NANOTECHNOLOGY IN SOIL REMEDIATION AND WATER TREATMENT

CHAPTER 3

Bhagat Singh
Department of Zoology,
SGTB Khalsa College University of Delhi, New Delhi 110007, India.

Email id: bschauhan79@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: One of the biggest problems of the twenty-first century is environmental pollution of soil and water resources, which endangers human health, ecosystem integrity, and sustainable development. Due to their high cost, lengthy treatment periods, and poor efficacy against newly discovered pollutants, traditional cleanup procedures often prove insufficient. Because of the special physicochemical characteristics of nanomaterials, nanotechnology has become a ground-breaking method that offers previously unheard-of potential for environmental cleaning. This chapter offers a thorough analysis of the underlying ideas, kinds of materials, mechanisms of action, and real-world applications of nanotechnology in soil remediation and water treatment. The topic covers a range of nanomaterials, such as metal oxide nanoparticles, carbon-based nanomaterials, zero-valent iron nanoparticles, and nanocomposites, as well as their methods of removing contaminants, such as chemical reduction, adsorption, and catalytic degradation. Even while nanotechnology shows great promise in terms of improved reactivity, selectivity, and efficiency when compared to traditional techniques, important factors like cost-effectiveness, scalability, and environmental safety still need to be taken into account. This chapter summarizes existing research, points out areas for improvement, and offers outlooks for the long-term use of nanotechnology in environmental remediation.

Keywords: Nanotechnology, soil remediation, water treatment, nanomaterials, environmental cleanup, zero-valent iron nanoparticles, nanoremediation.

INTRODUCTION

The escalating contamination of soil and water resources represents a formidable environmental crisis driven by industrialization, urbanization, agricultural intensification, and inadequate waste management practices (Karn *et al.*, 2009). Persistent organic pollutants, heavy metals, pharmaceutical residues, pesticides, and emerging contaminants such as microplastics and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) have infiltrated environmental matrices, creating complex pollution scenarios that challenge conventional remediation strategies (Qu *et al.*, 2013). The limitations of traditional approaches—including high operational costs, extended treatment durations, incomplete contaminant removal, and secondary pollution generation—have catalyzed the search for innovative solutions.

Nanotechnology, defined as the manipulation of matter at the nanoscale (1–100 nanometers), has revolutionized environmental science by introducing materials with extraordinary properties arising from their high surface area-to-volume ratios, quantum effects, and enhanced reactivity. These unique characteristics enable nanomaterials to interact with contaminants at the molecular level, achieving remediation efficiencies previously unattainable with conventional technologies. The application of nanotechnology in environmental remediation, termed nanoremediation, encompasses both in situ and ex situ treatment strategies for contaminated soil and water (Mueller *et al.*, 2012).

Recent studies have highlighted the ecological impacts of water pollution in riverine systems of northern India, including alterations in fish diversity, metal accumulation, and overall aquatic health (Singh *et al.*, 2025a; Singh *et al.*, 2025b; Singh *et al.*, 2024; Singh *et al.*, 2023). These findings underscore the urgent need for advanced remediation technologies, such as nanotechnology-based approaches, to mitigate pollutant loads and restore aquatic ecosystems.

Since the pioneering work demonstrating the effectiveness of nanoscale zero-valent iron (nZVI) for groundwater remediation in the late 1990s, the field has experienced exponential growth. Contemporary research explores diverse nanomaterials including carbon nanotubes, graphene oxide, titanium dioxide nanoparticles, quantum dots, and sophisticated nanocomposites tailored for specific contaminants (Amin *et al.*, 2014). The integration of nanotechnology with biological systems, photocatalysis, and electrochemical processes further expands the remediation toolkit (Khin *et al.*, 2012).

This chapter systematically examines the principles, applications, and prospects of nanotechnology in soil and water remediation. The discussion progresses from fundamental nanomaterial properties through specific applications in contaminant removal, evaluates performance metrics, addresses environmental health and safety concerns, and concludes with future research directions essential for translating laboratory successes into field-scale implementations.

Fundamental Principles of Nanomaterials in Environmental Remediation

The efficacy of nanomaterials in environmental remediation stems from distinctive physicochemical properties that differ markedly from their bulk counterparts (Hochella *et al.*, 2008). At the nanoscale, materials exhibit dramatically increased surface areas, altered electronic structures, enhanced catalytic activities, and modified thermodynamic properties that collectively enable superior contaminant interactions (Nel *et al.*, 2006).

The surface area-to-volume ratio increases inversely with particle diameter, meaning that as particles approach nanoscale dimensions, an increasingly larger proportion of atoms reside at the surface rather than in the interior structure (Auffan *et al.*, 2009). This geometric transformation translates into exponentially more reactive sites available for contaminant binding, catalytic reactions, or electron transfer processes (Nurmi *et al*., 2005). For instance, nZVI particles with diameters of 10-100 nm possess surface areas ranging from 10 to 50 m^2/g compared to less than 1 m^2/g for microscale iron particles, directly correlating with enhanced reactivity (Li *et al*., 2006).

Quantum confinement effects emerge when particle dimensions become comparable to the de Broglie wavelength of electrons, fundamentally altering electronic band structures and optical properties (Brus, 1984). These quantum mechanical phenomena enable nanomaterials to function as photocatalysts, generating reactive oxygen species under appropriate light irradiation for contaminant degradation (Hoffmann *et al*., 1995). Titanium dioxide nanoparticles exemplify this principle, with bandgap energies tunable through size control, thereby optimizing photocatalytic efficiency for specific applications (Chen & Mao 2007).

The high surface energy of nanomaterials drives thermodynamically favorable interactions with contaminants through various mechanisms (Nowack & Bucheli 2007). Adsorption processes benefit from abundant binding sites, enabling rapid and extensive contaminant uptake (Hua *et al*., 2012). Surface functionalization with organic ligands, polymers, or biomolecules further enhances selectivity toward target pollutants while improving nanoparticle stability and mobility in environmental matrices (Phenrat *et al*., 2007).

Nanomaterials facilitate electron transfer reactions critical for reductive degradation of halogenated organic compounds and heavy metal immobilization (Nurmi *et al*., 2005). Zero-valent metal nanoparticles serve as electron donors, converting oxidized contaminants into less toxic or immobile forms. The nanoscale dimensions minimize electron transfer distances, accelerating reaction kinetics compared to bulk materials (Gong *et al*., 2015).

Types of Nanomaterials for Remediation

Metal and Metal Oxide Nanoparticles

Zero-valent iron nanoparticles represent the most extensively studied and commercially implemented nanomaterial for environmental remediation (Crane & Scott 2012). These nanoparticles effectively degrade chlorinated organic compounds, reduce toxic heavy metals like chromium(VI) and lead, and sequester arsenic through precipitation reactions (Masciangioli & Zhang 2003). The remediation mechanism involves corrosion of the iron core, releasing electrons that drive reduction reactions while simultaneously generating iron oxides/hydroxides that adsorb contaminants (Kanel *et al*., 2005). Field applications have successfully treated contaminated groundwater, demonstrating the technology's practical viability (Elliott & Zhang 2001).

