International Journal of Environment and Climate Change

Volume 14, Issue 2, Page 950-957, 2024; Article no.IJECC.105878
ISSN: 2581-8627
(Past name: British Journal of Environment & Climate Change, Past ISSN: 2231–4784)

Nutrient Uptake and Quality Parameters of Groundnut as Influenced by Gypsum and CaMS Super Application

O. Vinay Kumar [a*], A. Madhavi Latha [a], T.L. Neelima [a] and K. Pavan Chandra Reddy [b]

[a] Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Hyderabad-500030, India.
[b] Department of Soil Science & Agricultural Chemistry, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Hyderabad-500030, India.

Authors' contributions

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

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2024/v14i24009

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/105878

Original Research Article

Received: 10/07/2023
Accepted: 16/09/2023
Published: 27/02/2024

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was laid on sandy loam soils during the *rabi* season 2020-21 by farmers field's of Raikode village, Narwa mandal of Narayanapet district to study the nutrient uptake and quality parameters of groundnut as influenced by the effect of gypsum and CaMS super application.The effect of different levels of gypsum and CaMS super on nutrient uptake at harvest was found to be significant. An increase in the gypsum and CaMS levels increase the uptake at harvest. The maximum uptake of nitrogen (98.08 and 114.92 kg ha^{-1}), phosphorus (13.69 and 15.41 kg ha^{-1}), potassium (24.87 and 63.37 kg ha^{-1}), calcium (29.20 and 125.45 kg ha^{-1}), magnesium (17.17 and 39.23 kg ha^{-1}) and sulphur (14.36 and 18.59 kg ha^{-1}) in both pods and haulms at harvest stage was

**Corresponding author: E-mail: ovinaykumar043@gmail.com;*

recorded in T_6 treatment which was at par with T_8 treatment N, P, K, Ca, Mg and S (90.57 & 109.47 kg ha^{-1}; 12.28 & 14.96 kg ha^{-1}; 22.18 & 59.92 kg ha^{-1}; 29.05 & 120.97 kg ha^{-1}; 16.61 & 37.94 kg ha^{-1}; 14.11 & 17.98 kg ha^{-1}, respectively) while the lower uptake was recorded in control treatment. Whereas quality parameters like aflatoxin content, acid value and iodine value were significantly influenced by the application of different levels of gypsum and CaMS super fertilizer. The aflatoxin content varied from 17.95 to 30.50 µg kg^{-1}. An increase in the levels of gypsum significantly decreases the aflatoxin content in groundnut oil. The lowest aflatoxin content was noticed in the T_6 treatmentwhich was at par with treatments T_7, T_6 and T_5 with the aflatoxin content of 18.43, 20.38 and 20.54 µg kg^{-1}, respectively. The acid value ranged from 0.80 to 1.72 mg KOH g^{-1}. T_2 treatment showed a significant increase in acid value over other treatments. Similarly, the application of phosphorus in the form of a single superphosphate significantly influenced the iodine value compared to the control. However, the highest iodine value (90.1 g 100 g^{-1}) was recorded in the control treatment, while the lowest iodine value (72.1 g 100 g^{-1}) was registered in the treatment receiving T_2 treatment.

Keywords: Nutrient uptake; aflatoxin content; refractive index; acid value; iodine value.

1. INTRODUCTION

"Groundnut (*Arachis hypogea* L.) is an important oil seed crop in India. The Groundnut cultivated area in India in *rabi* 2022 was around 4.34 lakh ha. Among the states, Karnataka stood first with a groundnut cultivated area of around 1.64 lakh ha followed by Telangana state with a Groundnut cultivated area of 0.79 lakh ha with a production of 3.73 lakh tonnes. Among the districts, Nagarkurnool stood first in groundnut sown area with (0.40 lakh ha) followed by Wanaparthy (0.09 lakh ha), Vikarabad (0.08 lakh ha), Mahabubnagar (0.04 lakh ha), Gadwal (0.04 lakh ha)" [1].

"Imbalanced and inadequate use of nutrients is the major reason for minimum yields in groundnut. Optimization of mineral fertilization is a key to improving the productivity of groundnuts. Being a leguminous crop, groundnut can fix up to 40-80 kg of nitrogen per hectare through Biological Nitrogen Fixation (BNF) which accounts for 86-92 per cent of the nitrogen taken up by the groundnut" [2]. "Even though legumes can fix nitrogen on their own, they often require phosphorus, calcium, and other nutrients for proper seed formation" [3]. "The most apparent influence of P is on the root system of plants. P is needed in higher amounts in nodulating legumes than in non-nodulating crops because it is essential for nodule formation and nitrogen fixation" [4]. Apart from primary nutrients, secondary nutrients like calcium (Ca) and sulphur (S) also play a vital role in enhancing the production as well as productivity of groundnut.

