Walkley and Black (1934). Available nitrogen (kg ha^{-1}) was assessed using the Alkaline permanganate method according to Subbiah and Asija (1956). Available phosphorus (kg ha^{-1}) was extracted using Olsen's method with 0.5 N NaHCO_3 at pH 8.5, as per Olsen et al. (1954). Available potassium (kg ha^{-1}) was extracted with normal neutral ammonium acetate and measured with a pH meter at pH 7.0, as described by Jackson (1973). Available zinc (mg kg^{-1}) and available sulfur (ppm) were estimated using DTPA extractant and Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy (AAS), Lindsay and Norvell (1978). The cropping history of the field was thoroughly reviewed for the three years preceding the current experiment to provide context for the results. In 2019, the field was cultivated with maize during the Kharif season and barley during the Rabi season. In 2020, rice was grown in the Kharif season, wheat in the Rabi season, and maize during the Zaid season. In 2021, soybean was planted in the Kharif season, pea in the Rabi season, and moong in the Zaid season. For 2022, the field was sown with guinea grass in the Kharif season, an experimental crop (mustard) in the Rabi season and remained fallow during the Zaid season.

The experiment was conducted to evaluate the effects of various treatments on crop performance. The study was carried out on a total area of 222 m^2 , with sowing done on 10 November 2022 using the line sowing method. The experimental design utilized a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with eight different treatments, replicated three times. T_1 was the absolute control with no fertilizers or chemicals, T_2 used 100% NPK and sulfur (S) with zinc (Zn) at 5 kg ha^{-1} , T_3 included 100% NPK and S with bio stimulants, T_4 applied 100% NPK and S with Nano Zn spray at 40 days after sowing (DAS), T_5 used 75% NPK and S with NPK consortia, T_6 applied 75% NPK and S with Nano nitrogen (N) spray at 40 DAS, T_7 combined 75% NPK and S with both Nano N and Nano Zn sprays at 40 DAS and T_8 used 75% NPK and S with NPK consortia and Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS. Each treatment was applied to a plot size of 3.7×2.5 meters (gross) and 2.7×1.5 meters (net), with a spacing of 25 cm between rows. The main irrigation channel was 1.5 meters wide, while the sub-irrigation channel was 1 meter wide, and the bund was 0.7 meters high. The seed rate was 5 kg per plot, and the variety used was Gold Madel. The recommended dose of N, P, K, and S for the crop was 120:60:40:20 kg ha^{-1} , with Zinc Sulphate monohydrate applied at 20 kg ha^{-1} .

The observations to be recorded include plant height (cm), dry matter accumulation (g m^{-2}), number of siliquae per plant, siliquae length (cm), number of seeds per siliquae, weight of siliquae per plant, seed yield (q ha^{-1}), stover yield (q ha^{-1}) biological yield (q

Comment [MF20]: Which one of season

Comment [MF21]: Which one of season

Comment [MF22]: Which one of season

Comment [MF23]: Which one of season

Comment [MF24]: Which one of season

Comment [MF25]: Which one of season

Comment [MF26]: Which one of season

Comment [MF27]: Which one of season

Comment [MF28]: Which one of season

Comment [MF29]: Which one of season

ha⁻¹), and harvest index (%). The results obtained from various chemical parameters of the initial experimental soil are given in Table 1.

Comment [MF30]: Remove space

Table 1 Initial chemical parameters of the experimental soil

Comment [MF31]: Written with results

S.N.	Particulars	Content
1	pH (1:2.5, soil: water suspension)	5.4
2	Electrical conductivity (dS m ⁻¹) (1:2.5 soil: water extract)	0.008
3	Organic carbon (%)	0.96
4	Available N (kg ha ⁻¹)	247.19
5	Available P (kg ha ⁻¹)	22.64
6	Available K (kg ha ⁻¹)	270.03
7	Available Zn (mg kg ⁻¹)	0.44
8	Available S (ppm)	12.69

Results and Discussion

Comment [MF32]: Must be use more references and recent for discussion

Growth parameters

Plant height (cm)

The data pertaining to plant height recorded at different growth stages has been presented in Table 2 and in Fig. 1. At 30 DAS, the plant height was found non-significant. Whereas, at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stage of the mustard crop, the highest plant height was observed in treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) which were higher over rest of the other treatments, while, treatment T₇ (75% NPK and S+ Nano N spray at 40 DAS + Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS) was statistically on par with treatment. However, the lowest plant height was noted under treatment T₁ (Absolute control) at various growth stages

of mustard crop. The foliar application of nano fertilizers was effective in promoting plant growth. This might suggest that urea, when used alone or in combination with nano nutrients, might positively influence plant growth. Nano fertilizers enhance plant growth by providing targeted nutrient delivery, increasing bioavailability and promoting overall plant growth. These results were in closely related with the findings of Sukirtee *et al.* (2018) and Kumar *et al.* (2016).

