NANOMATERIALS FOR CROP IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION
CHAPTER 1

Karçiçeği Gerger[1]
[1]Department of Horticulture, University of Çukurova, Faculty of Agriculture, 01330 Balcali Adana Türkiye.
Nazlıcan Bahar[2]
[2]Department of Horticulture, University of Çukurova, Faculty of Agriculture, 01330 Balcali Adana Türkiye.
Bilal Ahmad Wani[3]
[3]Department of Environmental Science, Sri Pratap College, M.A. Road, Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir 190001, India.

Email id: bilalenvsci@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Modern agriculture has many complex problems, and nanotechnology has emerged as a ground-breaking answer that offers creative ways to boost agricultural output while advancing environmental sustainability. This chapter offers a thorough analysis of the uses of nanomaterials in crop protection and development, examining their advantages, disadvantages, and modes of action in agricultural systems. High surface area-to-volume ratios and increased reactivity are only two of the special physicochemical characteristics of nanomaterials that show great promise for increasing nutrient delivery using nanofertilizers that increase absorption efficiency and lower environmental losses. By directly controlling pathogens and triggering plant defense systems, their antimicrobial qualities allow for efficient disease management and provide substitutes for traditional chemical pesticides. By altering antioxidant systems and enhancing physiological reactions, nanomaterials also increase crop resistance to abiotic challenges including heat, salt, and drought. Cutting application rates and increasing effectiveness, advanced nanocarrier technologies provide targeted and regulated pesticide delivery. Adoption of agricultural nanotechnology, however, requires careful evaluation of possible health and environmental hazards, which calls for thorough safety evaluations and the creation of suitable regulatory frameworks. This chapter summarizes the state of the art regarding the use of nanomaterials in agriculture, talks about safety issues and environmental effects, and suggests future lines of inquiry for creating sustainable agricultural technologies enabled by nanotechnology that can reduce ecological footprints and increase global food security.

Keywords: Nanomaterials, Nanofertilizers, Nanopesticides, Crop protection, Stress tolerance, Nanocarriers, Agricultural sustainability, Precision agriculture.

INTRODUCTION

The world's agricultural industry has previously unheard-of difficulties in supplying the food needs of a population that is expanding quickly while also tackling issues of environmental sustainability. Innovative methods are required to increase crop output while reducing ecological footprints since traditional agricultural techniques, which mostly rely on chemical fertilizers and pesticides, have resulted in soil degradation, water pollution, and decreased biodiversity (Kah *et al*., 2018). Through the use of nanomaterials, which generally have diameters between 1 and 100 nanometers, nanotechnology has emerged as a game-changing answer, providing innovative techniques to improve agricultural production systems. These materials are especially well-suited for agricultural applications due to their special physicochemical characteristics, which include high surface area-to-volume ratios, increased reactivity, and the capacity to pass through biological barriers (Prasad *et al*., 2017). By addressing important issues in crop nutrition, disease control, and stress tolerance, the use of nanomaterials into agriculture holds potential for improving environmental sustainability and resource efficiency.

By permitting accurate pesticide delivery, real-time crop health monitoring, and molecular-level improvement of plant physiological systems, nanotechnology's promise in agriculture surpasses that of traditional methods. In response to certain environmental cues or plant needs, nanomaterials may be designed to release nutrients or bioactive chemicals in a regulated way, decreasing waste and increasing input efficiency (Liu & Lal 2015). Additionally, certain nanoparticles' antibacterial qualities provide creative ways to control plant diseases without largely depending on chemical pesticides. Nanomaterials also hold potential for improving plant resistance to drought, salt, and temperature extremes as climate change exacerbates environmental pressures on crops (Raliya *et al*., 2018). The many uses of nanomaterials in crop protection and enhancement are examined in this chapter, along with their methods of action, advantages, drawbacks, and potential future developments in sustainable agriculture.

Nanotechnology Applications for Agriculture

Nanomaterials in Crop Nutrition and Growth Enhancement

Sustainable agriculture is based on effective nutrient management, and nanomaterials have shown great promise in maximizing crop nutrient delivery. With efficiency rates often below 50%, conventional fertilizers experience severe nutrient losses via leaching, volatilization, and fixation, leading to both financial losses and environmental contamination (Subramanian *et al*., 2015). These restrictions are addressed by nanofertilizers, which are made using nanoparticles or nanoencapsulation processes and provide targeted and regulated nutrient delivery in accordance with plant development phases. These nanoscale formulations reduce the total amount of fertilizers needed for optimal crop performance by improving nutrient bioavailability and absorption efficiency while minimizing environmental losses.