"Gypsum is an excellent source of calcium and sulphur for groundnuts all over the world. It contains about 18.6 per cent Sulphur and 23 per cent Calcium and also provides magnesium. Apart from providing calcium and sulphur, gypsum also plays a significant role in the reclamation of alkaline soils and improves the water movement allows it to grow well and improves soil structure which favours effective pegging in groundnut. Godavari CaMS Super was released by Coromandel International Limited in 2016. It acts both as a soil conditioner and Fertilizer, containing Ca 15%, Mg 3% and S 8%. Farmers use this product in groundnut crop @ 250 kg ha^{-1} to get good yields" [1]. Keeping in view, all these facts, the present project was proposed to study the effect of gypsum and CaMS super (Ca, Mg, S) requirement on productivity of *rab*i groundnut.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field trial was conducted during the *rabi* season 2020-21 at farmers' fields of Raikode village, Narwa mandal of Narayanapet district, which lies between 16°28'33.78" N latitude and 77°37'58.62" E longitude and 372 m above mean sea level altitude falls under the Southern Telangana Agro-climatic zone of Telangana. "The experimental field's soil had a sandy loam texture and a pH of 6.54 with available nitrogen (102.5 kg ha^{-1}), available phosphorus (13.06 kg ha^{-1}), available potassium (135.44 kg ha^{-1}), Available Calcium (16.43mg kg^{-1}), Available Magnesium (6.89mg kg^{-1}) and Available Sulphur (16.18mg kg^{-1}). Groundnut variety of K-6 was sown on 9th November 2020 with a spacing of 22.5 X 10 cm. The entire dose of phosphorus (40 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}) was applied basally. DAP (Diammonium phosphate) was used as the source of phosphorus and nitrogen. Potassium

(50 kg K_2O ha^{-1}) was applied in the form of muriate of potash, uniformly in all the plots just before the sowing of the crop. Thinning and weeding operations were done as per the requirement. Ten irrigations were applied to the crop with sprinklers during the crop season depending on the need of the crop. Final irrigation was given one day before harvesting to facilitate the easy picking of pods from the soil" [1].

"The experiment was randomized block design. Which was consisted ten treatments *viz.,* T_1:Control, T_2:100% RDF(40:40:50 NPK kg ha^{-1}) (P is applied through SSP), T_3:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 500 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage (Farmers practice), T_4: 100% RDF + Gypsum @ 500 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage), T_5:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage, T_6:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage), T_7:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage, T_8:100% RDF +Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage), T_9:100% RDF + CaMS Super @ 250 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage (Farmers practice), T_{10}:100% RDF + CaMS Super @ kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage+ 50% at pod development stage) replicated thrice" [1]. Recommended dose of potassium (50 kg K_2O ha^{-1}) in the form of muriate of potash was applied uniformly in all the plots just before the sowing of the crop. The entire dose of phosphorus (40 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}) was applied basally. DAP (Diammonium phosphate) was used as the source of phosphorus and nitrogen. The remaining amount of nitrogen was applied through urea. SSP (Single super phosphate) is applied as basal in treatment T_2 as a source of phosphorus. The application of nitrogen, phosphorus, gypsum and CaMS super was done as per the treatments of the experiment. The present experiment was conducted to study nutrient uptake and quality parameters of groundnut as influenced by the effect of gypsum and CaMS super application. The observations were recorded nutrient uptake and quality parameters. The data was analyzed using standard statistical techniques.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Effect on Nutrient Uptake

