

Journal of Experimental Agriculture International

Volume 46, Issue 3, Page 139-145, 2024; Article no.JEAI.113475 ISSN: 2457-0591 (Past name: American Journal of Experimental Agriculture, Past ISSN: 2231-0606)

# Studies on Nano DAP on Growth, Yield and Quality of Chickpeas under Rainfed Conditions of Northeastern Dry Zone of Karnataka

Amar Khemshetty <sup>a++</sup>, D. H. Patil <sup>b#\*</sup>, Pandit S. Rathod <sup>c†</sup>, A. S. Police Patil <sup>b‡</sup> and K. Basavaraj <sup>d#</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Raichur, Karnataka – 584 104, India. <sup>b</sup> Department of Agronomy, Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Kalaburagi, Karnataka–585 101, India. <sup>c</sup> Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Kalaburagi–585 101, India. <sup>d</sup> Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Kalaburagi, Karnataka–585 101, India.

#### Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

#### Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JEAI/2024/v46i32332

#### **Open Peer Review History:**

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/113475

> Received: 12/12/2023 Accepted: 17/02/2024 Published: 24/02/2024

Original Research Article

<sup>++</sup> PG Scholar;

<sup>#</sup> Senior Scientist;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> Professor;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup> Scientist;

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: E-mail: dhpatil99@gmail.com;

J. Exp. Agric. Int., vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 139-145, 2024

## ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Kalaburagi, during rabi season of 2022-23 to study the growth and yield of chickpea as influenced by fertilizers and foliar application of nano DAP. The experiment included four levels of RDF in main plots viz., 0% RDF (M<sub>1</sub>), 50% RDF (M<sub>2</sub>), 75% RDF (M<sub>3</sub>) and 100% RDF (M<sub>3</sub>) and three levels of nano DAP sprays in subplots viz., 2 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water (S<sub>1</sub>), 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water (S<sub>2</sub>), and Seed treatment with Nano DAP @ 5ml kg<sup>-1</sup> seeds (S<sub>3</sub>) laid out in split plot design. The results revealed that among all the treatment combinations,100% RDF + nano DAP @ 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water recorded significantly higher growth, parameters viz., plant height (37.56 cm), number of primary branches plant<sup>-1</sup> (6.86), leaf area plant <sup>1</sup> (2.58 dm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>), LAI (0.86) and total dry matter accumulation in plant (20.24 g plant<sup>-1</sup>) at harvest.; yield parameters viz., number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (23.52), seed weight per plant (9.16 g), 100 seed weight (22.30 g), haulm yield (3550kg ha-1), seed yield (1868 kg ha-1), quality parameters viz., protein content (19.31%) and protein yield (361.15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). This treatment was however found on par with 75 per cent RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water which recorded on par growth parameters viz., plant height (36.56 cm), number of primary branches plant<sup>-1</sup> (6.59), leaf area plant<sup>1</sup> (2.51 dm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>1</sup>), LAI (0.84), chlorophyll content (57.47) and total dry matter accumulation by plant (19.80 g plant<sup>-1</sup>) at harvest.; yield parameters viz., number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (23.25), seed weight per plant (9.04 g), 100 seed weight (21.16 g), haulm yield (3504kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), seed vield (1796 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), protein content (19.04%) and protein vield (342.52 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Keywords: Chickpea; fertilizer; nano DAP; growth; yield; economics.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) is one of the most prominent pulse crops not only in India but also in the world. It is called by different synonyms such as gram or bengalgram and is popularly referred to as chana in several places of the country. Chickpea is a cool season long-day legume crop belongs to the family fabaceae and subfamily faboideae. It is valued for its rich nutritive seed enormous source of protein (23%). with carbohydrate (63%), fat (5%), crude fiber (6%), ash (3%) and also rich in calcium, magnesium, iron and niacin [1]. Hence, it is increasingly consumed as a substitute for animal protein. It is predominantly consumed in the form of whole grain or dhal, sprouted grain, green or matured dry seeds and is used in the preparation of variety of snacks, sweets and condiments. Due to its high nutritional value, it has become an integral part of the daily dietary system for over millions of people. In India chickpea is grown on an area of 9.9 m ha, with a production of 11.9 m t and a productivity of 1192 kg ha-1 [2]. In Karnataka, Kalaburagi occupies the first position with respect to chickpea area (1.24 lakh ha), production (8.63 lakh tonnes) and productivity (733 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Chickpea is grown during rabi under residual moisture conditions and marginal lands which are low in fertility status and facing various abiotic stresses. biotic and The overall productivity of chickpea in India is comparatively low as compared to other countries. Indian

agriculture is facing a wide spectrum of challenges in crop production systems such as crop yield stagnation, declining organic matter, multi nutrient deficiencies, low use efficiency of fertilizers, shrinking arable land and water availability etc. Fertilizers play a pivotal role in agricultural production. Conventional chemical fertilizer application techniques are resulting in much nutrient loss such as fixation, immobilization, volatilization, leaching and runoff.