To provide vital macronutrients and micronutrients, many kinds of nanofertilizers have been created. Utilizing nanoencapsulation technologies, nitrogen-based nanofertilizers shield nitrogen compounds from leaching and fast conversion, guaranteeing their continuous availability throughout the growth season (Marchiol *et al*., 2020). In a similar vein, phosphorus nanofertilizers increase root absorption and prevent phosphorus from fixing in the soil, thereby increasing its usage efficiency. When applied at the right concentrations, zinc oxide nanoparticles have been shown to improve germination rates, root development, and overall plant biomass, indicating that they hold particular promise in treating zinc deficiency, a common micronutrient limitation impacting crop yields worldwide (Dimkpa & Bindraban 2016).

Numerous routes are involved in the ways that nanomaterials improve nutrient absorption. Numerous pathways, such as stomatal apertures, root tips, and lateral root connections, allow nanoparticles to enter plant cells. From there, they may move via vascular tissues to numerous plant organs (Ma *et al*., 2010). Once ingested, nanomaterials may affect photosynthetic efficiency, increase chlorophyll production, and modify enzyme activity to affect plant metabolism. For example, titanium dioxide nanoparticles have been shown to boost carbon dioxide fixation and light absorption, which improves photosynthetic rates and crop development (Raliya *et al*., 2015). In addition to enabling the movement of nutrients and water inside plants, carbon nanotubes have shown the capacity to pierce seed coverings and cell walls, increasing water absorption and germination rates.

Certain nanomaterials have physiological and biochemical effects that stimulate plant development in addition to their direct nutritional advantages. Plant cell walls are strengthened by silicon nanoparticles, which also increase tolerance to biotic and abiotic stressors and improve structural integrity and resistance to lodging in cereals (Luyckx *et al*., 2017). It has been shown that chitosan nanoparticles activate defensive systems in plants, strengthening their innate defenses against infections and fostering development via better nutrient absorption. Because silver nanoparticles modulate hormonal balance and antioxidant enzyme activities, their application at optimal concentrations has improved root and shoot development, increased germination percentages, and increased seedling vigor in a variety of crop species (Sharma *et al*., 2012). Table 1 lists the many ways that crop enhancement may be used.

Table 1: Applications of Nanomaterials in Crop Improvement.

Nanomaterial Type	Function in Crop Improvement	Mechanism / Benefit	Example / Crop	Reference
Zinc oxide (ZnO) nanoparticles	Enhances germination and growth	Promotes enzyme activity and chlorophyll synthesis	Mung bean (*Vigna radiata*)	Raliya & Tarafdar 2013
Titanium dioxide (TiO$_2$) nanoparticles	Improves photosynthetic efficiency	Increases light absorption and electron transport	Spinach (*Spinacia oleracea*)	Mahmood *et al*., 2021
Silver nanoparticles (AgNPs)	Stimulates root and shoot development	Modulates phytohormone signaling and antioxidant activity	Wheat (*Triticum aestivum*)	Sharma *et al*., 2012
Iron oxide (Fe$_3$O$_4$) nanoparticles	Enhances nutrient uptake	Facilitates iron absorption and reduces chlorosis	Maize (*Zea mays*)	Liu & Lal 2015
Silicon nanoparticles (SiNPs)	Improves abiotic stress tolerance	Enhances antioxidant enzyme activity under drought/salinity	Rice (*Oryza sativa*)	Tripathi *et al*., 2017

Nanomaterial Applications in Crop Protection Against Diseases and Pests

Despite widespread use of chemical pesticides, yearly crop losses from plant diseases caused by fungus, bacteria, viruses, and nematodes are estimated to be 20–40% of possible yields, posing serious concerns to world food security (Oerke, 2006). Concerns about environmental pollution, diseases developing pesticide resistance, and negative impacts on human health and non-target creatures have all been brought up by the overuse of conventional pesticides. Through a variety of processes, including as direct antibacterial activity, improved distribution of bioactive chemicals, and activation of plant defense systems, nanomaterials provide novel solutions for crop protection.

Through a variety of processes, metallic and metal oxide nanoparticles have strong antibacterial capabilities. According to Ocsoy *et al*. (2013), silver nanoparticles have shown broad-spectrum antibacterial action against a variety

of phytopathogens, including fungi that cause fatal illnesses in important crops. Multiple processes, including breakdown of cell membrane integrity, interference with DNA replication, suppression of protein synthesis, and the production of reactive oxygen species that cause oxidative stress in pathogenic microbes, are involved in the antimicrobial activity of silver nanoparticles. At concentrations far lower than those of traditional copper-based pesticides, copper oxide nanoparticles also demonstrate potent fungicidal and bactericidal qualities, successfully managing illnesses brought on by Phytophthora, Fusarium, and Xanthomonas species (Kanhed *et al*., 2014).

In comparison to other metallic nanoparticles, zinc oxide nanoparticles have shown good outcomes in the treatment of bacterial and fungal infections while displaying less phytotoxicity.