Comment [MF33]: Italic

Comment [MF34]: Italic

Comment [MF35]: Remove space

Table 2 Effect of different nutrient management on plant height of Indian mustard.

	Treatment	Plant height			
		30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	AT harvest
T ₁	Absolute control (No use of fertilizer and chemicals)	18.28	69.68	112.85	129.63
T ₂	100%NPK and S+Zn5Kg ha ⁻¹	22.07	83.29	129.12	145.06
T ₃	100%NPK and S+Bio stimulants	22.39	85.37	131.09	145.94
T ₄	100%NPKand S+NanoZn sprayat 40DAS	23.54	95.56	144.23	161.57
T ₅	75%NKP and S+NPK consortia	21.12	77.38	122.81	140.25
T ₆	75%NPKand S+NanoN sprayat 40DAS	21.61	79.47	126.72	143.52
T ₇	75%NPKand S+NanoN spray at40 DAS+ Nano Znspray at40 DAS	23.20	92.65	142.43	158.34
T ₈	75%NPK and S+NPK consortia +NanoZn sprayat 40DAS	22.54	86.15	131.39	146.52
	SE(m)±	1.54	2.53	3.81	4.38
	C.D.	NS	7.76	11.67	13.40




Fig. 1. Effect of different nutrient management on plant height of Indian mustard.

Dry matter accumulation (g m^{-2})

The integration of nitrogen and nano fertilizer significantly influenced the yield of the mustard crop regarding total dry matter accumulation. A noticeable increment was recorded at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stage of mustard crop and is presented in Table 3 and Fig. 2. The effect of various treatments on dry matter accumulation of mustard crop was found non-significant at 30 DAS. As per the data observed at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest the highest buildup of dry matter (respectively) were achieved under treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS). It was shown to be significantly on par with treatment T₇ (75% NPK and S+ Nano N spray at 40 DAS + Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS). Treatment T₁ (Absolute control) had the lowest dry matter accumulation of the mustard crop at 30, 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stage, respectively.

Nano material play important role in enhancing root growth of mustard crop which might have resulted in better nutrient uptake leading to efficient photosynthesis activity which ultimately results in more dry matter production in crop. This is line with findings of Khatkar *et al.* (2009). Metabolic activities inside the plant body affect dry matter accumulation. Better rhizospheric environment and more availability of nutrient at all the growth stages might have better metabolic activity and cellular activities (i.e. cell

Comment [MF36]: Italic

multiplication, cell elongation and cell expression) inside the plant system. This line was findings of Arora et al. (2012).

Comment [MF37]: Italic

Comment [MF38]: Remove space

Table 3. Effect of different nutrient management on dry matter accumulation of Indian mustard.

Treatment		Dry matter accumulation			
		30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	AT harvest
T ₁	Absolute control (No use of fertilizer and chemicals)	8.56	14.74	36.97	52.82
T ₂	100%NPK and S+Zn5Kg ha ⁻¹	11.04	23.39	47.84	75.28
T ₃	100%NPK and S+Bio stimulants	11.48	25.95	51.58	82.71
T ₄	100%NPKand S+NanoZn sprayat 40DAS	12.56	31.02	60.72	99.73
T ₅	75%NKP and S+NPK consortia	9.39	18.93	40.29	61.62
T ₆	75%NPKand S+NanoN sprayat 40DAS	9.83	21.28	45.69	68.17
T ₇	75%NPKand S+NanoNspray at40 DAS+ Nano Znspray at40 DAS	12.37	29.14	59.39	94.72
T ₈	75%NPK and S+NPK consortia +NanoZn sprayat 40DAS	11.76	26.18	54.48	86.81

	SE(m)±	1.77	0.73	1.50	2.28
	C.D.	NS	2.25	4.60	6.99




Fig. 2 Effect of different nutrient management on dry matter accumulation of Indian mustard

Yield attributes

The various treatments were considerable in increasing the yield attributes of mustard crop. The data regarding to yield attributes of mustard crop were presented in Table 4 and illustrated in Fig. 3.