Foliar fertilization is the most economical way of supplying the plant nutrients. One main advantage of foliar nutrition is that it often brings about immediate improvement in plant growth and development. Foliar fertilization or foliar feeding encourages the supply of nutrients, plant hormones, stimulants and other beneficial substances in liquid form to plant through aerial parts of the plants to realize enhanced yield. Fertilizers which are applied to the soil at the time of sowing are not fully available to the plants as the crop approaches maturity. Due to moisture stress under rainfed condition where the availability of soil moisture becomes scarce, the application of nutrient fertilizers as foliar spray results in superior yield. Supplemental foliar application is one of the many techniques available which makes them readily available. Application of nutrients through foliar spray at appropriate stages of growth becomes very important for their utilization and helps in better performance of the crop [3]. Thus, an alternate

technology such as nanotechnology is used to precisely deliver correct quantity of nutrients and other inputs required by crops in suitable proportion that promote productivity while ensuring environmental safety. Nano fertilizer is a useful tool in agriculture for improving crop growth, yield and quality metrics by increasing nutrient use efficiency, lowering fertilizer waste and cultivation costs. Nano fertilizers have a large surface area, high sorption capacity and controlled-release kinetics to specific locations. making them a clever delivery mechanism [4]. IFFCO has developed nanotechnology based liquid nano DAP fertilizers to address the imbalanced and excessive use of conventional urea and DAP fertilizers. This nano DAP contains about 8 per cent (80,000 ppm) of nitrogen and 16 per cent (1,60,000 ppm) of phosphorous. IFFCO nano DAP is prepared by nano technology that effectively fulfills crop nitrogen and phosphorous requirement when used as foliar spray and improves the productivity of crops. Thus, keeping theses points in view, an experiment to study the effect of nano technology on growth and yield of chickpea was planned and implemented.

#### 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during rabi season, 2022-23 at Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Kalaburagi (Karnataka) to assess the effect of nano DAP on growth and yield of chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). The soil of the experimental site belonged to Vertisols having pH (8.12), medium in available nitrogen (237 kg ha-<sup>1</sup>), phosphorous (31 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and potassium (325 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The experiment was laid out in split plot design with three replications. The experiment consisted of 12 treatment combinations involving four levels of RDF (0, 50, 75 and 100%) and three levels of nano DAP (2 and 4 ml per liter of water and seed treatment with nano DAP @ 5 ml per kg seed). Recommended quantity of farm yard manure at the rate of 5 t ha-1 was applied to each plot three weeks prior to sowing as per the treatment. The nutrients viz., nitrogen and phosphorus were applied in the form of urea and SSP respectively at the time of sowing as per the treatments. Seed treatment of nano DAP @ 5 ml per kg seed was also done as per the treatment. Foliar spray of nano DAP was done after 30 days of sowing @ 2 and 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water. The certified seeds of chickpea variety JG-11 were used for sowing. The crop was sown by hand dibbling and maintaining spacing of 30 cm between rows and 10 cm between plants. Suitable plant protection measures were followed

during the cropping season. Five plants were randomly selected in each net plot area for taking observations on growth and yield and quality attributing parameters as per the schedule. The crop in each net plot was harvested separately as per treatment and the values were converted into hectare basis and expressed in kilograms per hectare. The data recorded durina the investigation were compiled and analyzed for statistical significance as per the analysis of variance for the split plot design. Fisher's method of analysis of variance (ANOVA) as described by Gomez and Gomez [5] was adopted for the purpose. Standard error of mean and coefficient of variability have been worked out for a set of observations under each character at P=0.05 interpret to the significance.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## 3.1 Growth Parameters