Titanium dioxide nanoparticles excel in photocatalytic applications, generating hydroxyl radicals and other reactive oxygen species upon UV or visible light absorption (Fujishima *et al*., 2000). These highly oxidative species degrade persistent organic pollutants including dyes, pesticides, pharmaceuticals, and industrial chemicals into carbon dioxide, water, and mineral acids (Chong *et al*., 2010). The chemical stability, non-toxicity, and reusability of TiO_2 nanoparticles make them attractive for water treatment systems.

Iron oxide nanoparticles, particularly magnetite (Fe_3O_4) and maghemite (γ-Fe_2O_3), combine excellent adsorption capacities with magnetic properties enabling facile separation from treated water using external magnetic fields (Ambashta & Sillanpää, 2010). These nanoparticles effectively remove heavy metals, radionuclides, and organic contaminants through surface complexation and electrostatic interactions. Surface modification with functional groups or polymers enhances selectivity and adsorption capacity for specific contaminants (Hu *et al*., 2010).

Carbon-Based Nanomaterials

Carbon nanotubes, both single-walled and multi-walled variants, demonstrate exceptional adsorption capacities for organic contaminants and heavy metals due to their hollow tubular structures, high surface areas, and diverse surface chemistry (Rao *et al*., 2007). The hydrophobic internal cavities preferentially adsorb nonpolar organic compounds through π-π interactions and van der Waals forces, while functionalized exteriors interact with polar contaminants and metal ions (Pan & Xing 2008). Applications include removal of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, endocrine-disrupting compounds, antibiotics, and toxic metals from aqueous solutions (Lu *et al*., 2005).

Graphene oxide, a two-dimensional nanomaterial with oxygen-containing functional groups, exhibits remarkable versatility in environmental remediation (Perreault *et al*., 2015). The abundant hydroxyl, epoxy, and carboxyl groups facilitate strong interactions with diverse contaminants through hydrogen bonding, electrostatic attraction, and complexation. Graphene oxide demonstrates superior adsorption performance for heavy metals, dyes,

pharmaceuticals, and radionuclides, with adsorption capacities often exceeding those of activated carbon (Chandra *et al*., 2010). Reduction to graphene restores electrical conductivity, enabling integration into electrochemical remediation systems.
Fullerenes and their derivatives possess unique cage-like structures with potential applications in contaminant sequestration and reactive oxygen species generation (Fang *et al*., 2007). Functionalized fullerenes exhibit antimicrobial properties useful for water disinfection, though their high cost currently limits widespread application (Lyon *et al*., 2006).

Nanocomposites and Hybrid Materials

The limitations of single-component nanomaterials have motivated the development of nanocomposites that synergistically combine advantageous properties of different materials (Gehrke *et al*., 2015). Polymer-supported nanoparticles improve stability, prevent aggregation, and enhance deliverability in subsurface environments while maintaining high reactivity (Kanel *et al*., 2007). Chitosan, polyacrylic acid, and carboxymethyl cellulose commonly serve as supporting matrices for metal nanoparticles in remediation applications.
Bimetallic nanoparticles, such as iron-palladium, iron-nickel, or iron-copper systems, exhibit enhanced reactivity and expanded contaminant degradation capabilities compared to monometallic particles. The catalytic metal (e.g., palladium) promotes electron transfer and facilitates dechlorination reactions while the zero-valent iron provides electrons and maintains reducing conditions. These materials effectively degrade recalcitrant compounds including polychlorinated biphenyls and chlorinated solvents (Lowry & Reinhard 1999).
Clay-supported nanomaterials combine the high adsorption capacity and cation exchange properties of clays with the reactivity of nanoparticles (Bhattacharyya & Gupta 2008). Bentonite, montmorillonite, and kaolinite intercalated with metal oxide or zero-valent metal nanoparticles demonstrate enhanced stability, reduced toxicity, and improved performance in batch and continuous flow systems (Garrido-Ramírez *et al*., 2010).

Mechanisms of Contaminant Removal

Nanomaterial-mediated contaminant removal operates through multiple, often concurrent mechanisms including adsorption, catalytic degradation, chemical reduction, and photocatalysis (Pandey & Kang 2013). Understanding these mechanisms is fundamental for optimizing remediation strategies and predicting treatment outcomes across diverse environmental conditions.
Adsorption represents the primary mechanism for many nanomaterials, involving contaminant accumulation at the nanoparticle surface through physical and chemical interactions (Ali, 2012). Physical adsorption occurs via weak van der Waals forces, hydrogen bonding, and electrostatic interactions, while chemisorption involves covalent bond formation between contaminants and surface functional groups. Carbon-based nanomaterials predominantly remove organic contaminants through π-π interactions, hydrophobic effects, and electrostatic attraction (Yang & Xing 2010). Metal oxide nanoparticles adsorb heavy metals through surface complexation, where metal ions displace protons from hydroxyl groups, forming stable inner-sphere complexes (Mohan & Pittman 2007).
Catalytic degradation involves nanomaterials serving as catalysts that accelerate contaminant breakdown without being consumed in the reaction. Photocatalytic nanomaterials like TiO_2 absorb photons generating electron-hole pairs that migrate to the surface, where they participate in redox reactions producing reactive oxygen species capable of mineralizing organic pollutants (Herrmann, 1999). Fenton-like reactions catalyzed by iron-based nanomaterials generate hydroxyl radicals from hydrogen peroxide, providing another powerful oxidative degradation pathway (Nidheesh *et al*., 2013).
Chemical reduction by zero-valent metal nanoparticles transforms oxidized contaminants into reduced species through electron transfer (Gillham & O'Hannesin 1994). Chlorinated organic compounds undergo reductive dechlorination, sequentially replacing chlorine atoms with hydrogen, ultimately yielding non-toxic products (Arnold & Roberts 2000). Heavy metals like chromium(VI), mercury(II), and uranium(VI) are reduced to less toxic and less mobile oxidation states that precipitate or adsorb onto iron oxide surfaces (Ponder *et al*., 2000).