Number of siliquae plant⁻¹

The treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) was found the highest number of siliquae plant⁻¹ of mustard crop and it was statistically at par with treatment T₇ (75% NPK and S+ Nano N spray at 40 DAS + Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS) and superior over rest of the treatments. While, lowest number of siliquae plant⁻¹ was recorded under treatment T₁ (Absolute control). Better nutrient availability might have resulted in production of more sinks leading to more accumulated dry matter production and more branches plant⁻¹ which ultimately resulted in a greater number of siliquae plant⁻¹ of mustard crop. Similar findings are also reported by Gangwar et al. (2011).

Comment [MF39]: Italic

Siliquae length (cm)

The maximum siliquae length of mustard crop was observed under treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) which was significantly on par with treatment T₇ (75% NPK and S+ Nano N spray at 40 DAS + Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS). Whereas, T₁ (Absolute control) were noted the lowest siliquae length of mustard crop. Application of synthetic fertilizer along with sulphur and nano fertilizer are responsible for increasing the translocation of photosynthates towards sink resulted in increasing in siliquae length. These results are in conformity with the findings of Rathor et al. (2019).

Number of seeds siliquae plant⁻¹

The various treatments were failed to show significant effects on number of seeds siliquae plant⁻¹ of mustard crop. Whereas, the highest number of seeds siliquae plant⁻¹ was noted under treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) and minimum number of seeds siliquae plant⁻¹ was recorded under treatment T₁ (Absolute control).

Test weight (g)

The effect of various treatments was also failed to create significant effects on test weight of mustard crop. However, the maximum test weight of mustard crop was observed under treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS). While, minimum test weight was found under treatment T₁ (Absolute control).

Weight of siliquae plant⁻¹

Application NPK and nano fertilizer were considerably increasing the weight of siliquae plant⁻¹ of mustard crop during the field experiment. The highest weight of siliquae plant⁻¹ was observed under treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) and it was statistically at par with treatment T₇ (75% NPK and S+ Nano N spray at 40 DAS + Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS). While, treatment T₁ (Absolute control) was recorded under the lowest weight of siliquae plant⁻¹ of mustard crop. This might be due to the better absorption of nutrients resulted in more weight of siliquae plant⁻¹. Similar findings are also observed by Pandav et al. (2022).

Comment [MF40]: Italic

Comment [MF41]: Remove space

Table 4. Effect of different nutrient management on yield attributing character of Indian mustard.

	Treatment	Number of siliquae plant⁻¹	Siliquae length (cm)	Number of seeds siliquae plant⁻¹	Test weight (g)	Weight of Siliquae plant⁻¹
T₁	Absolute control (No use of fertilizer and chemicals)	208.62	3.79	11.23	4.19	24.48
T₂	100%NPK and S+Zn5Kg ha ⁻¹	230.49	4.75	11.95	4.71	30.72
T₃	100%NPK and S+Bio stimulants	238.73	4.96	12.06	4.76	33.96
T₄	100%NPKand S+NanoZn sprayat 40DAS	265.27	5.87	12.30	4.90	40.36
T₅	75%NKP and S+NPK	217.95	4.16	11.58	4.55	27.59

	consortia					
T₆	75%NPKand S+NanoN sprayat 40DAS	222.83	4.54	11.73	4.63	29.38
T₇	75%NPKand S+NanoNspray at40 DAS+ Nano Znspray at40 DAS	258.34	5.63	12.25	4.86	38.69
T₈	75%NPK and S+NPK consortia +NanoZn sprayat 40DAS	242.67	5.24	12.13	4.80	35.74
	SE(m)±	6.84	0.15	0.35	0.22	1.05
	C.D.	20.96	0.47	NS	NS	3.22




Fig. 3. Effect of different nutrient management on yield attributing character of Indian mustard.

Yields of mustard

The seed yield, stover yield, biological yield and harvest index of mustard crop is presented in Table 5 and illustrated in Fig. 4.

Seed yield ($q\ ha^{-1}$)

The seed yield of mustard crop was varied significantly among the various treatment applications. Amongst various treatments T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) was observed the maximum seed yield of mustard crop and it was statistically at par with treatment T₇ (75% NPK and S+ Nano N spray at 40 DAS + Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS) and superior of rest of the treatments. Whereas, the minimum seed yield of mustard crop was noted under treatment T₁ (Absolute control) during the field study. Treatment T₄ recorded the highest seed yield of mustard crop which might be due higher values of various growth parameters and yield character of mustard crop. Better translocation of photosynthates from source to sink has led to better growth parameters and higher yield attributing characters which might be resulted in maximum seed yield of mustard crop. These results are in conformity with the findings of Yadav and Dhanai (2016).