The results of the experiment revealed that the interaction effect between different levels of RDF and foliar sprays on growth parameters was found significant at p < 0.05 (Table 1). Application of 100% RDF with foliar spray of nano @ DAP 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water recorded significantly higher growth parameters viz., plant height (37,56 cm), number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup> (6.86), leaf area plant<sup>-1</sup> (2.58 dm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>), LAI (0.86) and total dry matter accumulation in plant (20.24 g plant<sup>-1</sup>) at harvest. This treatment was on par with 100% RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 2 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water, 100% RDF + Seed treatment with nano DAP @ 5 ml per kg seed. However, 75% RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water recorded on par growth parameters viz., plant height (36.56 cm), number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup> (6.59), leaf area plant<sup>-1</sup> (2.51 dm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>), LAI (0.84) and total dry matter accumulation in plant (19.80 g plant<sup>-1</sup>) with 100% RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 2 and 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water. The significantly higher growth parameters of chickpea in those treatments might be due to the high concentrations of nano DAP fertilizer with large permeability and high concentration of nanoparticles, that might have penetrated plant leaves and played an important role in promoting plant growth parameters, where nitrogen has a positive role in increasing the activity of meristemtic tissues and cell division and its importance in building amino acids such as tryptophan, which is the basis for building Auxins that contribute to cell division and expansion which ultimately resulted in higher growth parameters [6,7,8].Significantly lower growth parameters were observed with 0% RDF + seed treatment @ 5 ml/kg of seeds. This might be due to unavailability of required quantity nutrients for growth processes of chickpea plant.

#### **3.2 Yield Parameters**

The results of the experiment clearly indicated that the interaction effect between different levels of RDF and foliar sprays on yield parameters was found significant at p < 0.05 (Table 2). Application of 100% RDF with foliar spray of nano @ DAP 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water registered significantly higher yield parameters *viz.*, number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (23.52), seed weight per plant (9.16 g), seed yield (1868 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and haulm yield (3550kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). It was found on par with

100% RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water. 100% RDF + seed treatment with nano DAP @ 5 ml/liter of water. However, application of 75% RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water recorded on par seed vield and vield parameters viz., number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (23.25), seed weight per plant (9.04 g), 100 seed weight (21.16), seed yield (1796 kg ha-1) and haulm yield (3504kg ha-1) with 100 % RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 2 and 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water. This was mainly attributed to synergistic effect of conventional soil applied urea and SSP fertilizers and foliar applied nano DAP which enhanced the uptake of nitrogen and phosphorus [7]. The improved nitrogen and phosphorus availability at critical crop growth due to foliar spraying of nano DAP (nitrogen and phosphorus) which helped to improve the uptake of nutrients.

Table 1. Growth parameters of chickpea at harvest as influenced by different levels of RDF and nano DAP

