

ISSN Print: 2617-4693 ISSN Online: 2617-4707 IJABR 2024; 8(2): 454-457 www.biochemjournal.com Received: 02-12-2023 Accepted: 08-01-2024

#### Samiksha

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

## Dr. Annjoe V Joseph

Assistant Professor, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

#### Vijay Bahadur

Assistant Professor, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

#### Samir E Topno

Associate Professor, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author: Samiksha Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

# Effect of nano fertilizer and nano mixed micronutrients for yield and quality of Onion (*Allium cepa* L.)

# Samiksha, Dr. Annjoe V Joseph, Vijay Bahadur and Samir E Topno

# DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26174693.2024.v8.i2f.599

#### Abstract

The research work entitled "Effect of nano fertilizer and nano mixed micronutrients for yield and quality of Rabi Onion (Allium cepa L.) variety "Agri found light red" was conducted at SHUATS, Prayagraj during the Rabi seasons of 2021 and 2022. The experimental design employed a Factorial Randomized Block Design (FRBD) with one factor focusing on the application of nano mixed micronutrients and the other on the application of nano fertilizers. The nano mixed micronutrients given were M<sub>0</sub>-control; M<sub>1</sub>-0.2 ml/ L of nano mix micronutrient/L of water as foliar application; M<sub>2</sub>-0.4 ml/L of nano mix micronutrient/ L of water as foliar application; M<sub>3</sub>-0.6 ml/ L of nano mix micronutrient/L of water as foliar application. The nano-fertilizers treatment given were Fo- Control (without fertilizer); F<sub>1</sub>- 100% RDF as traditional fertilizer; F<sub>2</sub>-5 ml/ L each of Nano NPK/ L of water as foliar application; F<sub>3</sub>- 4 ml/L each of Nano NPK/ L of water as foliar application; F<sub>4</sub>- 3 ml/L each of Nano NPK/ L of water as foliar application. 50% traditional fertilizers were applied in all treatments excluding control. From the experimental findings it was concluded that interaction effect of F<sub>2</sub>M<sub>3</sub> (5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients) performed best for Bulb polar diameter (cm) a showed maximum (6.36 cm.). Among showed that the maximum Bulb equatorial diameter (7.41 cm) in term of quality parameters like TSS among the treatment at  $(14.85^{0}Brix)$  and titrable acidity (%) among the treatment at (0.26%).

Keywords: Acidity, fertilizer nano mixed, nutrient, onion

#### Introduction

Onion (Allium cepa L.) is a vegetable bulb crop widely cultivated and known to most cultures. <sup>[6, 7]</sup>. It is a biennial belongs to the family alliaceae and chromosome no. is 2n = 16. Onion also possesses nutritional and medicinal importance. The outstanding characteristic of onion is the pungency, which is due to volatile oil known as Allyl- propyl- disulphide, which is Sulphur rich volatile compound. It acts as gastric stimulant and promotes digestion <sup>[19]</sup>. Onion is an indispensable item in every kitchen as condiment and vegetable, therefore commands an extensive internal market. It is also used by processing industry for dehydration in the form of flakes and powder which are in great demand in the world market <sup>[1]</sup>. For economic importance among vegetables, the onion ranks second after the tomato <sup>[3,</sup> <sup>13]</sup>. Onion is also known to contain photochemical linked to positive nutritional and health impacts<sup>[8]</sup>. It is used as a remedy for various diseases like dysentery, convulsions, headaches, hysterial fits, rheumatic pain, malaria, fever and as a fine demulcent to give relief in piles <sup>[18]</sup>. The bulb has variable shapes and colors. <sup>[16]</sup>. Onion bulb is a rich source of minerals like phosphorus and calcium. It also contains protein and vitamin C, quercetin and flavonoids <sup>[17]</sup>. It contains 86.6 per cent Moisture, 40 kcal Calories, 1.10 g Protein, 9.34 mg Carbohydrates, 23 mg Calcium, 2 I.U Vitamins A, 7.4 mg Vitamins C, 0.027 mg Riboflavin, 0.0116 mg Niacin per 100 g of fresh edible portion <sup>[18]</sup>. Production of vegetables is estimated to be 204.84 million tonnes as against 200.45 million tonnes in 2020-21. Production of Onion is estimated to be 31.27 Million Tonnes as against 26.64 Million Tonnes in the year 2020-21<sup>[9]</sup>. Micronutrient fertilizers play a pivotal role in crop production by supplying essential trace elements such as iron, zinc, copper, manganese, and boron to plants. The application of nano mixed micronutrient fertilizers, either to the soil or as foliar sprays, helps rectify these deficiencies, resulting in heightened crop vigour, improved photosynthesis, and increased

resistance to diseases, and ultimately higher yields [12].