Data about nutrient uptake is presented in Table1. The effect of different levels of gypsum and CaMS super on nutrient uptake at harvest was found to be significant. An increase in the gypsum and CaMS levels increase the uptake at harvest. The maximum uptake of nitrogen (98.08 and 114.92 kg ha^{-1}), phosphorus (13.69 and 15.41 kg ha^{-1}), potassium (24.87 and 63.37 kg ha^{-1}), calcium (29.20 and 125.45 kg ha^{-1}), magnesium (17.17 and 39.23 kg ha^{-1}) and sulphur (14.36 and 18.59 kg ha^{-1}) in both pods and haulms at harvest stage was recorded in T_6 treatment which was at par with T_8 treatment (100% RDF +Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage) while the lower uptake was recorded in control treatment. The lower uptake of nitrogen (56.56 and 67.95 kg ha^{-1}), phosphorus (6.91 and 8.09 kg ha^{-1}), potassium (13.89 and 36.03 kg ha^{-1}), calcium (10.15 and 44.89 kg ha^{-1}), magnesium (7.40 and 23.30 kg ha^{-1}) and sulphur (7.43 and 9.10 kg ha^{-1}) in both pods and haulms, respectively Table 1 at harvest stage was recorded in T_1 treatment (Control).

Greater nutrient uptake values of nutrients the application of 100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage)is due to the synergistic effect of essential nutrients available in sufficient quantities in soil solution which increased overall vegetative growth of groundnut and nutrient uptake. Being a legume crop, groundnut fixes the atmospheric nitrogen and absorbs nitrate nitrogen thereby maintaining high nitrogen content in groundnut crops. Root nodules are another important root parameter regulating N fixation in groundnut and root nodules data revealed that the application of gypsum as a sulphur and calcium source considerably increased the number of root nodules over the NPK plot [5]. An increasing trend was observed with an increase in gypsum levels which was attributed to the synergistic effect between nitrogen and sulphur as well as phosphorus [6] and potassium [7]. while application of sulphur through single super phosphate alone, without any additional source yields a very low value which suggests its inadequacy. Similar results were reported by Naresha et al. [8]. Higher levels of calcium may favour the soil structure and texture which leads to better absorption of nutrients like phosphorus and potassium [9].

Calcium requirement is more at pod filling than pegging and pod development stages. The application of gypsum at this stage improves pod filling. The soluble calcium might be increased

Table 1. Uptake of nutrients (kg ha^{-1}) by groundnut as influenced by different levels of Gypsum and CaMS Super application at Harvest

Treatment Details	N		P		K		Ca		Mg		S	
	Pods	Haulm	Pods	Haulm	Pods	Haulm	Pods	Haulm	Pods	Haulm	Pods	Haulm
T_1: Control	56.56	67.95	6.91	8.09	13.89	36.03	10.15	44.89	7.40	23.30	7.43	9.10
T_2:100% RDF (40:40:50 NPK kg ha^{-1}) (P is applied through SSP)	70.58	80.69	8.08	9.62	15.2	41.98	19.14	74.32	9.39	26.55	10.95	11.06
T_3:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 500 kg ha^{-1} at f lower initiation stage (Farmers practice)	77.12	97.74	9.37	11.36	19.82	51.24	22.39	92.91	10.68	30.09	13.13	15.32
T_4:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 500 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage)	79.26	101.37	10.32	12.45	21.05	52.87	23.97	101.05	11.59	32.94	13.39	16.67
T_5:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage	90.17	105.61	11.17	14.00	21.84	55.38	27.27	111.92	14.48	35.10	13.64	16.74
T_6:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage)	98.10	114.92	13.69	15.41	24.87	63.37	29.20	125.45	17.17	39.23	14.36	18.59
T_7:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1}a at flower initiation stage	86.15	103.97	10.69	13.60	21.47	54.63	24.86	104.81	12.81	33.55	13.55	16.52
T_8:100% RDF +Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage)	90.57	109.47	12.28	14.96	22.18	59.92	29.05	120.97	16.61	37.94	14.11	17.98
T_9:100% RDF + CaMS Super @ 250 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage (Farmers practice)	74.75	82.66	9.16	10.09	18.50	43.86	21.74	81.36	9.73	43.15	12.24	11.72
T_{10}:100% RDF + CaMS Super @ 250 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage+ 50% at pod development stage)	76.42	83.98	9.33	10.04	19.44	44.32	21.75	81.99	10.54	44.27	12.58	12.22
SEm±	**5.18**	**6.75**	**0.85**	**1.11**	**1.76**	**4.30**	**2.01**	**8.67**	**1.12**	**2.61**	**0.49**	**1.22**
CD (p=0.05)	**15.37**	**19.77**	**2.52**	**3.10**	**5.22**	**12.67**	**5.97**	**25.75**	**3.32**	**7.75**	**1.44**	**3.62**