Stover yield (q ha⁻¹)

Amongst various treatments application of NPK and nano fertilizer were considerably increase the stover yield of mustard crop during the field experiment. The highest stover yield of mustard crop was observed under treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) which was statistically on par with treatment T₇ (75% NPK and S+ Nano N spray at 40 DAS + Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS). However, treatment T₁ (Absolute control) was noted the lowest seed yield of mustard crop during field study. This might be due to the better availability of nutrients which resulted in higher stover yield leading to more accumulated dry matter of mustard crop. Similar findings are also noted by Gangwar et al. (2011).

Comment [MF42]: Italic

Biological yield (q ha⁻¹)

The maximum biological yield was found under treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) and it was statistically comparable with treatment T₇ (75% NPK and S+ Nano N spray at 40 DAS + Nano Zn spray at 40 DAS). While, the lowest seed yield of mustard crop was noted under treatment T₁ (Absolute control) during field experiment. Highest biological yield might could be attributed to combined effect of seed and stover yields of mustard crop. Better dry matter accumulation resulted in better translocation of photosynthates resulting in higher seed, stover and biological yield. These results are similar with the results of Kumar et al. (2022).

Comment [MF43]: Italic

Harvest index (%)

The harvest index of mustard crop was found non-significant. However, the treatment T₄ (100% NPK and S+ NANO Zn spray at 40 DAS) was noted the highest harvest index of mustard crop and lowest harvest index was observed under treatment T₁ (Absolute control).

Comment [MF44]: Remove space

Table 5 Effect of different nutrient management on yield character of Indian mustard.

Treatment		Seed yield (q ha ⁻¹)	Stover yield (q ha ⁻¹)	Biological yield (q ha ⁻¹)	Harvest index (%)
T ₁	Absolute control (No use of fertilizer and chemicals)	12.69	45.71	58.40	21.73
T ₂	100%NPK and S+Zn5Kg ha ⁻¹	19.79	68.81	88.60	22.34
T ₃	100%NPK and S+Bio stimulants	21.39	77.29	98.68	21.68
T ₄	100%NPKand S+NanoZn sprayat 40DAS	23.71	95.38	119.09	19.91
T ₅	75%NKP and S+NPK consortia	15.56	51.68	67.24	23.14
T ₆	75%NPKand S+NanoN sprayat 40DAS	16.49	58.59	75.08	21.96
T ₇	75%NPKand S+NanoNspray at40 DAS+ Nano Znspray at40 DAS	22.36	90.49	113.52	20.29
T ₈	75%NPK and S+NPK consortia +NanoZn sprayat 40DAS	21.96	83.83	105.79	20.76
SE(m)±		0.56	2.12	2.65	1.10
C.D.		1.71	6.48	8.11	NS

	C.V.	5.02	5.13	5.05	8.88
--	-------------	------	------	------	------




Fig. 4 Effect of different nutrient management on yield character of Indian mustard.

Conclusion:

As a result of the study's findings, the NPKS and Nano fertilizer exhibits the greatest growth outcomes when compared to other nanofertilizers. With nanofertilizers promising to be a safe approach to provide nutrients to plants without harming the environment, speeding plant development and production through their application can therefore open new vistas in agricultural practices. To ensure the safety of the plants treated with nanoparticles for use by humans and animals, additional field research is necessary to examine the impact of this concentration on the growth and metabolism of mustard crop.

Comment [MF45]: What's mean this word

Comment [MF46]: Remove space

References:

Arora S, Sharma P, Kumar S, Nayan R, Khanna P and Zaidi M. (2012). Gold-nanoparticle induced enhancement in growth and seed yield of *Brassica juncea*. *Plant Growth Regulation* 66(3): 303-310

Chauhan JS, Singh KH, Singh VV and Kumar S. 2011. Hundred years of rapeseed mustard breeding in India accomplishments and future strategies. *Indian Journal of Agriculture Science* 81(12): 1093-1109

Comment [MF47]: Should be used more recent references
Must be arrange into one style