According to Dimkpa *et al*. (2012), their antibacterial action entails the photocatalytic formation of reactive oxygen species when exposed to light, which destroys pathogen cell structures and interferes with metabolic activities. Similar photocatalytic processes enable titanium dioxide nanoparticles to effectively combat a range of plant diseases and promote plant growth at the right concentrations. One major benefit over traditional pesticides is the ability of certain nanomaterials to both prevent illnesses and promote plant growth.

Bioactive substances and plant insecticides in nanoformulations have become more ecologically benign than synthetic chemicals. By stabilizing essential oils and plant extracts—which have inherent pesticidal qualities but are prone to volatility and quick degradation—nanoencapsulation may increase their effectiveness and decrease the frequency of applications (Nenaah, 2014). These bioactive substances are transported by polymeric nanoparticles and nanoemulsions, which provide regulated release at their intended locations while shielding them from environmental deterioration. This method combines the improved stability and effectiveness offered by nanotechnology with the environmental safety of natural pesticides.

Additionally, nanomaterials prime defensive systems in plants to react to pathogen invasions more quickly and efficiently by eliciting systemic resistance. Without the metabolic expenses connected with constitutive defense expression, chitosan nanoparticles provide plants with a state of increased readiness by inducing the synthesis of pathogenesis-related proteins, phytoalexins, and other defense chemicals (Malerba & Cerana 2016). It has been shown that silica nanoparticles both provide physical barriers that prevent pathogen entry and elicit comparable defensive responses. Instead of depending just on direct biocidal activity, this indirect protective mechanism uses plants' intrinsic immunity to provide sustainable disease control.

Table 2: Nanomaterials for Crop Protection.

Nanomaterial Type	Target / Protection Function	Mechanism of Action	Example / Pathogen / Pest	Reference
Silver nanoparticles (AgNPs)	Antifungal and antibacterial	Disrupts microbial cell walls and DNA replication	*Fusarium oxysporum, Xanthomonas spp.*	Jo *et al*., 2009
Copper nanoparticles (CuNPs)	Controls fungal diseases	Generates ROS, inhibits spore germination	*Alternaria alternata*	Park *et al*., 2006
Chitosan nanoparticles	Acts as biopesticide and plant immunity booster	Induces systemic acquired resistance (SAR)	Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*)	Saharan *et al*., 2016
Zinc oxide (ZnO) nanoparticles	Controls bacterial blight and wilt	Interferes with pathogen metabolism and enzyme systems	*Ralstonia solanacearum*	Dimkpa *et al*., 2013
Nano-encapsulated pesticides	Controlled and targeted release	Reduces environmental toxicity and increases efficiency	Pyrethroid nanoformulation	Kah *et al*., 2018

Another essential use in crop security is the creation of nano-enabled sensors for early disease detection. Biosensors based on nanoparticles may identify volatile organic compounds or pathogen-specific chemicals emitted in the early stages of infection, allowing for prompt treatment before symptoms become apparent (Xu *et al*., 2019). These diagnostic instruments make use of plasmonic, quantum, or fluorescent nanoparticles that react to target analytes by altering their optical characteristics, enabling quick and accurate illness diagnosis. Crop losses may be considerably decreased while pesticide use is kept to a minimum by combining early diagnosis with tailored nanopesticide treatment. Table 2 displays the various crop protection techniques.

Nanomaterials for Enhanced Stress Tolerance in Crops

More than 50% of yield losses in key crops worldwide are attributed to abiotic stresses such as heat, salinity, drought, and heavy metal pollution, whose intensity and frequency have increased under changing climatic conditions (Fahad *et al*., 2017). In addition to climatic stresses, agronomic practices also influence crop productivity; for instance, residue management under zero and conventional tillage significantly affects weed population dynamics and wheat yield (Ahmad *et al*., 2023). Traditional breeding approaches for developing stress-tolerant cultivars are time-consuming and

constrained by the complex inheritance of stress tolerance traits. In contrast, nanotechnology offers rapid and flexible solutions to enhance crop resilience by regulating stress-responsive genes, strengthening antioxidant defense systems, and improving water and nutrient uptake efficiency (Bittu Ram *et al*., 2023; Choudhary *et al.,* 2023).

Drought stress, characterized by water scarcity, adversely affects plant growth, photosynthesis, and reproductive development. Nanomaterials have shown considerable promise in mitigating drought stress through multiple mechanisms. Silicon nanoparticles enhance water retention in plant tissues by strengthening cell wall integrity and reducing transpirational water loss through improved stomatal regulation (Siddiqui *et al*., 2014). Improved root growth and hydraulic conductivity further enhance water uptake. Carbon nanotubes promote root system development and facilitate water transport across cell membranes, while titanium dioxide nanoparticles protect the photosynthetic apparatus and maintain chlorophyll content under water-limited conditions. Advanced cultivation practices such as aeroponics also contribute to improved water and nutrient use efficiency, leading to enhanced vegetable crop growth (Boddu *et al*., 2024).