| Treatments                       | Plant<br>height<br>(cm) | Number of<br>branches<br>plant <sup>-1</sup> | leaf area<br>plant <sup>-1</sup><br>(dm² plant <sup>-1</sup> ) | Leaf Area<br>Index (LAI) | Total dry matter<br>accumulation in<br>plant (g plant <sup>-1</sup> ) |  |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| Main plots: RDF levels           |                         |  |  |                          |   |  |
| M1: 0%                           | 29.84                   | 4.68   | 2.16   | 0.72                     | 15.75   |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> : 50%             | 30.83                   | 5.48   | 2.24   | 0.75                     | 17.38   |  |
| M3: 75%                          | 34.12                   | 6.23   | 2.35   | 0.78                     | 18.98   |  |
| M4:100%                          | 37.17                   | 6.79   | 2.56   | 0.85                     | 20.16   |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                 | 0.44                    | 0.06   | 0.04   | 0.01                     | 0.17  |  |
| CD @ 5%                          | 1.52                    | 0.21   | 0.14   | 0.05                     | 0.58  |  |
| Sub plots: Nano DAP levels       |                         |  |  |                          |   |  |
| S <sub>1</sub> : 2 ml/l of water | 32.71                   | 5.72   | 2.31   | 0.77                     | 17.95   |  |
| S <sub>2</sub> : 4 ml ml/l of    | 34.03                   | 6.01   | 2.38   | 0.79                     | 18.56   |  |
| water                            |                         |  |  |                          |   |  |
| S₃: Seed                         | 32.22                   | 5.65   | 2.29   | 0.76                     | 17.69   |  |
| treatment@ 5 ml/kg               |                         |  |  |                          |   |  |
| of seeds                         |                         |  |  |                          |   |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                 | 0.24                    | 0.05   | 0.01   | 0.005                    | 0.11  |  |
| CD @ 5%                          | 0.71                    | 0.16   | 0.04   | 0.01                     | 0.33  |  |
| Interaction                      |                         |  |  |                          |   |  |
| M1 x S1                          | 29.52                   | 4.55   | 2.17   | 0.72                     | 15.55   |  |
| $M_1 \times S_2$                 | 30.67                   | 5.08   | 2.18   | 0.73                     | 16.25   |  |
| M₁ x S₃                          | 29.32                   | 4.41   | 2.15   | 0.72                     | 15.43   |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> x S <sub>1</sub>  | 30.87                   | 5.50   | 2.25   | 0.75                     | 17.25   |  |
| $M_2 \times S_2$                 | 31.34                   | 5.50   | 2.26   | 0.75                     | 17.94   |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> x S <sub>3</sub>  | 30.28                   | 5.44   | 2.21   | 0.74                     | 16.95   |  |
| $M_3 \times S_1$                 | 33.45                   | 6.04   | 2.28   | 0.76                     | 18.77   |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> x S <sub>2</sub>  | 36.56                   | 6.59   | 2.51   | 0.84                     | 19.80   |  |
| $M_3 \times S_3$                 | 32.35                   | 6.05   | 2.27   | 0.76                     | 18.36   |  |
| M4 x S1                          | 37.02                   | 6.80   | 2.56   | 0.85                     | 20.21   |  |
| M4 x S2                          | 37.56                   | 6.86   | 2.58   | 0.86                     | 20.24   |  |
| M4 x S3                          | 36.92                   | 6.71   | 2.53   | 0.84                     | 20.03   |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                 | 0.47                    | 0.11   | 0.03   | 0.01                     | 0.22  |  |
| CD @ 5%                          | 1.42                    | 0.33   | 0.09   | 0.03                     | 0.66  |  |

| Treatments                      | Number of<br>pods<br>plant <sup>-1</sup> | Seed<br>weight per<br>plant (g) | 100 seed<br>weight<br>(g) | Seed yield<br>(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Haulm<br>yield<br>(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Harvest<br>index<br>(%) |  |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| Main plots: RDF levels          |  |                                 |                           |                                      |  |                         |  |
| M <sub>1</sub> : 0%             | 16.32                                    | 6.67                            | 18.15                     | 1451                                 | 3125                                     | 31.55                   |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> : 50%            | 19.36                                    | 7.86                            | 20.28                     | 1609                                 | 3333                                     | 32.70                   |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> : 75%            | 22.29                                    | 8.76                            | 21.07                     | 1718                                 | 3435                                     | 33.33                   |  |
| M4:100%                         | 23.42                                    | 9.13                            | 21.75                     | 1827                                 | 3523                                     | 34.14                   |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                | 0.23                                     | 0.08                            | 0.19                      | 15                                   | 23                                       | 0.18                    |  |
| CD @ 5%                         | 0.78                                     | 0.28                            | 0.65                      | 50                                   | 82                                       | 0.63                    |  |
| Sub plots: Nano DA              | AP levels                                |                                 |                           |                                      |  |                         |  |
| S1: 2 ml/l of water             | 20.58                                    | 8.09                            | 20.32                     | 1624                                 | 3364                                     | 32.90                   |  |
| S <sub>2</sub> : 4 ml ml/l of   | 21.32                                    | 8.39                            | 20.92                     | 1722                                 | 3413                                     | 33.40                   |  |
| water                           |  |                                 |                           |                                      |  |                         |  |
| S₃: Seed                        | 19.15                                    | 7.85                            | 19.70                     | 1606                                 | 3285                                     | 32.49                   |  |
| treatment@ 5 ml/kg              |  |                                 |                           |                                      |  |                         |  |
| of seeds                        |  |                                 |                           |                                      |  |                         |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                | 0.15                                     | 0.07                            | 0.13                      | 12                                   | 8  | 0.19                    |  |
| CD @ 5%                         | 0.44                                     | 0.22                            | 0.38                      | 37                                   | 26                                       | NS                      |  |
| Interaction                     |  |                                 |                           |                                      |  |                         |  |
| M1 x S1                         | 16.26                                    | 6.50                            | 18.00                     | 1389                                 | 3205                                     | 31.94                   |  |
| $M_1 \times S_2$                | 18.30                                    | 7.34                            | 19.56                     | 1585                                 | 3238                                     | 32.87                   |  |
| M <sub>1</sub> x S <sub>3</sub> | 14.41                                    | 6.17                            | 16.90                     | 1375                                 | 2930                                     | 30.23                   |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> x S <sub>1</sub> | 20.11                                    | 8.01                            | 20.43                     | 1603                                 | 3338                                     | 32.45                   |  |
| $M_2 \times S_2$                | 20.22                                    | 8.00                            | 20.66                     | 1637                                 | 3359                                     | 32.77                   |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> x S <sub>3</sub> | 17.76                                    | 7.58                            | 19.76                     | 1588                                 | 3303                                     | 32.48                   |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> x S <sub>1</sub> | 22.51                                    | 8.69                            | 21.11                     | 1691                                 | 3402                                     | 33.21                   |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> x S <sub>2</sub> | 23.25                                    | 9.04                            | 21.16                     | 1796                                 | 3504                                     | 33.87                   |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> x S <sub>3</sub> | 21.11                                    | 8.55                            | 20.93                     | 1666                                 | 3399                                     | 32.90                   |  |
| M4 x S1                         | 23.44                                    | 9.15                            | 21.73                     | 1813                                 | 3512                                     | 34.04                   |  |
| $M_4 \times S_2$                | 23.52                                    | 9.16                            | 22.30                     | 1868                                 | 3550                                     | 34.48                   |  |
| M4 x S3                         | 23.31                                    | 9.09                            | 21.21                     | 1798                                 | 3507                                     | 33.90                   |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                | 0.30                                     | 0.15                            | 0.25                      | 25                                   | 17                                       | 0.37                    |  |
| CD @ 5%                         | 0.89                                     | 0.44                            | NS                        | 74                                   | 52                                       | NS                      |  |