Applications in Soil Remediation

Soil contamination by heavy metals, persistent organic pollutants, and petroleum hydrocarbons necessitates effective remediation technologies that restore soil functionality and prevent contaminant. Nanotechnology offers innovative approaches for in-situ and ex-situ soil treatment with advantages over conventional methods including enhanced contaminant accessibility, accelerated treatment kinetics, and reduced environmental disturbance (Kuppusamy *et al*., 2016).
Nanoscale zero-valent iron has demonstrated exceptional performance in treating soils contaminated with chlorinated solvents, heavy metals, and explosives (He *et al*., 2007). Field-scale applications involve direct injection of nZVI slurries into contaminated soil zones, where nanoparticles migrate through pores, contacting and degrading pollutants (He & Zhao 2007). Successful case studies include remediation of trichloroethylene-contaminated sites, where nZVI achieved greater than 90% contaminant reduction within weeks compared to years required for natural attenuation. The technology shows particular promise for source zone treatment where contaminant concentrations are highest.

Nanotechnology Applications for Agriculture

Heavy metal immobilization in soil represents another critical application area (Komárek *et al*., 2013). Metal oxide nanoparticles, particularly iron oxides and manganese oxides, adsorb toxic metals like lead, cadmium, and arsenic, reducing their bioavailability and preventing leaching into groundwater (Gil-Díaz *et al*., 2016). Hydroxyapatite nanoparticles effectively stabilize lead in contaminated soils through precipitation of lead phosphates, demonstrated in numerous field trials (Cao *et al.*, 2008). Unlike traditional approaches using bulk materials, nanoscale amendments achieve comparable or superior immobilization at lower application rates due to enhanced reactivity (Hooda, 2010).

Petroleum hydrocarbon degradation in soil benefits from nanomaterial-enhanced bioremediation strategies (Koul & Taak 2018). Iron oxide nanoparticles stimulate indigenous microbial populations, accelerating biodegradation of aliphatic and aromatic hydrocarbons (Dong *et al*., 2017). Nanoscale nutrients and electron acceptors improve bioavailability, enhancing microbial activity in contaminated zones. Combining nanoparticles with surfactants increases contaminant mobility and bioavailability, synergistically improving remediation efficiency.

Table 1: Nanomaterials for Soil Remediation Applications.

Nanomaterial Type	Target Contaminants	Mechanism	Typical Dosage	Remediation Efficiency	Key References
Nanoscale zero-valent iron (nZVI)	Chlorinated solvents (TCE, PCE), Heavy metals (Cr, Pb, As)	Reductive degradation, Adsorption	2-20 g/kg soil	85-98% removal	He *et al.* (2007)
Iron oxide nanoparticles (Fe_3O_4, α-Fe_2O_3)	Heavy metals (Pb, Cd, Cu, As)	Adsorption, Surface complexation	0.5-5 g/kg soil	70-95% immobilization	Gil-Díaz *et al.* (2016)
Titanium dioxide (TiO_2) nanoparticles	Persistent organic pollutants, Petroleum hydrocarbons	Photocatalytic oxidation	1-10 g/kg soil	60-90% degradation	Chong *et al.* (2010)
Hydroxyapatite nanoparticles	Lead, Cadmium	Precipitation, Ion exchange	1-5% w/w	80-99% stabilization	Cao *et al.* (2008)
Carbon nanotubes (CNTs)	Organic pollutants (PAHs, PCBs)	Adsorption, Enhanced bioavailability	0.1-1 g/kg soil	50-85% removal	Pan & Xing (2008); Rao *et al.* (2007)
Bimetallic nanoparticles (Fe/Pd, Fe/Ni)	Chlorinated organics, Explosives	Catalytic reduction	3-15 g/kg soil	90-99% degradation	Lowry & Reinhard (1999)

Applications in Water Treatment

Water contamination by industrial effluents, agricultural runoff, municipal wastewater, and emerging contaminants threatens public health and ecosystem integrity globally. Conventional water treatment technologies struggle with emerging contaminants, require extensive infrastructure, and generate substantial waste streams (Qu *et al*., 2013). Nanotechnology-based water treatment offers transformative solutions characterized by high efficiency, rapid kinetics, and minimal secondary pollution.

Heavy metal removal from contaminated water represents one of the most successful applications of nanomaterials. Iron oxide nanoparticles remove arsenic, lead, mercury, cadmium, and chromium through adsorption and precipitation mechanisms, achieving removal efficiencies exceeding 99% under optimized conditions (Mohan & Pittman 2007). The magnetic properties enable easy separation and nanoparticle recovery, facilitating regeneration and reuse (Ambashta & Sillanpää 2010). Large-scale pilot studies have demonstrated the technical and economic feasibility of magnetic nanoparticle-based systems for arsenic removal from drinking water in affected regions (Jain *et al*., 2015).

Organic contaminant degradation employs photocatalytic nanomaterials that mineralize dyes, pesticides, pharmaceuticals, and personal care products under light irradiation (Hoffmann *et al*., 1995). Titanium dioxide nanoparticles, either suspended or immobilized on supports, effectively degrade recalcitrant compounds including triclosan, carbamazepine, and estrogens (Chong *et al*., 2010). Visible-light-active photocatalysts developed through metal doping or dye sensitization extend applicability to solar-driven systems, improving sustainability (Chen & Mao 2007). Photocatalytic reactors incorporating TiO_2 nanoparticles have treated various industrial wastewaters, achieving over 90% pollutant removal (Herrmann, 1999).

Desalination and water purification using nanomaterial-based membranes represents an emerging frontier (Elimelech & Phillip 2011). Carbon nanotube membranes exhibit exceptional water permeability with high salt rejection, potentially revolutionizing reverse osmosis processes (Holt *et al*., 2006). Graphene oxide membranes demonstrate precise molecular sieving capabilities, enabling selective removal of contaminants while maintaining high water flux. Nanocomposite membranes incorporating silver or titanium dioxide nanoparticles resist biofouling, a major limitation of conventional membrane systems (Qu *et al*., 2013).

Antimicrobial applications leverage the inherent biocidal properties of certain nanomaterials for water disinfection (Li *et al*., 2008). Silver nanoparticles inactivate bacteria, viruses, and protozoa through multiple mechanisms including membrane disruption, protein denaturation, and DNA damage (Marambio-Jones & Hoek 2010). Point-of-use water treatment devices incorporating silver nanoparticles provide microbiologically safe drinking water in resource-limited settings (Dankovich & Gray 2011). However, concerns regarding silver release and environmental impacts necessitate careful system design and monitoring (Fabrega *et al*., 2011).

Table 2: Nanomaterials for Water Treatment Applications.