Salinity stress poses a serious challenge to agriculture, particularly in arid and semi-arid regions where irrigation-induced salt accumulation disrupts ionic balance, induces osmotic stress, and generates reactive oxygen species. Nanomaterials mitigate salinity stress by maintaining ionic homeostasis, enhancing osmolyte accumulation, and strengthening antioxidant defense systems (Zulfiqar & Ashraf 2021). Zinc oxide nanoparticles have been shown to maintain favorable potassium-to-sodium ratios and enhance antioxidant enzyme activity, thereby improving crop performance under saline conditions (Bittu Ram *et al*., 2023). Iron oxide nanoparticles improve nutrient availability and uptake, preventing deficiency symptoms and sustaining metabolic processes.

Heat stress, intensified by global warming, negatively impacts agricultural productivity by damaging cellular membranes, denaturing proteins, and inhibiting photosynthesis. Nanomaterials help plants tolerate heat stress by stabilizing membranes, enhancing the synthesis of heat shock proteins, and protecting photosynthetic machinery from thermal damage (Hasanuzzaman *et al*., 2013). Complementary agronomic strategies such as integrated nutrient management further improve crop yield and quality under stress-prone environments, as demonstrated in crops like gaillardia, okra, and broccoli (Indhumathi *et al*., 2023; Karsh *et al.,* 2024; Kumar *et al*., 2024).

Heavy metal contamination of agricultural soils is an emerging concern threatening food safety and crop productivity. Certain nanomaterials reduce metal uptake by plants or immobilize metals in soil. Iron oxide nanoparticles effectively sequester toxic metals such as arsenic, cadmium, and lead, thereby reducing their bioavailability (Gil-Díaz *et al*., 2016). Additionally, nanomaterials enhance plant tolerance to heavy metals by strengthening antioxidant systems. Selenium nanoparticles, for example, reduce cadmium toxicity by limiting its translocation to edible plant parts and enhancing antioxidant enzyme activity. Alongside these technological interventions, crop improvement through genotype screening and disease management remains essential, as evidenced by yield stability studies in spine gourd and disease resistance screening in lentil and Bt cotton (Jajoriya & Raiger 2023; Kharte *et al*., 2023; Kulkarni & Sabeena 2023).

Nanocarriers for Agrochemical Delivery

Precision agriculture has advanced significantly with the creation of complex nanocarrier systems, which allow for the targeted and controlled administration of agrochemicals with increased effectiveness and less environmental impact. Traditional pesticide formulations include significant losses from drift, runoff, and photodegradation, as well as early breakdown, low solubility, and limited target specificity. By shielding active components from environmental deterioration, increasing their stability, boosting absorption effectiveness, and permitting regulated release mechanisms responsive to biological or environmental stimuli, nanocarriers overcome these drawbacks (Kah & Hofmann 2014).

Made from natural or synthetic polymers, polymeric nanoparticles are adaptable delivery systems for a range of agrochemicals, such as insecticides, herbicides, plant growth regulators, and genetic materials. Environmental friendliness and continuous release of encapsulated substances are two benefits of biodegradable polymers including chitosan, alginate, and polylactic acid (Kumar *et al*., 2015). By altering the cross-linking density, molecular weight, and polymer composition, the release kinetics may be customized to meet the needs of certain crops and environmental circumstances. To ensure delivery at the best times and places, pH-responsive polymeric nanocarriers, for example, may release their payload in response to certain soil pH conditions or pH changes at infection sites.

Liposomes, solid lipid nanoparticles, and nanoemulsions are examples of lipid-based nanocarriers that have outstanding biocompatibility and the capacity to encapsulate both hydrophilic and hydrophobic substances. These systems facilitate the passage of sensitive bioactive molecules across plant cell membranes while preventing their degradation, including proteins, plant hormones, and RNA interference agents (Patra *et al*., 2018). When compared to traditional formulations, essential oil and botanical pesticide nanoemulsions exhibit greater stability and performance. Better adhesion and spreading on leaf surfaces result in better pest control at lower treatment rates. Certain lipid nanocarriers' self-emulsifying qualities make formulation processes easier and enhance performance repeatability.

Because of their superior chemical stability, variable pore diameters, high loading capacity, and simplicity of surface functionalization, mesoporous silica nanoparticles have garnered a lot of interest as agrochemical carriers. Through surface changes and pore size engineering, these materials' porous structure may hold significant amounts of active chemicals while permitting regulated release (Pérez-de-Luque, 2017). By functionalizing mesoporous silica with certain ligands, customized distribution to specific plant tissues or cells is made possible, increasing effectiveness while reducing off-target effects. Furthermore, mesoporous silica may be loaded with many active chemicals, allowing for combination pesticide and nutrition delivery or synergistic pest control.