#### Materials and Methods

The trial took place at Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Science & Technology, Prayagraj (U.P.), stretching across the rabi season of 2021 and spanning two years, concluding in 2022. The experimental setup employed a Factorial Randomized Block Design (FRBD) consisting of 19 treatments and three replications (see Table No.1). With one factor focusing on the application of nano mixed micronutrients, and the other factor addressing the application of nano fertilizers. This design aimed to systematically assess the combined effects of these factors on the specified parameters, providing valuable insights into the potential benefits of using nano mixed micronutrients in the cultivation of onion, particularly the "Agrifound light red" variety.

## **Table No.1: Treatment Combination**

The experimental field was well prepared and standard cultural and plant protection measures were followed to raise a healthy crop. Analysis of variance was carried out as per the procedure.

#### 1. Equatorial diameter (cm)

The diameter at the maximum width of the bulb across the polar length was measured with the help of Vernier Calipers and was expressed in centimeters.

#### 2. Polar diameter (cm)

The lengths between two polar ends of the bulb were recorded with the help of Vernier Calipers and mean length was worked out from all the five bulbs in each plot and expressed in centimeters.

The total soluble solids (TSS): Contents of the bulb were measured with the help of hand refractometer. A drop of juice was placed over the prism of digital refractometer and was noted in per cent.

**Titrable acidity (%):** Acid content of the extracted juice was determined by titrating 5 ml of juice against N/10 NaOH using Phenolphthalein as an indicator. Acidity was expressed in term of anhydrous citric acid (A.O.A.C.1960) per 100 ml of bulb juice.

#### Results and Discussion A. Yield Parameter 1. Polar diameter (cm)

Bulb polar diameter (cm) Pooled mean analysis also showed a similar pattern. Since the interaction effect is small compared to the average effect and has been found to be significant, the treatment ranking should not change from year to year. Therefore, it can be excluded. For pooled mean analysis, there were significant differences in the data regarding the bulb polar diameter (cm). Among the different treatment combination,  $T_{12}$  (5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application) showed maximum Bulb polar diameter (6.36 cm). Minimum bulb polar diameter (cm) was observed in  $T_1$  (Control Without fertilizer) with (4.10 cm) <sup>[11, 10]</sup>.

## 2. Equatorial diameter (cm)

Bulb equatorial diameter (cm) Pooled mean analysis also showed a similar pattern. Since the interaction effect is small compared to the average effect and has been found to be significant, the treatment ranking should not change from year to year. Therefore, it can be excluded. For pooled mean analysis, there were significant differences in the data regarding the Bulb equatorial diameter (cm). Among the different treatment combination,  $T_{12}$  (5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application) showed maximum Bulb equatorial diameter (7.41 cm). Minimum Bulb equatorial diameter (cm) was observed in  $T_1$  (Control Without fertilizer) with (5.01 cm) Smilar result were also reported by <sup>[11, 10]</sup>.

# **B.** Quality Parameter

## 1. TSS (°Brix)

TSS (°Brix) Pooled mean analysis also showed comparable trends. The treatment ranking should not change from year to year because the interaction effect is significant even though it is smaller than the average effect. It is therefore excludable. There were significant differences in the data for the pooled mean analysis when comparing for TSS within a treatment. T<sub>12</sub> (5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar appliciton+0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application) had the highest TSS among the treatments at (14.85°Brix) and minimum was found to (12.01°Brix) T<sub>1</sub> (Control Without fertilizer) was found significantly superior to T<sub>12</sub>(F<sub>2</sub> M<sub>3</sub>). Thus Nano mix Micronutrient and Nano fertilizer had low TSS (°Brix) than control ones. Similar result also reported that was <sup>[14, 15]</sup>.

## 2. Titrable Acidity (%)

Titrable Acidity (%) Pooled mean analysis also showed comparable trends. The treatment ranking should not change from year to year because the interaction effect is significant even though it is smaller than the average effect. It is therefore excludable. There were significant differences in the data for the pooled mean analysis when comparing for Titrable Acidity (%) within a treatment. T<sub>12</sub> (5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application) had the lowest Titrable Acidity (%) among the treatments at (0.26%) and highest was found to (0.81) T<sub>1</sub> (Control Without fertilizer). was found significantly superior to T<sub>12</sub> (F<sub>2</sub> M<sub>3</sub>). Thus Nano fertilizers & nano mixed Micronutrient and Nano had low Titrable Acidity (%) than control ones. Similar result also reported that was <sup>[2, 5]</sup>.