Table 2. Oil content (%), Protein content (%), Aflatoxin content (µg kg^{-1}), Refractive Index, Acid Value (mg KOH g^{-1}) and Iodine Value (g 100 g^{-1}) of groundnut as influenced by different levels of Gypsum and CaMS Super application at harvest

Treatment Details	Oil content	Protein content	Aflatoxin content	Refractive Index	Acid value	Iodine value
T_1: Control	45.77	20.31	30.50	1.4629	1.32	90.10
T_2:100% RDF (40:40:50 NPK kg ha^{-1}) (P is applied through SSP)	46.82	21.38	27.50	1.4682	1.72	72.11
T_3:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 500 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage (Farmers practice)	46.15	22.25	24.53	1.4649	1.66	74.60
T_4:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 500 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage)	47.40	22.46	23.68	1.4645	1.70	86.22
T_5:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage	47.68	22.94	20.54	1.4636	1.00	85.20
T_6:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage)	48.43	23.56	20.38	1.4336	0.90	80.21
T_7:100% RDF + Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1}a at flower initiation stage	47.43	22.73	18.43	1.4632	0.80	86.90
T_8:100% RDF +Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage)	47.72	23.00	17.95	1.4635	0.90	87.32
T_9:100% RDF + CaMS Super @ 250 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage (Farmers practice)	46.25	21.63	26.57	1.4632	0.80	88.30
T_{10}:100% RDF + CaMS Super @ 250 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage+ 50% at pod development stage)	46.58	21.93	26.19	1.4636	1.00	89.41
SEm±	**2.67**	**0.90**	**1.62**	**0.10**	**0.05**	**4.58**
CD (p=0.05)	**NS**	**NS**	**4.80**	**NS**	**0.14**	**13.59**

leading to increased pod yields. Since groundnut utilizes most of its sulphur requirements at pegging to pod filling stages [10] split application of sulphur source (gypsum) will ensure sufficient quantities of S at times of need which has been proved in the experiment. An increasing trend in sulphur uptake was observed with an increase in gypsum levels [11].

3.2 Effect on Quality Parameters

Application of 100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage) has recorded the highest oil content of 48.43 per cent followed by T_8 (100% RDF +Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage), T_5 (100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage), T_7 (100% RDF + Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage) with 47.72, 47.68 and 47.43 per cent, respectively (Table2). Lowest oil content was recorded in control plot (45.77%). However, the increase in the oil content with sulphur application was due to increased availability and solubility of sulphur-containing amino acids like cysteine, cystine and methionine and also involved in the formation of glucosides or glucosinolates, which on hydrolysis increase the oil content. Hence, addition of sulphur in almost all the treatments in the form of SSP, Gypsum and CaMS Super creates a favourable environment in the root zone and increases the uptake of nutrients as well as oil synthesis in groundnut. These results are in line with the findings of Kavya et al. [12]. “The highest oil content might be due to the influence of sulphur in the rapid conversion of nitrogen to crude protein and finally to oil. Acetic thiolinase, a sulphur-based enzyme in the presence of sulphur converts acetyl Co A to malonyl Co A rapidly resulting in higher oil content” [13].

Close observation of data regarding protein content from Table 2 reveals a non-significant influence of gypsum and CaMS Super on the protein content of groundnut Application of 100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage) recorded highest protein content (27.43%) followed by treatment 100% RDF +Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage) (23.56%). Minimum protein content was noticed in the control treatment (20.31%). The maximum protein content was observed with the split application of gypsum as compared to full dose application at flowering time though the difference was non-significant. Similar findings were observed by Patel et al. [14] with the application of gypsum exerted a non-significant influence on protein content.

An examination of data (Table 2) revealed that higher amount of Aflatoxin content was noticed in the control treatment whereas the lowest aflatoxin content was recorded in T_8 (100% RDF +Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage) treatment with 17.95 µg kg^{-1}, which was at par with treatments T_7 (100% RDF + Gypsum @ 750 kg ha^{-1}a at flower initiation stage), T_6 (100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage) and T_5 (100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-1} at flower initiation stage) with the aflatoxin content of 18.43, 20.38 and 20.54 µg kg^{-1} respectively. The highest aflatoxin content was observed in the control treatment with 30.50 µg kg^{-1}. However, split dose treatments recorded lower content of aflatoxin over full dose application of gypsum and CaMS Super application at the time of flowering. Aflatoxin content is low in the treatments receiving the sulphur through gypsum rather than CaMS super and SSP. These findings were in line with the Kankam et al. [15].