The state-of-the-art in intelligent delivery systems are stimuli-responsive nanocarriers, which react to certain biological or environmental cues to release their payload at the exact moment and location required. Enzyme-responsive carriers can release pesticides precisely at locations where pest-related enzymes are present, light-responsive systems can synchronize release with photosynthetic activity, and temperature-sensitive nanocarriers can react to fever responses or diurnal temperature fluctuations in infected plants (Nuruzzaman *et al.*, 2016). These intelligent delivery devices mark a paradigm change toward really precise agriculture by optimizing pesticide performance while reducing environmental exposure and non-target consequences.

Safety Considerations and Environmental Implications

Although nanoparticles have shown promise in agriculture, their broad use requires a thorough assessment of the possible dangers to human health, natural ecosystems, and food safety. Due to processes that are different from those of bulk materials, the special qualities that make nanoparticles useful for agricultural applications may also result in unanticipated risks (Servin *et al.*, 2015). Developing safe and sustainable nanotechnology applications requires an understanding of the destiny, transport, transformation, and consequences of nanomaterials in agricultural ecosystems.

According to ecotoxicological research, the effects of nanoparticles on the environment vary greatly based on their size, content, concentration, surface coating, and length of exposure. At high concentrations, several metallic nanoparticles especially those based on silver and copper have shown toxicity to earthworms, beneficial soil microbes, and other non-target animals (Colman *et al.*, 2013). Long-term agricultural sustainability may be jeopardized if soil microbial populations are disrupted since this might have an impact on organic matter decomposition, nutrient cycling, and general soil health. Nonetheless, a number of studies also show negligible side effects at application rates relevant to farming methods, indicating that ecological concerns may be reduced by careful usage within suitable dose limits.

Another major worry is the possibility of nanoparticle bioaccumulation in food systems. Certain nanoparticles may accumulate in grains, fruits, and vegetables, perhaps making their way into human meals, whereas other nanomaterials mostly stay in roots with little transfer to edible plant parts (Rico *et al.*, 2011). Since little is known about the long-term health effects of exposure to food-borne nanoparticles, thorough toxicological evaluations and the development of safety criteria are required. To handle the special properties of nanomaterials, regulatory frameworks must change, creating standards for food product testing, labeling, and allowable amounts.

Nanomaterials' durability and biological impacts are influenced by their environmental destiny and modification. Nanoparticles undergo a number of changes when released into agricultural settings, including as aggregation, dissolution, sulfidation, and interaction with organic materials found in the environment (Lowry *et al.*, 2012). Their toxicity, mobility, and bioavailability may all be affected by these changes. For example, when silver nanoparticles in soil undergo sulfidation, they change into less accessible forms of silver sulfide, which lowers their toxicity and antibacterial activity. Predicting long-term environmental effects and creating nanomaterials that safely decompose after serving their original purposes need an understanding of these transition processes.

One of the top priorities for sustainable agricultural nanotechnology is the creation of ecologically safe and biodegradable nanomaterials. Utilizing plant extracts, microorganisms, or agricultural waste materials, green synthesis techniques provide environmentally favorable substitutes for chemical synthesis processes, resulting in nanoparticles that are less hazardous and more compatible with the environment (Iravani, 2011). Natural polymer-based nanocarriers break down into non-toxic components, reducing their persistence in the environment. Biocompatible coatings for surface functionalization may preserve functional qualities while lowering toxicity. The design and use of agricultural nanomaterials should be guided by lifecycle assessment techniques, which take into account the effects on the environment from synthesis to disposal.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES AND CHALLENGES

To fully fulfill nanotechnology's promise for crop protection and enhancement, a number of obstacles must be overcome before it can be included into conventional agriculture. Technological challenges include developing cost-effective production techniques that can compete with conventional inputs, producing stable formulations that function consistently under a range of field conditions, and scaling up nanoparticle synthesis to meet agricultural demand while maintaining quality consistency (Kah *et al.*, 2013). Although they need to be further optimized for agricultural nanomaterials, advanced manufacturing methods such as continuous flow synthesis, spray drying, and self-assembly approaches offer promise for large-scale production.

Extensive study is required to fill up the knowledge gaps surrounding nanomaterial interactions with complex agricultural systems. There is still much to learn about how nanomaterials behave in various soil types, climates, and agricultural methods. To assess the persistence, transformation, and ecological effects of nanomaterials across many growing seasons, long-term field research is crucial (Fraceto *et al.,* 2016). Effects on beneficial insects, soil fauna, soil microbial diversity, and overall ecosystem functioning should all be examined in such research. To optimize benefits and minimize dangers, studies must also define the best application techniques, doses, and timing for various crops and nanomaterial kinds.

Many nations still lack adequate regulatory frameworks for agricultural nanomaterials, which leaves consumers and developers in the dark. International collaboration is necessary to establish comprehensive but flexible laws that establish acceptable exposure limits, clarify testing procedures, and standardize safety assessment processes (Parisi *et al*., 2015). In order to provide comprehensive safety assessments without impeding technological growth, regulatory systems should strike a balance between promoting innovation and precautionary principles. Traceability systems and unambiguous labeling regulations may boost customer trust and make post-market monitoring easier.