#### Table 1: Treatment Combination of onion on different Nano Fertilizer and Nano mixed Micronutrients

S. No.	Combination	Treatment	Combination				
1.	$F_0M_0$	T1	Control (Wihtout fertilizer)				
2.	$F_0M_1$	T <sub>2</sub>	Control (Wihtout fertilizer)+ 0.2 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application				
3.	$F_0M_2$	<b>T</b> <sub>3</sub>	Control (Wihtout fertilizer)+ 0.4 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application				
4.	F <sub>0</sub> M <sub>3</sub>	<b>T</b> 4	Control (Wihtout fertilizer)+ 0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application				
5.	$F_1M_0$	<b>T</b> 5	100% RDF as traditional fertilizer+ Control (Wihtout fertilizer)				
6.	$F_1M_1$	T <sub>6</sub>	100% RDF as traditional fertilizer+0.2 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application				
7.	$F_1M_2$	<b>T</b> 7	100% RDF as traditional fertilizer+0.4 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application				
8.	$F_1M_3$	T <sub>8</sub>	100% RDF as traditional fertilizer+0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application				
9.	$F_2M_0$	<b>T</b> 9	5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+ Control (Wihtout fertilizer)				
10	$F_2M_1$	T10	5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.2 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
		1 10	water as foliar application				
11	$F_2M_2$	T11	5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.4 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
		- 11	water as foliar application				
12	F <sub>2</sub> M <sub>3</sub>	T <sub>12</sub>	5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
			water as foliar application				
13	F <sub>3</sub> M <sub>0</sub>	T13	4 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+ Control (Wihtout fertilizer)				
14	$F_3M_1$	<b>T</b> 14	4 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.2 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
		114	water as foliar application				
15	$F_3M_2$	T <sub>15</sub>	4 mlL each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.4 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
1.5			water as foliar application				
16	F <sub>3</sub> M <sub>3</sub>	T <sub>16</sub>	4 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
			water as foliar application				
17	$F_4M_0$	T17	3 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+ Control (Wihtout fertilizer)				
18	$F_4M_1$	T <sub>18</sub>	3 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.2 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
		1 10	water as foliar application				
19	$F_4M_2$	T19	3 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.4 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
		¥ 17	water as foliar application				
20	$F_4M_3$	T20	3 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.6 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of				
		* 20	water as foliar application				

#### Table 2: Performance of Nano Fertilizers and Nano mixed Micronutrients yield and quality parameter in the year 2021 & 2022

Treaster and Natation	Treation to combination	Polar diameter (cm)	Equatorial diameter (cm)	TSS (°Brix)	Titrable Acidity (%)
reatment Notation	reatments combination	Pooled	Pooled	Pooled	Pooled
$T_1$	$F_0M_0$	4.10	5.01	12.01	0.81
$T_2$	$F_0M_1$	4.68	5.78	12.70	0.76
T3	$F_0M_2$	4.61	5.67	12.56	0.77
$T_4$	$F_0M_3$	5.91	6.93	14.19	0.39
T5	$F_1M_0$	4.43	5.48	12.40	0.80
T <sub>6</sub>	$F_1M_1$	5.14	6.19	13.20	0.65
T <sub>7</sub>	$F_1M_2$	4.98	6.04	13.22	0.70
T <sub>8</sub>	$F_1M_3$	5.85	6.93	14.21	0.46
T9	$F_2M_0$	5.65	6.74	13.90	0.52
T <sub>10</sub>	$F_2M_1$	6.04	7.02	14.44	0.31
T <sub>11</sub>	$F_2M_2$	6.26	7.35	14.73	0.28
T <sub>12</sub>	$F_2M_3$	6.36	7.41	14.85	0.26
T <sub>13</sub>	$F_3M_0$	6.00	7.06	14.29	0.37
T <sub>14</sub>	$F_3M_1$	6.20	7.23	14.65	0.33
T15	F <sub>3</sub> M <sub>2</sub>	5.22	6.27	13.47	0.57
T <sub>16</sub>	F <sub>3</sub> M <sub>3</sub>	4.77	5.86	12.90	0.70
T <sub>17</sub>	$F_4M_0$	4.70	5.81	12.80	0.75
T <sub>18</sub>	$F_4M_1$	5.17	6.26	13.35	0.60
T19	$F_4M_2$	5.38	6.43	13.70	0.57
T <sub>20</sub>	F4M3	5.78	6.83	14.06	0.47
	'F' Test	S	S	S	S
	SE.m (±)	0.090	0.084	0.131	0.041
	CD0.05	0.031	0.029	0.045	0.014