Nanomaterial Type	Target Contaminants	Treatment Approach	Removal Capacity	Advantages	Limitations	Key References
Magnetic iron oxide nanoparticles	Heavy metals (As, Pb, Hg, Cr)	Adsorption + magnetic separation	50-200 mg/g	Magnetic recovery, High efficiency, Reusability	pH sensitivity	Ambashta & Sillanpää (2010)
TiO_2 nanoparticles	Organic pollutants, Dyes, Pharmaceuticals	Photocatalytic oxidation	Complete mineralization	Chemically stable, Reusable, Non-toxic	UV light requirement, Recovery challenges	Chong *et al.* (2010); Herrmann (1999)
Carbon nanotubes (CNTs)	Organic contaminants, Heavy metals	Adsorption	100-400 mg/g	High capacity, Fast kinetics	High cost, Toxicity concerns	Lu *et al.* (2005); Rao *et al.* (2007)
Graphene oxide	Heavy metals, Dyes, Radionuclides	Adsorption, Membrane filtration	200-800 mg/g	Extremely high surface area, Versatile chemistry	Production cost, Stability issues	Chandra *et al.* (2010); Perreault *et al*. (2015)
Silver nanoparticles	Bacteria, Viruses, Protozoa	Antimicrobial action	>99.9% inactivation	Broad-spectrum, Rapid action	Silver release, Cost, Toxicity	Marambio-Jones & Hoek (2010); Li *et al.* (2008)
nZVI	Nitrates, Chlorinated organics	Reductive degradation	50-150 mg/g	High reactivity, Versatile	Oxidation susceptibility, Aggregation	Crane & Scott (2012)
Nanocomposite membranes	Salts, Organics, Microorganisms	Size exclusion, Rejection	Variable	Enhanced permeability, Antifouling	Membrane integrity	Elimelech & Phillip (2011); Qu *et al.* (2013)

Environmental Health and Safety Considerations

While nanotechnology offers tremendous potential for environmental remediation, the intentional release of engineered nanomaterials into the environment raises valid concerns related to their fate, transport, ecological effects, and potential risks to human health (Klaine *et al.,* 2008). Responsible development therefore necessitates robust risk assessment frameworks that carefully balance remediation benefits against potential hazards (Maynard *et al*., 2006). Similar concerns regarding sustainability, environmental safety, and responsible innovation have also been emphasized in broader agri-bio innovation and sustainable agriculture frameworks (Singh & Lal 2024; Wani & Kumar 2024).

The behavior of nanomaterials in environmental matrices differs markedly from that of bulk materials and dissolved chemical species (Lowry *et al*., 2012). Processes such as aggregation, sedimentation, dissolution, surface modification, and interactions with natural organic matter and soil minerals critically influence nanoparticle mobility, persistence, and bioavailability (Levard *et al*., 2012). For example, zero-valent iron nanoparticles rapidly oxidize under aerobic conditions, forming iron oxides that significantly reduce their reactivity and transport potential (Liu *et al*., 2005). Surface coatings can improve nanoparticle stability and subsurface transport, though they may also modify toxicity profiles and environmental behavior (Phenrat *et al*., 2007). Green synthesis approaches, such as the use of cyanobacterial extracts for gold nanoparticle production, offer environmentally benign alternatives that may reduce ecological risks associated with conventional synthesis methods (Shehzadi *et al*., 2023).

Ecotoxicological investigations have demonstrated that certain nanomaterials can adversely affect aquatic organisms, soil microorganisms, and plants, particularly at elevated concentrations (Nowack & Bucheli 2007). Silver nanoparticles, for instance, exhibit toxicity toward bacteria and aquatic invertebrates through ionic release and direct nanoparticle interactions (Fabrega *et al*., 2011). Carbon nanotubes display variable toxicity depending on their size, functionalization, and purity, with mechanisms involving membrane disruption and oxidative stress (Petersen *et al*., 2011). Metal oxide nanoparticles may induce reactive oxygen species generation, leading to cellular damage in non-target organisms (Nel *et al*., 2006). Field-based evidence of such ecological effects has been reported for colloidal silver, which negatively influenced natural communities of juvenile fishes following short-term exposure (Vijayan *et al*., 2024).

Nanotechnology Applications for Agriculture

Human exposure pathways to engineered nanomaterials include inhalation during production or application, dermal contact, and ingestion through contaminated food or water (Oberdörster *et al*., 2005). Occupational exposure remains the primary concern, necessitating appropriate personal protective equipment and engineering controls. Although most studies suggest limited systemic distribution of nanomaterials following environmental exposure at environmentally realistic concentrations, uncertainties persist regarding long-term, low-dose exposure and the potential for bioaccumulation (Handy *et al*., 2008).

Risk mitigation strategies focus on minimizing unintended impacts through the use of stabilized or immobilized nanomaterials, application at minimum effective doses, targeted deployment to contaminated zones, and long-term post-treatment monitoring (Bardos *et al*., 2014). Life cycle assessment tools are increasingly applied to compare nanoremediation technologies with conventional remediation approaches, accounting for energy consumption, chemical inputs, emissions, and waste generation (Gavankar *et al*., 2012). Despite progress, regulatory frameworks addressing nanomaterials remain underdeveloped, with significant gaps in standardized testing protocols, exposure thresholds, and long-term monitoring requirements (Hansen *et al*., 2008).

Economic and Practical Considerations

Translating nanotechnology from laboratory-scale research to field-scale application requires overcoming economic, scalability, and operational challenges (Karn *et al*., 2009). Cost–benefit analyses must incorporate nanomaterial synthesis costs, delivery mechanisms, monitoring requirements, and long-term site management relative to traditional remediation options (Mueller *et al*., 2012). Advances in sustainable agricultural practices, such as optimized nutrient management and biofertilizer use, highlight the importance of balancing cost efficiency with environmental performance (Sanadi *et al*., 2023; Sharma *et al*., 2024).

Nanomaterial production costs vary widely depending on synthesis techniques, purity standards, and production scale (Comba & Sethi 2009). While laboratory-grade nanomaterials remain expensive, commercial-scale production methods such as liquid-phase reduction and mechanical milling have substantially reduced costs (Li & Zhang 2007). Continued process optimization and economies of scale have reduced the price of nanoscale zero-valent iron to approximately USD 30–100 per kilogram for bulk quantities (Quinn *et al*., 2005). However, carbon-based nanomaterials remain comparatively costly, limiting their widespread deployment despite their high remediation efficiency (De Volder *et al*., 2013).

Delivery and emplacement technologies are critical determinants of field-scale success (Kocur *et al*., 2014). Techniques such as direct slurry injection using conventional well infrastructure are effective for groundwater and shallow soil remediation (He & Zhao 2007), while hydraulic or pneumatic fracturing enhances nanoparticle distribution in low-permeability media (Kocur *et al*., 2013). For agricultural and surface-contaminated soils, surface application followed by mechanical incorporation is often preferred (Kuppusamy *et al*., 2016). Optimizing injection pressure, nanoparticle concentration, and stabilizing agents enhances treatment efficiency while reducing operational costs (Phenrat *et al*., 2010).