Adoption rates are strongly influenced by how the general public views and accepts nanotechnology in agriculture. Resistance to agricultural goods enabled by nanotechnology may arise from consumer worries about new technologies in food production as well as a lack of knowledge about nanotechnology (Yada *et al*., 2014). Stakeholder participation in decision-making processes and open communication regarding advantages, hazards, and safety precautions may promote trust and educated debates. Applications of nanotechnology and its potential benefits for sustainable agriculture may be better understood via educational programs aimed at farmers, extension agencies, and consumers.

New uses for nanomaterials have the potential to completely transform agriculture. Real-time monitoring of soil nutrients, moisture, pH, and pathogen presence may be possible with nanosensors included into precision agricultural systems, facilitating data-driven decision-making and optimal input management (Neethirajan *et al*., 2017). Gene delivery technologies based on nanomaterials may speed up crop breeding initiatives by enabling the genetic enhancement of crops via effective transformation techniques. Crop establishment under difficult circumstances may be improved by using nanopriming methods that increase seed vigor and stress tolerance during germination. Natural systems-inspired biomimetic nanomaterials may provide ecologically friendly answers to agricultural problems.

CONCLUSION

Nanomaterials are a game-changing technology that has the ability to advance sustainable agriculture methods while addressing important issues in crop protection and enhancement. Nanotechnology offers creative solutions that can boost agricultural productivity, lessen environmental effects, and contribute to global food security through applications ranging from improved disease management and stress tolerance to enhanced nutrient delivery and controlled release of agrochemicals. Targeted transport, stimuli-responsive release, and multifunctional capabilities that combine growth-promoting, protective, and nutritive impacts are just a few of the functions made possible by the special physicochemical characteristics of nanomaterials.

However, weighing the advantages and possible drawbacks is necessary for the effective use of nanotechnology in agriculture. Responsible implementation requires thorough safety evaluations, the creation of ecologically safe nanomaterials, the creation of suitable regulatory frameworks, and open communication with stakeholders. The development of safe and efficient nano-enabled agricultural technology will be guided by ongoing research that fills in knowledge gaps on the behavior of nanomaterials in agricultural settings, long-term ecological effects, and application strategy optimization.

Nanotechnology provides useful tools for developing robust and sustainable food production systems as population expansion, climate change, and resource constraints put increasing strain on global agriculture. Applying nanomaterials sparingly, in accordance with scientific data and safety guidelines, may help usher in the next agricultural revolution by improving crop quality and yield while reducing environmental impact. To turn the potential of agricultural nanotechnology into workable solutions that benefit farmers, consumers, and the environment, interdisciplinary cooperation between nanoscientists, agronomists, ecologists, toxicologists, and politicians will be essential.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, N., Puniya, R., Bazaya, B. R., Sharma, V., Sinha, B. K., Dey, T., & Sharma, B. C. (2023). Effect of rice straw on weed populations, biomass and yield of wheat under zero and conventional tillage practices. *Biological Forum, 15*(1), 57–63.

Bittu Ram, Jakhar, S. S., Bhuker, A., Digamber, Hamender, & Singh, P. (2023). Effect of nano form ZnO priming treatments on growth and yield of different wheat variety. *Biological Forum, 15*(1), 651–656.

Boddu, V., Kumar, D. H., Kumar, S. N., Y., B., & Rajani, A. (2024). Aeroponics in vegetable crops. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences, 16*(1), 74–78.

Nanotechnology Applications for Agriculture

Choudhary, R., Choudhary, M. R., Sharma, Y. K., Choudhary, A., & Ujaniya, P. (2023). Effect of inorganic fertilizer, organic manures and nano urea on vegetative attributes and biochemical activity of garlic. *Biological Forum, 15*(2), 732–736.

Colman, B. P., Arnaout, C. L., Anciaux, S., Gunsch, C. K., Hochella Jr, M. F., Kim, B., ... & Bernhardt, E. S. (2013). Low concentrations of silver nanoparticles in biosolids cause adverse ecosystem responses under realistic field scenario. *PLoS One*, *8*(2), e57189.

Dimkpa, C. O., & Bindraban, P. S. (2016). Fortification of micronutrients for efficient agronomic production: A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, *36*(1), 1-26.

Dimkpa, C. O., McLean, J. E., Britt, D. W., & Anderson, A. J. (2013). Nano-sized zinc oxide influences the response of wheat to biotic stress caused by *Pseudomonas syringae*. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry, 68*, 229–236.

Dimkpa, C. O., McLean, J. E., Latta, D. E., Manangón, E., Britt, D. W., Johnson, W. P., ... & Anderson, A. J. (2012). CuO and ZnO nanoparticles: phytotoxicity, metal speciation, and induction of oxidative stress in sand-grown wheat. *Journal of Nanoparticle Research*, *14*(9), 1-15.