Refractive index data is given in Table 2 and it revealed that the application of 100% RDF (40:40:50 NPK kg ha^{-1}) (P is applied through SSP) showed a higher refractive index of 1.4682, while the lowest was recorded in the control treatment (1.4629). The effect of gypsum and CaMS Super application at different levels and different stages did not show any significant difference among the treatments. The higher measurements of the Refractive index of oils revealed the necessity to purify the oils.A similar finding was reported by Agomuo et al. [16] and these were supported by Zahran and Tawfeuk [17].

The data regarding the effect of gypsum and CaMS Super application at different levels on Acid value is presented in Table 2. The effect of gypsum and CaMS Super application at different levels and different stages showed significant differences among the treatments. Treatment receiving 100% RDF (40:40:50 NPK kg ha^{-1}) (P is applied through SSP) recorded high acid value of 1.72 mg KOH g^{-1}, followed by T_4 (100% RDF + Gypsum @ 500 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage) and T_3 (100% RDF + Gypsum @ 500 kg ha^{-1} at flower

initiation stage) with an acid value of 1.70 and 1.66 mg KOH g^{-1}, respectively. The application of sulphur in the form of gypsum has exerted single super phosphate which triggers the biochemical reactions and increases the acid value content over other sources like gypsum and CaMS super fertilizers. These findings were supported by Ariraman and Kalaichelvi, [18-22].

It is evident from the data (Table 2) that iodine value was significantly increased with an increase in the gypsum levels. Application of 100% RDF (40:40:50 NPK kg ha^{-1}) (P is applied through SSP) has recorded a lower iodine content of 72.1g 100 g^{-1}, which was at par with T_3 treatment with 74.6 g 100 g^{-1} of iodine content. The higher Iodine content of 90.1g 100 g^{-1} was noticed in the control treatment [23-25]. Sulphur application through gypsum, CaMS super and SSP showed significant influence over the control. This might be due to the conversion of unsaturated fatty acids to saturated fatty acids and the synthesis of fatty acids by sulphur which reduces the rancidity of groundnut oil and thereby decreases the iodine value of groundnut oil. The iodine number was used to define the degree of unsaturation and stability of peanut oil samples. These results conformed with the findings of Ravi et al. [26-27].

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the above-mentioned findings, it may be inferred that, Among the different treatments, the application of 100% RDF + Gypsum @ 625 kg ha^{-}(50% at flower initiation stage + 50% at pod development stage) showed a significant influence on growth, yield and quality of groundnut. The highest dry matter production (7783 kg ha^{-1}), pod and haulm yields (2737 and 5046 kg ha^{-1}), and less aflatoxin content (17.09 µg kg^{-1}) were recorded in the T_6 treatment. Among the two CaMS super treatments, T_{10} (100% RDF + CaMS Super @ 250 kg ha^{-1} (50% at flower initiation stage+ 50% at pod development stage) showed higher growth, yield and quality of groundnut.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Groundnut outlook - PJTSAU.Agricultural Market Intelligence Centre. 2023;1-3. Available:https://agmarknet.gov.in.
2. Dart PJ, Mc Donald, D Gibbons RW. Groundnut production systems with some implication from recent research. Indonesia National Planning Seminar on Palawija, Yogyakarta; 1983.
3. Asiedu EA, Vangastel AJG, Gregg BR. Extension agents technical crop guidelines for assisting seed producers in Ghana; 2000.
4. Brady NC, Well RR. The nature and properties of soils. 13th Ed. Pearson Education (Singapore) Pvt. Ltd. Indian branch. 2002;105-108.
5. Kannan P, Swaminathan C, Ponmani S. Sulfur nutrition for enhancing rainfed groundnut productivity in typical alfisol of semi-arid regions in India. Journal of Plant Nutrition. 2017;40(6):828-840.
6. Jaggi RC, Dixit SP. Sulphur efficiency in presence of other nutrients. Intensive Agriculture. 1996;5:13-14.
7. Ravikumar C, Ariraman R, Ganapathy M, Karthikeyan A. Effect of different sources and levels of sulphur on growth and nutrient uptake of irrigated summer groundnut (A*rachis hypoagea* L.) CV. VRI-2 for loamy soils. Plant Archives. 2020;20(1):1947-1952.
8. Naresha R, Laxminarayana P, Devi KS, Sailaja V. Effect of irrigation scheduling and phosphogypsum levels on yield attributes, yield and available nutrients in soil after harvest of *rabi* groundnut. International Journal of Pure& Applied Bioscience. 2018;6(2):1300-1308.
9. Geetha Sireesha PV, Padmaja G, Vijay Shankar Babu M. Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients on available N, P, K and yield of rainfed Groundnut. Environment & Ecology. 2017;35 (4D):3246-3249.
10. Murant AF, Kumar IK. Different variants of the satellite RNA of groundnut rosette virus are responsible for the chlorotic and green forms of groundnut rosette disease. Annals of Applied Biology. 1990;117(1):85-92.
11. Patel AR, Zinzala VR. Effect of sulphur and boron on nutrient content and uptake by summer groundnut (*Arachis hypogeal* L.). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2018;7(4):47-50.
12. Kavya S, Susheela B, Charanteja K, Madhavi A, Parameswari YS. Effect of moisture regimes and gypsum levels on growth and yield of *rabi* groundnut (*Arachis hypogeal* L.). International Journal of