Monitoring and performance evaluation require advanced analytical tools capable of differentiating engineered nanomaterials from naturally occurring nanoparticles and tracking their spatial and temporal distribution (Grieger *et al*., 2010). Non-invasive geophysical methods, such as electrical resistivity tomography, enable real-time monitoring of nanoparticle migration (Kanel *et al*., 2008). Complementary chemical analyses assess contaminant degradation and confirm remediation success. The integration of monitoring data with predictive modeling tools supports adaptive management strategies and improves long-term remediation outcomes (Fatisson *et al*., 2010).

CONCLUSION

Nanotechnology represents a paradigm shift in environmental remediation, offering unprecedented capabilities for treating contaminated soil and water through materials with extraordinary properties arising from nanoscale dimensions. The diverse array of nanomaterials including zero-valent iron nanoparticles, carbon nanotubes, graphene oxide, metal oxides, and sophisticated nanocomposites provides a versatile toolkit for addressing virtually any contamination scenario through mechanisms encompassing adsorption, catalytic degradation, chemical reduction, and photocatalytic mineralization.

Demonstrated successes in laboratory studies and pilot-scale field trials establish technical feasibility, with removal efficiencies often exceeding 90% for target contaminants and treatment times reduced from years to months or weeks compared to conventional approaches. Applications span heavy metal immobilization, chlorinated solvent degradation, petroleum hydrocarbon treatment, and emerging contaminant removal, addressing priority pollution challenges across diverse environmental matrices.

However, realizing the full potential of nanoremediation requires addressing critical challenges including production costs, delivery and distribution in heterogeneous subsurface environments, long-term stability and performance, potential environmental health impacts, and regulatory uncertainty. The deliberate introduction of engineered nanomaterials into the environment demands rigorous risk assessment, comprehensive monitoring, and adaptive management strategies that balance remediation benefits against potential ecological disruption.

Nanotechnology Applications for Agriculture

Future progress depends on continued innovation in nanomaterial design, integration with complementary technologies, development of green synthesis methods, mechanistic understanding through advanced characterization, standardization of evaluation protocols, and holistic sustainability assessment frameworks. Interdisciplinary collaboration spanning materials science, environmental engineering, toxicology, ecology, and social sciences is essential for responsible technology development.

As research advances and practical experience accumulates, nanotechnology will increasingly contribute to solving the urgent environmental challenges of the 21st century, restoring contaminated sites, protecting public health, and enabling sustainable development. The journey from laboratory curiosity to widespread implementation continues, driven by scientific innovation, environmental necessity, and commitment to responsible stewardship of novel technologies.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Nanotechnology for environmental remediation stands at a critical juncture between promising laboratory results and widespread practical implementation (Karn *et al*., 2009). Several key research directions will determine the field's trajectory and societal impact over the coming decades.

Advanced nanomaterial design through rational engineering approaches offers opportunities to develop multifunctional materials with enhanced performance, selectivity, and environmental compatibility (Gehrke *et al*., 2015). Machine learning and computational modeling can accelerate discovery by predicting optimal compositions, structures, and surface modifications for specific remediation scenarios (Mueller *et al*., 2016). Biomimetic approaches inspired by natural systems may yield nanomaterials with superior efficiency and minimal ecological disruption (Arico *et al*., 2005).

Integration with other remediation technologies through hybrid systems leverages synergistic. Coupling nanomaterials with electrokinetic, phytoremediation, or bioremediation methods addresses complex contamination scenarios more effectively than individual approaches (Harbottle *et al*., 2009). Sequential treatment trains combining nanomaterial pre-treatment with biological polishing optimize cost-effectiveness and completeness (Kuppusamy *et al*., 2017).

Green synthesis methods using plant extracts, microorganisms, or agricultural waste as reducing and stabilizing agents align nanotechnology with sustainability principles (Duan *et al*., 2015). These approaches reduce chemical consumption, minimize toxic byproducts, and lower production costs while potentially enhancing biocompatibility (Iravani, 2011). Scaling these methods from laboratory to industrial production remains a challenge requiring further development.

Mechanistic understanding through advanced characterization techniques elucidates contaminant-nanomaterial interactions at molecular scales, informing design improvements and predicting performance under variable environmental conditions (Hochella *et al*., 2012). Synchrotron-based spectroscopy, advanced microscopy, and isotope tracing reveal transformation pathways and identify rate-limiting steps. This fundamental knowledge enables predictive modeling tools that optimize remediation designs and reduce field trial requirements.

Standardization of testing protocols, nomenclature, and reporting metrics facilitates inter-study comparisons and technology transfer (Grieger *et al*., 2010). Developing consensus methodologies for assessing nanomaterial reactivity, stability, toxicity, and environmental fate accelerates regulatory acceptance and commercialization (Lowry *et al*., 2012). International collaboration through organizations like the ISO Nanotechnology Technical Committee advances harmonization efforts.

Life cycle sustainability assessment frameworks that holistically evaluate environmental, economic, and social dimensions will guide responsible implementation (Gavankar *et al*., 2015). Comparative assessments against conventional remediation alternatives, considering energy consumption, carbon footprint, resource depletion, and long-term stewardship requirements, inform decision-making and prioritize research investments (Bardos *et al*., 2018).

REFERENCES

Ali, I. (2012). New generation adsorbents for water treatment. *Chemical Reviews*, *112*(5), 5073-5091.

Ambashta, R. D., & Sillanpää, M. (2010). Water purification using magnetic assistance: A review. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, *180*(1-3), 38-49.

Amin, M. T., Alazba, A. A., & Manzoor, U. (2014). A review of removal of pollutants from water/wastewater using different types of nanomaterials. *Advances in Materials Science and Engineering*, *2014*, Article 825910.

Arico, A. S., Bruce, P., Scrosati, B., Tarascon, J. M., & Van Schalkwijk, W. (2005). Nanostructured materials for advanced energy conversion and storage devices. *Nature Materials*, *4*(5), 366-377.

Arnold, W. A., & Roberts, A. L. (2000). Pathways and kinetics of chlorinated ethylene and chlorinated acetylene reaction with Fe(0) particles. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *34*(9), 1794-1805.

Auffan, M., Rose, J., Bottero, J. Y., Lowry, G. V., Jolivet, J. P., & Wiesner, M. R. (2009). Towards a definition of inorganic nanoparticles from an environmental, health and safety perspective. *Nature Nanotechnology*, *4*(10), 634-641.

Nanotechnology Applications for Agriculture

Bardos, P., Bone, B., Daly, P., Elliott, D., Jones, S., Lowry, G., & Merly, C. (2014). A risk/benefit approach to the application of iron nanoparticles for the remediation of contaminated sites in the environment. *European Commission Seventh Framework Programme NanoRem Project*. NanoRem Report TR2-NN.

Bardos, P., Bone, B., Elliott, D., Hartog, N., Henstock, J., & Nathanail, P. (2018). A risk/benefit approach to the application of iron nanoparticles for the remediation of contaminated sites in the environment: Interim guidance. *NanoRem Bulletin*, *4*, 1-12.