# Table 2. Yield and yield parameters of chickpea as influenced by different levels of RDF and nano DAP

Nitrogen being a component of many amino acids helped in increased dry matter production and translocation of photosynthates from source to sink. The better source to sink relationship resulted in higher number of pods per plant, seed yield per plant, 100 seed weight resulted in higher seed yield in those treatments [9,10,11]. Significantly lower yield and yield parameters were observed with 0% RDF + seed treatment @ 5 ml/kg of seeds. This might be due to unavailability of required quantity nutrients for growth processes of chickpea plant.

#### **3.3 Quality Parameters**

It is clearly observed from the data that, the interaction effect between different levels of RDF

and foliar sprays on yield parameters was found significant at p < 0.05 (Table 3). Significantly lower protein content and protein yield were observed with 0% RDF + seed treatment @ 5 ml/kg of seeds. Application of 100% RDF with foliar spray of nano @ DAP 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water registered significantly higher quality parameters viz., protein content (19.31 %) and protein yield (361.15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). However, it was on par with 100% RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 2 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water, 100% RDF + seed treatment with nano DAP @ 5 ml/liter of water and 75% RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 4 ml litre-1 of water at harvest. The higher protein content and protein yield recorded due to better uptake of nitrogen and converted into amino acids [12,13].

| Trootmonto  | Protoin content (%) | Protoin viold (kg ho <sup>-1</sup> ) |  |  |  |  |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Main plate DDE lavala (M)                         | Protein content (%) | Protein yield (kg na )               |  |  |  |  |
|   | 44.00               | 040.05                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>1</sub> : 0%                               | 14.62               | 212.25                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> : 50%                              | 15.89               | 255.94                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> : 75%                              | 17.70               | 304.79                               |  |  |  |  |
| M4:100%   | 19.19               | 350.72                               |  |  |  |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                                  | 0.12                | 5.28                                 |  |  |  |  |
| CD at 5 %   | 0.43                | 18.27                                |  |  |  |  |
| Sub plot: Nano DAP levels (S)                     |                     |                                      |  |  |  |  |
| S <sub>1</sub> : 2 ml/l of water                  | 16.81               | 275.60                               |  |  |  |  |
| S <sub>2</sub> : 4 ml ml/l of water               | 17.43               | 302.25                               |  |  |  |  |
| S <sub>3</sub> : Seed treatment@ 5 ml/kg of seeds | 16.32               | 264.93                               |  |  |  |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                                  | 0.11                | 3.16                                 |  |  |  |  |
| CD at 5 %   | 0.34                | 9.48                                 |  |  |  |  |
| Interactions (M×S)                                |                     |                                      |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>1</sub>                     | 14.72               | 204.75                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>                     | 14.94               | 236.85                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>3</sub>                     | 14.19               | 195.16                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>                     | 15.73               | 252.24                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>2</sub>                     | 16.40               | 268.46                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3</sub>                     | 15.55               | 247.10                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>1</sub>                     | 17.57               | 297.27                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>2</sub>                     | 19.04               | 342.52                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>3</sub>                     | 16.48               | 274.58                               |  |  |  |  |
| M4 S1   | 19.20               | 348.14                               |  |  |  |  |
| M <sub>4</sub> S <sub>2</sub>                     | 19.31               | 361.15                               |  |  |  |  |
| M4 S3   | 19.06               | 342.87                               |  |  |  |  |
| Mean SE <u>+</u>                                  | 0.22                | 6.32                                 |  |  |  |  |
| CD at 5 %   | 0.67                | 18.95                                |  |  |  |  |