Environment and climate change. 2022;12 (11):2159-2165.
13. Nagavani AV, Sumathi V, Chandrika V, Muneendra Babu A. 2001. Effect of nitrogen and sulphur on yield and oil content of sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.) Journal Oilseeds Research. 1990;18(1):73-74.
14. Patel GN, Patel PT, Patel PH, Patel DM, Patil DK, Patil RM. Yield attributes, yield, quality and uptake of nutrients by summer groundnut, *Arachis hypogaea* L. as influenced by sources and levels of sulphur under varying irrigation schedules. Journal of Oilseeds Research. 2009;26(2):119-122.
15. Kankam F, Larbi Koranteng S, Elias NK. Aflatoxin contamination in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.); its causes and management. Ghana Journal of Science Technology and Development. 2021;7(2):102–121.
16. Agomuo E, Amadi P, Ogunka-Nnoka C, Amadi B, Ifeanacho M, Njoku U. Characterization of oils from Duranta repens leaf and seed. Oilseeds and fats Crops and Lipids. 2017;24(6):A601.
17. Zahran HA, Tawfeuk HZ. Physicochemical properties of new peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) varieties. Oilseeds and fats Crops and Lipids. 2019;26:19.
18. Ariraman R, Kalaichelvi K. Effect of sulphur nutrition in Groundnut. Agricultural Reviews. 2020;41(2):132-138.
19. Adhikari T, Kundu S, Meena V, Rao AS. Utilization of nano rock phosphate by maize (*Zea mays* L.) crop in a vertisol of Central India. J. Agric. Sci. Techno. 2014;4(5A):23-29.
20. Datta SC. Nanoclay research in agriculture environment and industry. National Symposium on Applications of Clay Science: Agriculture, Environment and Industry. 18-19 Feb 2011, NBSS & LUP, Nagpur. 2011;71-73.
21. DeRosa MC, Monreal C, Schnitzer M, Walsh R, Sultan Y. Nanotechnology in fertilizers. Nature Nanotechnol. 2010;5(2):91-99.
22. Kottegoda N, Munaweera I, Madusanka N, Karunaratne V. A green slow-release fertilizer composition based on urea-modified hydroxyapatite nanoparticles encapsulated wood. Current Sci. 2011;73-78.
23. Ladha JK, Pathak H, Krupnik TJ, Six J, van Kessel C. Efficiency of fertilizer nitrogen in cereal production: Retrospects and prospects. Advances in agronomy. 2005;87:85-156.
24. Manikandan A, Subramanian KS. Evaluation of zeolite-based nitrogen nano-fertilizers on maize growth, yield and quality on inceptisols and alfisols. Int. J. Plant Soil Sci.2016;9(4):1-9.
25. Ramesh K, Biswas AK, Somasundaram J, Rao AS. Nanoporous zeolites in farming: current status and issues ahead. Current Science. 2010;99(6):760-764.
26. Ravi S, Channal HT, Hebsur NS, Patil BN, Dharmatti PR. Effect of S, Zn & Fe nutrition on growth, yield & nutrient uptake & quality of safflower. Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Science. 2008;21(3):382-385.
27. Kumar OV, Latha AM, Neelima TL, Sireesha PVG, Reddy KP. Effect of gypsum and CaMS super application on yield and yield attributes of groundnut. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2023; 12(6):1691-1694.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/105878