Bhattacharyya, K. G., & Gupta, S. S. (2008). Adsorption of a few heavy metals on natural and modified kaolinite and montmorillonite: A review. *Advances in Colloid and Interface Science*, *140*(2), 114-131.

Brus, L. E. (1984). Electron-electron and electron-hole interactions in small semiconductor crystallites: The size dependence of the lowest excited electronic state. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, *80*(9), 4403-4409.

Cao, X., Ma, L. Q., Rhue, D. R., & Appel, C. S. (2008). Mechanisms of lead, copper, and zinc retention by phosphate rock. *Environmental Pollution*, *152*(2), 309-315.

Chandra, V., Park, J., Chun, Y., Lee, J. W., Hwang, I. C., & Kim, K. S. (2010). Water-dispersible magnetite-reduced graphene oxide composites for arsenic removal. *ACS Nano*, *4*(7), 3979-3986.

Chen, X., & Mao, S. S. (2007). Titanium dioxide nanomaterials: Synthesis, properties, modifications, and applications. *Chemical Reviews*, *107*(7), 2891-2959.

Chong, M. N., Jin, B., Chow, C. W., & Saint, C. (2010). Recent developments in photocatalytic water treatment technology: A review. *Water Research*, *44*(10), 2997-3027.

Comba, S., & Sethi, R. (2009). Stabilization of highly concentrated suspensions of iron nanoparticles using shear-thinning gels of xanthan gum. *Water Research*, *43*(15), 3717-3726.

Crane, R. A., & Scott, T. B. (2012). Nanoscale zero-valent iron: Future prospects for an emerging water treatment technology. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, *211*, 112-125.

Dankovich, T. A., & Gray, D. G. (2011). Bactericidal paper impregnated with silver nanoparticles for point-of-use water treatment. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *45*(5), 1992-1998.

De Volder, M. F., Tawfick, S. H., Baughman, R. H., & Hart, A. J. (2013). Carbon nanotubes: Present and future commercial applications. *Science*, *339*(6119), 535-539.

Dong, H., Xie, Y., Zeng, G., Tang, L., Liang, J., He, Q., ... & Zhao, F. (2017). The dual effects of carboxymethyl cellulose on the colloidal stability and toxicity of nanoscale zero-valent iron. *Chemosphere*, *144*, 1682-1689.

Duan, H., Wang, D., & Li, Y. (2015). Green chemistry for nanoparticle synthesis. *Chemical Society Reviews*, *44*(16), 5778-5792.

Elimelech, M., & Phillip, W. A. (2011). The future of seawater desalination: Energy, technology, and the environment. *Science*, *333*(6043), 712-717.

Elliott, D. W., & Zhang, W. X. (2001). Field assessment of nanoscale bimetallic particles for groundwater treatment. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *35*(24), 4922-4926.

Fabrega, J., Luoma, S. N., Tyler, C. R., Galloway, T. S., & Lead, J. R. (2011). Silver nanoparticles: Behaviour and effects in the aquatic environment. *Environment International*, *37*(2), 517-531.

Fang, J., Lyon, D. Y., Wiesner, M. R., Dong, J., & Alvarez, P. J. (2007). Effect of a fullerene water suspension on bacterial phospholipids and membrane phase behavior. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *41*(7), 2636-2642.

Fatisson, J., Ghoshal, S., & Tufenkji, N. (2010). Deposition of carboxymethylcellulose-coated zero-valent iron nanoparticles onto silica: Roles of solution chemistry and organic matter. *Langmuir*, *26*(15), 12832-12840.

Fujishima, A., Rao, T. N., & Tryk, D. A. (2000). Titanium dioxide photocatalysis. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology C: Photochemistry Reviews*, *1*(1), 1-21.

Garrido-Ramírez, E. G., Theng, B. K. G., & Mora, M. L. (2010). Clays and oxide minerals as catalysts and nanocatalysts in Fenton-like reactions—A review. *Applied Clay Science*, *47*(3-4), 182-192.

Gavankar, S., Suh, S., & Keller, A. F. (2012). Life cycle assessment of engineered nanoparticles for groundwater remediation: Implications for sustainable deployment. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *46*(18), 10129-10136.

Gavankar, S., Suh, S., & Keller, A. F. (2015). The role of scale and technology maturity in life cycle assessment of emerging technologies: A case study on carbon nanotubes. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, *19*(1), 51-60.

Gehrke, I., Geiser, A., & Somborn-Schulz, A. (2015). Innovations in nanotechnology for water treatment. *Nanotechnology, Science and Applications*, *8*, 1-17.

Gil-Díaz, M., Alonso, J., Rodríguez-Valdés, E., Gallego, J. R., & Lobo, M. C. (2016). Comparing different commercial zero valent iron nanoparticles to immobilize As and Hg in brownfield soil. *Science of the Total Environment*, *584-585*, 1324-1332.

Gillham, R. W., & O'Hannesin, S. F. (1994). Enhanced degradation of halogenated aliphatics by zero-valent iron. *Ground Water*, *32*(6), 958-967.

Gong, Y., Liu, Y., Xiong, Z., Kaback, D., & Zhao, D. (2015). Immobilization of mercury in field soil and sediment using carboxymethyl cellulose stabilized iron sulfide nanoparticles. *Nanotechnology*, *23*(29), 294012.

Nanotechnology Applications for Agriculture

Grieger, K. D., Fjordbøge, A., Hartmann, N. B., Eriksson, E., Bjerg, P. L., & Baun, A. (2010). Environmental benefits and risks of zero-valent iron nanoparticles (nZVI) for in situ remediation: Risk mitigation or trade-off? *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology*, *118*(3-4), 165-183.

Handy, R. D., von der Kammer, F., Lead, J. R., Hassellöv, M., Owen, R., & Crane, M. (2008). The ecotoxicology and chemistry of manufactured nanoparticles. *Ecotoxicology*, *17*(4), 287-314.

Hansen, S. F., Michelson, E. S., Kamper, A., Borling, P., Stuer-Lauridsen, F., & Baun, A. (2008). Categorization framework to aid exposure assessment of nanomaterials in consumer products. *Ecotoxicology*, *17*(5), 438-447.

Harbottle, M. J., Fairley, M., Atkinson, T., & Lee, C. S. (2009). Electrokinetic-enhanced bioremediation of chlorinated solvents: A review of the processes and environmental applications. *Bioremediation: Biotechnology, Engineering and Environmental Management*, 187-203.

He, F., & Zhao, D. (2007). Manipulating the size and dispersibility of zerovalent iron nanoparticles by use of carboxymethyl cellulose stabilizers. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *41*(17), 6216-6221.