- Crouch IJ, van Staden J. 1993. Evidence for the presence of plant growth regulators in commercial seaweed products. *Plant Growth Regulation* 13:21–29
- Durand N, Briand X, Meyer C. 2003. The effect of marine bioactive substances (NPRO) and exogenous cytokinins on nitrate reductase activity in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Physiol Plant* 119:489–493
- Fornes F, Sañchez-Perales M, Guadiola JL. 2002. Effect of a seaweed extract on the productivity of 'de Nules' clementine mandarin and navelina orange. *Bot Mar* 45:486–489
- Gangwar TV, Patel MV and Jadav NJ. 2011. Effect of phosphorus, sulphur and phosphate solubilizing bacteria on yield, nutrient uptake and soil fertility after harvest of mustard. *Indian Journal of Fertilizers* 7(8): 32-40
- Hu J and Xianyu Y. 2021. When nano meets plants: a review on the interplay between nanoparticles and plants. *Nano Today* 38:101143
- Jackson ML. 1973. Soil chemical analysis, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi. 498
- Kah M, Kookana RS, Gogos A, and Bucheli TD. 2018. A critical evaluation of nanopesticides and nanofertilizers against their conventional analogues. *National Nanotechnology* 13, 677–684
- Khatkar Y, Dawson J, Zade KK, Dixitand PM and Khatkar R. 2009. Effect of nitrogen, phosphorus and sulphur fertilization on growth and yield of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) *International Journal Agricultural Science* 5 (2): 396-398
- Kumar A, Singh K, Verma P, Singh O, Panwar A and Singh T. 2022. Effect of nitrogen and zinc nano fertilizer with the organic farming practices on cereal and oil seed crops. *Scientific reports*12(1):1-7
- Kumar V, Kandpal BK, Dwivedi A, Kumar SV, Kumar V and Sharma DK. 2016. Effect of nitrogen and zinc fertilizer rates on growth, quality and yield of Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *International Journal of Agricultural Science* 8(06): 1031-1035
- Lindsay WL and Norvell WA. 1978. Development of a DTPA soil test for zinc, iron, manganese and copper. *Soil Science Social America* 42 3: 421-428
- Moaveni P, Kheiri T. 2011 In 2nd International Conferences on Agricultural and Animal Science; November 25-27, in Maldives, Singapore: *International Association of Computer Science and information Technology press* 22: 160-163

- Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanble FS and Dean LA. 1954. Estimation of available phosphorus in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate (NaHCO₃). *U.S. Department of Agriculture Central Institute for research*No. 939
- Ordog V, Stirk WA, van Staden J, Novak O, Strnad M. 2004. Endogenous cytokinins in the three genera of microalgae from the Chlorophyta. *Journal of Phycology* 40:88–95
- Pandav DM, Talathi MS, Bodake PS, Chavan VG, More SS, Pethe UB, ... & Mote GK. 2022. Response of nitrogen level and nano urea on mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under Konkan condition. *Pharma Innovation* 11(12), 2055-2061
- Rathore SS, Shekhawat KA, Singh RK, Updhyay PK, Shekhawat R and Premi OP. 2019. Effect of nano particles on growth, productivity, profitability of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under semi-arid conditions. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Science* 89(7): 1145-1150
- Stirk WA, Novak MS, van Staden J. 2003. Cytokinins in macroalgae. *Plant Growth Regulator* 41:13–24
- Subbiah BV and Asija GL. 1956. Arapid procedure for the estimation of available nitrogen in soils. *Graduate Science* 25, 254-260
- Sukirtee, Singh YV, Rajan KR, Menka K and Bharteey PK. 2018. Interaction effect of nitrogen and Sulphur on yield, oil and nutrient content of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) in an Inceptisol. *International Journal of Chemical Studies* 6(6): 1234-1238
- Upadhyay PK, Singh VK, Rajanna GA, Dwivedi BS, Dey A, Singh RK & Rawat S. 2023. Unveiling the combined effect of nano fertilizers and conventional fertilizers on crop productivity, profitability, and soil well-being. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems* 7, 1260178
- Vernieri P, Borghesi E, Ferrante A, Magnani G. 2005. Application of biostimulants in floating system for improving rocket quality. *Journal of Food Agricultural Environment* 3:86–88
- Walkey AJ and Black IA. 1934. Estimation of soil organic carbon by chromic acid titration method. *Soil Science* 37, 29-38

Yadav MS and Dhanai CS. 2018. Effect of fertilizer on yield and yield attributing characters of mustard (*brassica juncea* L.). *Journal of Pharmacognogy and Phytochemistry* 7(2): 2300-2303

Zhang X, Schmidt RE. 1997. The impact of growth regulators on the a-tocopherol status in water-stressed *Poa pratensis* L. *International Turfgrass Society Research Journal* 8:1364–1373

UNDER PEER REVIEW