# Table 3. Quality parameters of pigeonpea as influenced by different levels of RDF and nano DAP

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The growth and yields obtained with application of 75% RDF + foliar spray of nano DAP @ 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water indicated that, it was on par with 100% RDF with nano treatments and the use of nano DAP at right quantity helped plant to put better growth and yield parameters and finally yield. Thus 25% of RDF can be saved by using nano DAP @ 4 ml litre<sup>-1</sup> of water. The nano DAP fertilizers are new genera of fertilizers which even in small quantity are equal to large volume of conventional fertilizers and are having high surface area by which they are absorbed by the plant system and thereby improving growth and yield of chickpea.

#### **COMPETING INTERESTS**

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

1. Mula MG, Gonzales FR, Mula RP, Gaur PM, Gonzales IC, Dar WD, Eusebio JE, Ilao SSL, Chickpea (Garbanoz): An emerging crop for the rainfed and dryland areas of the Philipines. Information Bulletin No. 88 Patancheru, Andhra Pradesh, India. ICRISAT. 2011;88.

- 2. Annual Report, All India Coordinated Research Project on chickpea, Area, Yield and Production for the year. 2021-22.
- Anandhakrishnaveni S, Palchamy A, Mahendran, S., Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on growth and yield of green gram. Legume Res. 2004;27:149-50.
- Solanki P, Bhargava A, Chhipa H, Jain N, Panwar J. Nano-fertilizers and their smart delivery system. Nanotechnologies in food and agriculture. 2015;81-101.
- Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical procedures for Agricultural Research, 2nd Edition, A willey Inter Science Publication. New York (USA); 1984.
- Alqader Saleh, Al-jobourilaythmazin, Eshoaa H., Effect of nitrogenous and urea nano-hydroxyapatite fertilizer on growth and yield of two cultivars of broad bean

(*Vicia faba* L.). Euphrates J. Agri. Sci. 2020;12(2):598-618.

- Kumar N, Manuja S, Sankhyan NK, Kumar P, Kumar A, Sharma T. Effect of 7. nano application of DAP and conventional fertilizers on rice yield. In: Proc. Sustainable Agricultural of Resilient Innovations for Agri-Food Systems. 2022;373
- Aziz BR, Zrar DB, Effect of foliar application of nano-NPK fertilizer on growth and yield of bean (*Vicia faba* L.). J. Pure Appl .Sci. 2021;33(4):90-99.
- Choudhary P, Singh D, Kaushik MK, Sharma SS, Jain HK, Saharan V, Singh DP, Sharma R. K.., Production, productivity and quality of maize (*Zea* mays L.) as affected by foliar application of zinc based nano fertilizer and different

fertility levels. Pharm. Innov. J. 2022; 11(2):1878-1882.

- 10. Kumar Y, Tiwari KN, Singh T, Raliya, Nano fertilizers and their role in sustainable agriculture. Annals of Plant and Soil Research, R. 2021;23(3):238-255.
- Aziz BR, Zrar DB, Effect of foliar application of nano-NPK fertilizer on growth and yield of bean (*Vicia faba* L.). J. Pure Appl. Sci. 2021;33(4):90-99.
- Pruthvi RN, Response of cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) to seed treatment and foliar application of nano zinc. M.Sc. Thesis. University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad (India); 2018.
- Manjunath G, Effect of nano nutrients on growth, seed yield and quality in cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.). M.Sc Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., GKVK, Bengaluru; 2018.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history: The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/113475