He, F., Zhao, D., Liu, J., & Roberts, C. B. (2007). Stabilization of Fe-Pd nanoparticles with sodium carboxymethyl cellulose for enhanced transport and dechlorination of trichloroethylene in soil and groundwater. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, *46*(1), 29-34.

Herrmann, J. M. (1999). Heterogeneous photocatalysis: Fundamentals and applications to the removal of various types of aqueous pollutants. *Catalysis Today*, *53*(1), 115-129.

Hochella, M. F., Jr., Lower, S. K., Maurice, P. A., Penn, R. L., Sahai, N., Sparks, D. L., & Twining, B. S. (2008). Nanominerals, mineral nanoparticles, and Earth systems. *Science*, *319*(5870), 1631-1635.

Hochella, M. F., Jr., Mogk, D. W., Ranville, J., Allen, I. C., Luther, G. W., Marr, L. C., ... & Vikesland, P. (2012). Natural, incidental, and engineered nanomaterials and their impacts on the Earth system. *Science*, *363*(6434), eaau8299.

Hoffmann, M. R., Martin, S. T., Choi, W., & Bahnemann, D. W. (1995). Environmental applications of semiconductor photocatalysis. *Chemical Reviews*, *95*(1), 69-96.

Holt, J. K., Park, H. G., Wang, Y., Stadermann, M., Artyukhin, A. B., Grigoropoulos, C. P., ... & Bakajin, O. (2006). Fast mass transport through sub-2-nanometer carbon nanotubes. *Science*, *312*(5776), 1034-1037.

Hooda, P. S. (Ed.). (2010). *Trace elements in soils*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hu, J., Lo, I. M., & Chen, G. (2010). Fast removal and recovery of Cr(VI) using surface-modified jacobsite ($MnFe_2O_4$) nanoparticles. *Langmuir*, *26*(13), 11431-11437.

Hua, M., Zhang, S., Pan, B., Zhang, W., Lv, L., & Zhang, Q. (2012). Heavy metal removal from water/wastewater by nanosized metal oxides: A review. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, *211-212*, 317-331.

Iravani, S. (2011). Green synthesis of metal nanoparticles using plants. *Green Chemistry*, *13*(10), 2638-2650.

Jain, A., Raven, K. P., & Loeppert, R. H. (2015). Arsenite and arsenate adsorption on ferrihydrite: Surface charge reduction and net OH^- release stoichiometry. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *33*(8), 1179-1184.

Kanel, S. R., Choi, H., Kim, J. Y., Vigneswaran, S., & Shim, W. G. (2007). Removal of arsenic(III) from groundwater using nano scale zero-valent iron as a colloidal reactive barrier material. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *40*(6), 2045-2050.

Kanel, S. R., Greneche, J. M., & Choi, H. (2005). Arsenic(V) removal from groundwater using nano scale zero-valent iron as a colloidal reactive barrier material. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *40*(6), 2045-2050.

Kanel, S. R., Nepal, D., Manning, B., & Choi, H. (2008). Transport of surface-modified iron nanoparticle in porous media and application to arsenic(III) remediation. *Journal of Nanoparticle Research*, *9*(5), 725-735.

Karn, B., Kuiken, T., & Otto, M. (2009). Nanotechnology and in situ remediation: A review of the benefits and potential risks. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, *117*(12), 1813-1831.

Khin, M. M., Nair, A. S., Babu, V. J., Murugan, R., & Ramakrishna, S. (2012). A review on nanomaterials for environmental remediation. *Energy & Environmental Science*, *5*(8), 8075-8109.

Klaine, S. J., Alvarez, P. J., Batley, G. E., Fernandes, T. F., Handy, R. D., Lyon, D. Y., ... & Lead, J. R. (2008). Nanomaterials in the environment: Behavior, fate, bioavailability, and effects. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, *27*(9), 1825-1851.

Kocur, C. M., Chowdhury, A. I., Sakulchaicharoen, N., Boparai, H. K., Weber, K. P., Sharma, P., ... & O'Carroll, D. M. (2014). Characterization of nZVI mobility in a field scale test. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *48*(5), 2862-2869.

Kocur, C. M., Lomness, J. K., Boparai, H. K., Chowdhury, A. I., Weber, K. P., Austrins, L. M., ... & O'Carroll, D. M. (2013). Contributions of abiotic and biotic dechlorination following carboxymethyl cellulose stabilized nanoscale zero valent iron injection. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *48*(14), 8054-8061.

Komárek, M., Vaněk, A., & Ettler, V. (2013). Chemical stabilization of metals and arsenic in contaminated soils using oxides—A review. *Environmental Pollution*, *172*, 9-22.

Koul, B., & Taak, P. (2018). Biotechnological strategies for effective remediation of polluted soils. Springer.

Kuppusamy, S., Palanisami, T., Megharaj, M., Venkateswarlu, K., & Naidu, R. (2016). In-situ remediation approaches for the management of contaminated sites: A comprehensive overview. *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, *236*, 1-115.

Nanotechnology Applications for Agriculture

Kuppusamy, S., Thavamani, P., Megharaj, M., Venkateswarlu, K., & Naidu, R. (2017). Agronomic and remedial benefits and risks of applying biochar to soil: Current knowledge and future research directions. *Environment International*, *87*, 1-12.

Levard, C., Hotze, E. M., Lowry, G. V., & Brown, G. E., Jr. (2012). Environmental transformations of silver nanoparticles: Impact on stability and toxicity. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *46*(13), 6900-6914.

Li, L., Fan, M., Brown, R. C., Van Leeuwen, J., Wang, J., Wang, W., ... & Clipper, M. (2006). Synthesis, properties, and environmental applications of nanoscale iron-based materials: A review. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, *36*(5), 405-431.

Li, Q., Mahendra, S., Lyon, D. Y., Brunet, L., Liga, M. V., Li, D., & Alvarez, P. J. (2008). Antimicrobial nanomaterials for water disinfection and microbial control: Potential applications and implications. *Water Research*, *42*(18), 4591-4602.

Li, X. Q., & Zhang, W. X. (2007). Sequestration of metal cations with zerovalent iron nanoparticles: A study with high resolution X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (HR-XPS). *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, *111*(19), 6939-6946.

Liu, Y., Majetich, S. A., Tilton, R. D., Sholl, D. S., & Lowry, G. V. (2005). TCE dechlorination rates, pathways, and efficiency of nanoscale iron particles with different properties. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *39*(5), 1338-1345.

Lowry, G. V., & Reinhard, M. (1999). Pd-catalyzed TCE dechlorination in groundwater: Solute effects, biological control, and oxidative catalyst regeneration. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *34*(15), 3217-3223.

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.

Lu, C., Chung, Y. L., & Chang, K. F. (2005). Adsorption of trihalomethanes from water with carbon nanotubes. *Water Research*, *39*(6), 1183-1189.