Fahad, S., Bajwa, A. A., Nazir, U., Anjum, S. A., Farooq, A., Zohaib, A., ... & Huang, J. (2017). Crop production under drought and heat stress: plant responses and management options. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *8*, 1147.

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

Gil-Díaz, M., Alonso, J., Rodríguez-Valdés, E., Gallego, S. M., & Lobo, M. C. (2016). Reduction of arsenic bioavailability to ryegrass in a soil amended with zero-valent iron nanoparticles. *Environmental Pollution*, *218*, 804-812.

Hasanuzzaman, M., Nahar, K., Alam, M. M., Roychowdhury, R., & Fujita, M. (2013). Physiological, biochemical, and molecular mechanisms of heat stress tolerance in plants. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *14*(5), 9643-9684.

Indhumathi, M., Chandrashekar, S. Y., Srinivasa, V., Shivaprasad, M., & Girish, R. (2023). Effect of integrated nutrient management on flowering, flower quality and flower yield of gaillardia (*Gaillardia pulchella* Foug.) under hill zone of Karnataka. *Biological Forum, 15*(1), 119–123.

Iravani, S. (2011). Green synthesis of metal nanoparticles using plants. *Green Chemistry*, *13*(10), 2638-2.

Jajoriya, N. K., & Raiger, H. L. (2023). Non-parametric measures of fruit yield stability in spine gourd (*Momordica dioica*) genotypes. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences, 15*(1), 5–11.

Jo, Y. K., Kim, B. H., & Jung, G. (2009). Antifungal activity of silver ions and nanoparticles on phytopathogenic fungi. *Plant Disease, 93*(10), 1037–1043.

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

Kah, M., Beulke, S., Tiede, K., & Hofmann, T. (2013). Nanopesticides: state of knowledge, environmental fate, and exposure modeling. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, *43*(16), 1823-1867.

Kah, M., Kookana, R. S., Gogos, A., & Bucheli, T. D. (2018). A critical evaluation of nanopesticides and nanofertilizers against their conventional analogues. *Nature Nanotechnology, 13*, 677–684.

Kanhed, P., Birla, S., Gaikwad, S., Gade, A., Seabra, A. B., Rubilar, O., ... & Rai, M. (2014). In vitro antifungal efficacy of copper nanoparticles against selected crop pathogenic fungi. *Materials Letters*, *115*, 13-17.

Karsh, V. K., Ghodeshwar, P., Choudhary, A. S., & Satankar, N. (2024). Impact of integrated nutrient management on yield and quality of okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* Moench.). *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences, 16*(1), 40–45.

Kharte, S., Kumar, A., Puri, S., Ramakrishnan, R. S., Sharma, R., Singh, Y., & Malvi, S. (2023). Field screening of lentil germplasm against wilt of lentil caused by Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. lentis. *Biological Forum, 15*(1), 88–91.

Kulkarni, V. R., & Sabeena, I. B. (2023). Management of fungal foliar diseases of Bt cotton. *Biological Forum, 15*(1), 24–27.

Kumar, S., Bhanjana, G., Sharma, A., Sidhu, M. C., & Dilbaghi, N. (2015). Synthesis, characterization and on field evaluation of pesticide loaded sodium alginate nanoparticles. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, *101*, 1061-1067.

Kumar, S., Nongthombam, J., Devi, N. L., Khangembam, J., Chaudhary, K. P., Pandey, N. K., & Mohan, B. (2024). Impact of integrated nutrient management and gravity-based irrigation on broccoli yield: A cluster front line demonstration approach. *AgriBio Innovations, 1*(1), 72–76.

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

Lowry, G. V., Gregory, K. B., Apte, S. C., & Lead, J. R. (2012). Transformations of nanomaterials in the environment. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *46*(13), 6893-6899.

Luyckx, M., Hausman, J. F., Lutts, S., & Guerriero, G. (2017). Silicon and plants: current knowledge and technological perspectives. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *8*, 411.

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

Mahmood, A., Murtaza, G., & Shahid, M. (2021). Titanium dioxide nanoparticles: A promising tool in crop improvement and protection. *Journal of Nanomaterials,* 1–12.

Malerba, M., & Cerana, R. (2016). Chitosan effects on plant systems. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *17*(7), 996.

Marchiol, L., Mattiello, A., Pošćić, F., Giordano, C., & Musetti, R. (2020). *In vivo* synthesis of nanomaterials in plants: location of silver nanoparticles and plant metabolism. *Nanoscale Research Letters*, *15*(1), 1-22.

Neethirajan, S., Tuteja, S. K., Huang, S. T., & Kelton, D. (2017). Recent advancement in biosensors technology for animal and livestock health management. *Biosensors and Bioelectronics*, *98*, 398-407.

Nenaah, G. E. (2014). Chemical composition, toxicity and growth inhibitory activities of essential oils of three *Achillea* species and their nano-emulsions against *Tribolium castaneum* (Herbst). *Industrial Crops and Products*, *53*, 252-260.

