Agri Articles
(e-Magazine for Agricultural Articles)
Volume: 06, Issue: 04 (JULY-AUG, 2026)
Available online at http://www.agriarticles.com

Nano-Fertilizers vs Traditional Fertilizers: Can Nanotechnology Transform Crop Nutrition?

Vishwakarma Kumar[1] and *Shubham Gaurav[2]
[1]M.Sc. Research Scholar, Department of Agronomy, School of Natural Resources Management, College of Post Graduate Studies in Agricultural Sciences, Umiam, Meghalaya-793103, Central Agricultural University, Imphal, India
[2]Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, Bihar Agricultural University, Sabour, Bihar-813210
[*]Corresponding Author's email: shubhamgaurav048@gmail.com

Walk into any farm supply shop and you'll find the same familiar sacks urea, DAP and MOP that have fed the world's crops for the better part of a century. They are cheap, they work, and every farmer knows how to use them. But here's an uncomfortable truth that agronomists have known for decades: most of what's inside those bags never actually reaches the crop. A large share of the nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium farmers apply each season simply disappears washed into streams, released into the air, or locked away in the soil where roots can't reach it. That's not just a waste of money. It's a slow, steady drain on soil health and water quality, season after season. This is the gap that a new generation of technologies nano-fertilizers is trying to close. Built on particles so small they're measured in billionths of a metre, these products promise to deliver nutrients more precisely, with less waste and, in theory, better yields. But is this genuine innovation, or just clever marketing dressed in scientific language?

Introduction: Why Do We Need Smarter Fertilizers?

Modern agriculture runs on fertilizer. Without the steady input of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, the yields that feed a growing global population simply wouldn't be possible. Conventional fertilizers deserve credit they underpinned the Green Revolution and remain the backbone of crop nutrition programs worldwide. But conventional fertilizers were never designed with precision in mind. They dissolve quickly, release their nutrients all at once, and leave it largely up to chance whether the plant's roots are there to absorb them at the right moment. Research shows that nitrogen-use efficiency under normal field conditions rarely climbs above 30–35% (Upadhyay et al., 2023). In other words, for every three bags of urea a farmer buys, roughly two bags' worth of nitrogen may never make it into the crop. This inefficiency is where nano-fertilizers enter the conversation not as a magic fix, but as an engineering attempt to make nutrient delivery smarter, slower, and more targeted.

What Is Nano-Fertilizers?

The word "nano" refers to scale, not to any single ingredient. Nano-fertilizers are simply nutrient formulations whether nitrogen, zinc, iron, or other elements engineered or processed so that their particles fall between 1 and 100 nanometres in size (Jakhar et al., 2022). To put that in perspective, a nanometre is about 80,000 times smaller than the width of a human hair. Why does size matter this much? At the nanoscale, particles have an enormous surface area relative to their volume. This means more of the nutrient is exposed and available for interaction with the plant, while the tiny particle size allows nutrients to be encapsulated, coated, or bound in ways that control how quickly they're released into the soil (Jakhar et al., 2022; Kekeli et al., 2025; Ding et al., 2023). Think of it like the difference between splashing bucket of water onto a garden bed versus using a drip irrigation line. Conventional fertilizers are the bucket fast, generous, and largely uncontrolled. Nano-fertilizers aim to be the drip line releasing nutrients gradually, closer to when and where the plant can actually use them.

Traditional Fertilizers: The Hidden Problem of Nutrient Loss

For all their affordability and familiarity, conventional fertilizers have a well-documented weakness: much of what's applied to the field never becomes part of the harvest. The scale of this loss is striking. Studies estimate that 40–70% of applied nitrogen, 80–90% of phosphorus, and 50–90% of potassium are lost before plants can take them up (Ding et al., 2023). A separate analysis puts total N, P, and K losses from soil at 50–70% of what's applied (Yadav et al., 2023).

These losses happen through several familiar pathways:

- **Leaching**: nutrients, especially nitrogen, dissolve in water and move downward past the root zone into groundwater.
- **Volatilization:** nitrogen escapes into the atmosphere as ammonia gas, particularly after urea application in warm conditions.
- **Runoff:** fertilizer washes off fields during heavy rain or irrigation, ending up in nearby drains, ponds, and rivers.
- **Fixation:** nutrients like phosphorus bind tightly to soil particles, becoming chemically locked away from plant roots.

Together, these mechanisms reduce nutrient utilization and contribute to broader environmental degradation (Kekeli et al., 2025; Upadhyay et al., 2023). The economic cost is direct farmers are effectively paying for fertilizer that ends up in a drainage canal rather than a grain head. The environmental cost is more diffuse but equally serious: excess nitrogen and phosphorus reaching water bodies fuels eutrophication and algal blooms (Yadav et al., 2023; Nongbet et al., 2022), while nitrogen lost to the air contributes to greenhouse gas emissions.

Nano-Fertilizers vs Traditional Fertilizers: What Is the Difference?