Lyon, D. Y., Adams, L. K., Falkner, J. C., & Alvarez, P. J. (2006). Antibacterial activity of fullerene water suspensions: Effects of preparation method and particle size. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *40*(14), 4360-4366.

Marambio-Jones, C., & Hoek, E. M. (2010). A review of the antibacterial effects of silver nanomaterials and potential implications for human health and the environment. *Journal of Nanoparticle Research*, *12*(5), 1531-1551.

Masciangioli, T., & Zhang, W. X. (2003). Environmental technologies at the nanoscale. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *37*(5), 102A-108A.

Maynard, A. D., Aitken, R. J., Butz, T., Colvin, V., Donaldson, K., Oberdörster, G., ... & Warheit, D. B. (2006). Safe handling of nanotechnology. *Nature*, *444*(7117), 267-269.

Mohan, D., & Pittman, C. U., Jr. (2007). Arsenic removal from water/wastewater using adsorbents—A critical review. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, *142*(1-2), 1-53.

Mueller, N. C., Braun, J., Bruns, J., Černík, M., Rissing, P., Rickerby, D., & Nowack, B. (2012). Application of nanoscale zero valent iron (NZVI) for groundwater remediation in Europe. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *19*(2), 550-558.

Mueller, N. C., van der Meer, J., & Nowack, B. (2016). Environmental life cycle assessment of nanomaterials: From released particles to toxicity and from current applications to future uses. In *Nanotechnology* (Vol. 5, pp. 169-197). CRC Press.

Nel, A., Xia, T., Mädler, L., & Li, N. (2006). Toxic potential of materials at the nanolevel. *Science*, *311*(5761), 622-627.

Nidheesh, P. V., Gandhimathi, R., & Ramesh, S. T. (2013). Degradation of dyes from aqueous solution by Fenton processes: A review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *20*(4), 2099-2132.

Nowack, B., & Bucheli, T. D. (2007). Occurrence, behavior and effects of nanoparticles in the environment. *Environmental Pollution*, *150*(1), 5-22.

Nurmi, J. T., Tratnyek, P. G., Sarathy, V., Baer, D. R., Amonette, J. E., Pecher, K., ... & Penn, R. L. (2005). Characterization and properties of metallic iron nanoparticles: Spectroscopy, electrochemistry, and kinetics. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *39*(5), 1221-1230. https://doi.org/10.1021/es049190u

Oberdörster, G., Oberdörster, E., & Oberdörster, J. (2005). Nanotoxicology: An emerging discipline evolving from studies of ultrafine particles. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, *113*(7), 823-839.

Pan, B., & Xing, B. (2008). Adsorption mechanisms of organic chemicals on carbon nanotubes. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *42*(24), 9005-9013.

Pandey, G., & Kang, M. (2013). Nanotechnology-based adsorbents and their environmental applications. In *Nanotechnology for sustainable development* (pp. 109-131). Springer.

Perreault, F., De Faria, A. F., & Elimelech, M. (2015). Environmental applications of graphene-based nanomaterials. *Chemical Society Reviews*, *44*(16), 5861-5896.

Petersen, E. J., Zhang, L., Mattison, N. T., O'Carroll, D. M., Whelton, A. J., Uddin, N., ... & Nguyen, T. (2011). Potential release pathways, environmental fate, and ecological risks of carbon nanotubes. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *45*(23), 9837-9856.

Phenrat, T., Saleh, N., Sirk, K., Kim, H. J., Tilton, R. D., & Lowry, G. V. (2007). Aggregation and sedimentation of aqueous nanoscale zerovalent iron dispersions. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *42*(1), 284-290.

Phenrat, T., Saleh, N., Sirk, K., Tilton, R. D., & Lowry, G. V. (2010). Partial oxidation ("aging") and surface modification decrease the toxicity of nanosized zerovalent iron. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *41*(7), 2350-2356.

Ponder, S. M., Darab, J. G., & Mallouk, T. E. (2000). Remediation of Cr(VI) and Pb(II) aqueous solutions using supported, nanoscale zero-valent iron. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *34*(12), 2564-2569.

Qu, X., Alvarez, P. J., & Li, Q. (2013). Applications of nanotechnology in water and wastewater treatment. *Water Research*, *47*(12), 3931-3946.

Quinn, J., Geiger, C., Clausen, C., Brooks, K., Coon, C., O'Hara, S., ... & Grandy, K. (2005). Field demonstration of DNAPL dehalogenation using emulsified zero-valent iron. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *39*(5), 1309-1318.

Rao, G. P., Lu, C., & Su, F. (2007). Sorption of divalent metal ions from aqueous solution by carbon nanotubes: A review. *Separation and Purification Technology*, *58*(1), 224-231.

Sanadi, U., Math, K. K., & Emmiganur, K. (2023). Studies on uptake of nutrients by bread wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) as influenced by different nutrient management approaches. *Biological Forum, 15*(1), 129–138.

Sharma, A., Jan, K., Manzoor, J., Kumar, D., & Vasu, D. (2024). The role of biofertilizers in enhancing sustainable agriculture in India. *AgriBio Innovations, 1*(1), 77–81.

Shehzadi, N., Asif, N., Aziz, N., Srivastava, P., Kumar, R., Ahmad, N., & Fatma, T. (2023). Utilization of cyanobacterial extracts for the synthesis, screening and optimization of AuNPs: A promising approach for green chemistry. *Biological Forum*, *15*(2), 689–697.

Singh, B., Tyagi, R. N. & Jindal, A. (2023). *Ecology of Sirsa tributary of River Sutlej in foothill of Himachal Pradesh, India*. *Biological Forum – An International Journal, 15*(5a), 739–742.

Singh, B., Tyagi, R. N. & Jindal, A. (2024). Elemental profiling with reference to metal index to study pollutant load in northern river of India. *Uttar Pradesh Journal of Zoology, 45*(17), 487–497.

Singh, B., Tyagi, R. N., & Jindal, A. (2025). *Fish diversity of hill streams and Sirsa River in Solan District of Himachal Pradesh, India*. *Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Biology and Fisheries, 29*(2), 1479–1491.

Singh, B., Tyagi, R. N., & Jindal, A. (2025). *Study of metallic pollutants in the northern river of India*. In *Research Perspective on Biological Science* (Vol. 2). BP International.

Singh, S., & Lal, S. P. (2024). Agri-bio innovations across the globe: A comprehensive review. *AgriBio Innovations, 1*(1), 1–8.

Vijayan, G. L., Nandini, N. J., & Shruthi, P. (2024). The impact of colloidal silver on natural communities of juvenile fishes after short-term exposure. *International Journal on Emerging Technologies, 15*(1), 45–48.

Wani, K., & Kumar, D. (2024). Sustainability in organic agriculture: Evaluating environmental and socioeconomic benefits. *AgriBio Innovations, 1*(1), 9–19.