## Conclusion

Based on present investigation, the interaction effect of  $F_2M_3$  (5 ml/L each of Nano NPK/L of water as foliar application+0.4 ml/L of Nano mix micronutrients /L of water as foliar application), was found superior in terms of yield parameters like polar diameter and equatorial diameter of bulb & quality parameters like TSS and titrable acidity in

rabi season onion. Therefore, nano fertilizers & nano mixed micronutrients & has important function in growth and development of onion.

#### **Competing Interests**

Author have declared that no competing interests Exist.

#### References

- 1. Aagasimani PD. Studies on organic farming practices in onion. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad; c2010.
- 2. Abdel WM, El-attar AB, Mahmoud AA. Economic evaluation of nano and organic fertilizers as an alternative source to chemical fertilizers on *Carum carvi* L. plant yield and components. Agriculture (Pol, nohospodarstvo). 2017;63(1):33-49.
- 3. Aboukhadrah SH, El-Alsayed AWAH, Sobhy L, Abdelmasieh W. Response of Onion Yield and Quality To Different Planting Date, Methods and Density. Egypt. J Agron. 2017;39:203-219.
- Al-Burki HAH, Al-Ajeel SAHS. Effect of Bio-Fertilizer and Nano-Elements on Growth and Yield of Two French bean Varieties. Plant Archives. 2021;21(Supplement 1):1191-1194.
- 5. Ballesteros R, Ortega JF, Hernandez D, Moreno MA. Onion biomass monitoring using UAV-based RGB imaging. Precis. Agric; c2018. p. 1-18.
- 6. Córcoles JI, Ortega JF, Hernández D, Moreno MA. Estimation of leaf area index in onion (*Allium cepa* L.) using an unmanned aerial vehicle. Biosyst. Eng. 2013;115:31-42.
- Griffiths G, Trueman L, Crowther T, Thomas B, Smith B. Onions-a global benefit to health. Phytotherapy Research. 2002;16(7):603-615.
- Press Information Bureau, Government of India. Available at: https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx,PRID=181062
- Kumar Y, Tiwari KN, Nayak RK, Rai A, Singh SP, Singh AN, *et al.* Nano fertilizers for Increasing Nutrient Use Efficiency, Yield and Economic Returns in Important Winter Season Crops of Uttar Pradesh. Indian Journal of Fertilizers. 2020;16(8):772-786.
- Lekshmi JAM, Bahadur V, Abraham RK, Kerketta A. Effect of Nano Fertilizer on Growth, Yield and Quality of Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*). International Journal of Plant and Soil Science. 2022;34(21):61-69.
- 11. Lobanov NS. The role of iron in photosynthesis. J Biochem. 2017;82(4):391-402.
- 12. Mallor C, Balcells M, Mallor F, Sales E. Genetic variation for bulb size, soluble solids content and pungency in the Spanish sweet onion variety Fuentes de Ebro. Response to selection for low pungency. Plant Breed. 2011;130:55-59.
- Mishra B, Sahu GS, Mohanty LK, Swain BC, Hati S. Effect of Nano Fertilizers on Growth, Yield, and Economics of Tomato Variety Arka Rakshak. Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Biosciences. 2020;8(6):200-204.
- 14. Panda J, Nandi A, Mishra SP, Pal AK, Pattnaik AK, Jena NK. Effects of Nano Fertilizer on Yield, Yield Attributes and Economics in Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2020;9(5):2583-2591.
- 15. Pareek S, Sagar NA, Sharma S, Kumar V. Onion (*Allium cepa* L.). In: Fruit and Vegetable Phytochemicals: Chemistry and Human Health. Yahia EM, editor. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley & Sons; c2017.
- 16. Scott T. What is the chemical process that causes my eyes to tear when I peel an onion? Ask the expert;

Chemistry Scientific American, Retrieved on 8th April, 2007.

- Sharma J, Agarwal S. Impact of organic fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of spinach. Indian J. Plant Sci. 2014;3(3):37-43.
- 18. Yawalkar KS, Har RH. Vegetable crops of India. Agro Horticultural Publishing House, Nagpur; c2004. p. 250.