Nuruzzaman, M., Rahman, M. M., Liu, Y., & Naidu, R. (2016). Nanoencapsulation, nano-guard for pesticides: a new window for safe application. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *64*(7), 1447-1483.

Ocsoy, I., Paret, M. L., Ocsoy, M. A., Kunwar, S., Chen, T., You, M., & Tan, W. (2013). Nanotechnology in plant disease management: DNA-directed silver nanoparticles on graphene oxide as an antibacterial against Xanthomonas perforans. *ACS Nano*, *7*(10), 8972-8980.

Oerke, E. C. (2006). Crop losses to pests. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, *144*(1), 31-43.

Parisi, C., Vigani, M., & Rodríguez-Cerezo, E. (2015). Agricultural nanotechnologies: what are the current possibilities? *Nano Today*, *10*(2), 124-127.

Park, H. J., Kim, S. H., Kim, H. J., & Choi, S. H. (2006). A new composition of nanosized silica-silver for control of various plant diseases. *Plant Pathology Journal, 22*(3), 295–302.

Patra, J. K., Das, G., Fraceto, L. F., Campos, E. V. R., Rodriguez-Torres, M. D. P., Acosta-Torres, L. S., ... & Shin, H. S. (2018). Nano based drug delivery systems: recent developments and future prospects. *Journal of Nanobiotechnology*, *16*(1), 1-33.

Pérez-de-Luque, A. (2017). Interaction of nanomaterials with plants: what do we need for real applications in agriculture? *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, *5*, 12.

Prasad, R., Bhattacharyya, A., & Nguyen, Q. D. (2017). Nanotechnology in sustainable agriculture: recent developments, challenges, and perspectives. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *8*, 1014.

Raliya, R., & Tarafdar, J. C. (2013). ZnO nanoparticle biosynthesis and its effect on phosphorous-mobilizing enzyme secretion and gum contents in clusterbean (*Cyamopsis tetragonoloba* L.). *Agricultural Research, 2*(1), 48–57.

Raliya, R., Biswas, P., & Tarafdar, J. C. (2015). TiO_2 nanoparticle biosynthesis and its physiological effect on mung bean (*Vigna radiata* L.). *Biotechnology Reports*, *5*, 22-26.

Raliya, R., Saharan, V., Dimkpa, C., & Biswas, P. (2018). Nanofertilizer for precision and sustainable agriculture: current state and future perspectives. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *66*(26), 6487-6503.

Rico, C. M., Majumdar, S., Duarte-Gardea, M., Peralta-Videa, J. R., & Gardea-Torresdey, J. L. (2011). Interaction of nanoparticles with edible plants and their possible implications in the food chain. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *59*(8), 3485-3498.

Saharan, V., Sharma, G., Yadav, M., Choudhary, M. K., Sharma, S. S., Pal, A., & Biswas, P. (2016). Synthesis and in vitro antifungal efficacy of Cu–chitosan nanoparticles against pathogenic fungi of tomato. *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules, 91*, 235–242.

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.

Sharma, P., Bhatt, D., Zaidi, M. G. H., Saradhi, P. P., Khanna, P. K., & Arora, S. (2012). Silver nanoparticle-mediated enhancement in growth and antioxidant status of *Brassica juncea*. *Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology*, *167*(8), 2225-2233.

Siddiqui, M. H., Al-Whaibi, M. H., Faisal, M., & Al Sahli, A. A. (2014). Nano-silicon dioxide mitigates the adverse effects of salt stress on *Cucurbita pepo* L. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, *33*(11), 2429-2437.

Subramanian, K. S., Manikandan, A., Thirunavukkarasu, M., & Rahale, C. S. (2015). Nano-fertilizers for balanced crop nutrition. In *Nanotechnologies in food and agriculture* (pp. 69-80). Springer, Cham.

Tripathi, D. K., Singh, S., Singh, V. P., Prasad, S. M., Chauhan, D. K., & Dubey, N. K. (2017). Silicon nanoparticles more effectively alleviate arsenate toxicity than silicon in maize seedlings. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry, 111*, 90–100.

Xu, M., Zhu, J., Wei, Y., Nie, Y., Li, C., Xu, J., ... & Chen, H. (2019). Multicolor quantum dot-based chemical nose for rapid and array-free differentiation of multiple proteins. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *67*(19), 5660-5666.

Yada, R. Y., Buck, N., Canady, R., DeMerlis, C., Duncan, T., Janer, G., ... & Wen, K. (2014). Engineered nanoscale food ingredients: evaluation of current knowledge on material characteristics relevant to uptake from the gastrointestinal tract. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, *13*(4), 730-744.

Zulfiqar, F., & Ashraf, M. (2021). Nanoparticles potentially mediate salt stress tolerance in plants. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry*, *160*, 257-268.