Attribute	Nano-Fertilizers	Traditional Fertilizers
Nutrient release	Controlled, gradual-roughly 40–50 days (Seleiman et al., 2020)	Rapid-roughly 4–10 days (Seleiman et al., 2020)
Nutrient-use efficiency	Reported to improve utilization by 20–30% over conventional forms (Kekeli et al., 2025); 18% gain for micronutrients, 29% for macronutrients in one comparison (Ding et al., 2023)	Nitrogen-use efficiency rarely exceeds 30–35% under field conditions (Upadhyay et al., 2023)
Nutrient losses	Reduced leaching and runoff reported (Ding et al., 2023; Zulfiqar et al., 2019)	High losses 40–90% of N, P, and K (Ding et al., 2023)
Application rate	Generally lower doses needed (Yadav et al., 2023)	Larger amounts typically required (Nongbet et al., 2022)
Yield response	10–80% improvement over conventional fertilizers at reduced application rates, in reported studies (Kekeli et al., 2025)	Serves as the baseline for comparison
Environmental impact	Potential to reduce runoff, groundwater contamination, and greenhouse gas emissions (Ding et al., 2023; Upadhyay et al., 2023; Yadav et al., 2023)	Linked to eutrophication, algal blooms, and greenhouse gas losses (Yadav et al., 2023; Nongbet et al., 2022)
Cost	Lower application rates can cut costs and labour (Yadav et al., 2023; Ayenew et al., 2024), but production and raw material costs are higher (Yadav et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2026)	Cheaper to produce and widely available, but higher cumulative losses raise effective cost per unit of nutrient absorbed
Practical challenges	Lack of standardized dosages, regulatory gaps, limited long-term field data (Kekeli et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2026; Yadav et al., 2023)	Well-established practice, but structurally inefficient nutrient delivery

Can Nano-Fertilizers Improve Crop Yield?

The theoretical advantages of nano-fertilizers only matter if they translate into real yield gains in the field and here, the evidence, while still limited in scale, is genuinely encouraging. In field trials across maize-wheat and pearl millet-mustard cropping systems, combining nano-urea and nano-zinc with just 75% of the recommended nitrogen dose produced yields comparable to applying 100% nitrogen through conventional fertilizer alone (Upadhyay et al., 2023). That's a meaningful finding: the same harvest, with a quarter less nitrogen going into the soil. This combination cut the nitrogen load by 25% without any yield penalty, while also reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the field (Upadhyay et al., 2023). Rice growers may find similar results. Nano-NPK formulations significantly increased both grain yield and milled rice yield compared with conventional NPK, with reported yield increases ranging from 11% to 150% depending on the rice cultivar used (Valojai et al., 2021). Interestingly, the same study found that combining conventional NPK with nano-NPK rather than using nano-fertilizer alone produced the best overall results for both yield and grain quality (Valojai et al., 2021). The pattern that emerges across these studies is worth pausing on: nano-fertilizers appear to work best not as a wholesale replacement, but as a complement to conventional fertilizer, allowing farmers to maintain or improve yields while trimming the total volume of nutrients applied.

The Environmental Advantage

Because nano-fertilizers release nutrients more gradually and in smaller, more targeted doses, they are associated with reduced nutrient runoff, lower groundwater contamination, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions compared with conventional fertilizers (Ding et al., 2023; Upadhyay et al., 2023; Yadav et al., 2023). There is also emerging evidence on soil biology. One study found that nano-fertilizer use supported soil microbial biomass carbon and dehydrogenase activity both indicators of a biologically active, healthy soil at levels comparable to conventional fertilization (Upadhyay et al., 2023). In other words, in that study, nano-fertilizers didn't appear to harm soil biological health relative to standard practice. That said, "reduced losses" is not the same as "environmentally risk-free." Nano-fertilizers introduce a genuinely new variable into farming systems: engineered nanomaterials entering soil, water, and potentially the food chain. Their long-term ecological behaviour is still being studied, and it would be premature to describe them as automatically safe simply because they are more efficient.

Are Nano-Fertilizers Really Cheaper?

This is where the picture becomes more nuanced and where farmers deserve a balanced answer rather than a sales pitch. On one side of the ledger, nano-fertilizers require lower application rates, which can reduce both the amount of product purchased and the labour needed to apply it (Yadav et al., 2023; Ayenew et al., 2024). Fewer trips across the field, less product to transport and spread these savings are real and can add up. On the other side, production costs for nano-fertilizers remain higher than for conventional products. The raw materials used to manufacture nanoparticles are more expensive, and these products often require specialized storage and transport infrastructure that most conventional fertilizer supply chains simply don't have yet (Yadav et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2026). For an individual farmer, the net economic outcome will depend heavily on local product pricing, availability, and the specific crop and soil conditions involved. There is no single answer to "are they cheaper" only "cheaper under some conditions, and not yet under others."

The Other Side of the Story: Risks and Limitations

No agricultural technology is without trade-offs, and nano-fertilizers are no exception. A fair assessment has to include the following concerns:

- **Toxicity at excessive doses.** Supra-optimal application rates have been shown to have detrimental effects on crop growth, soil health, and broader environmental outcomes

(Babu et al., 2021). More is not automatically better with nano-fertilizers arguably, precision matters even more than it does with conventional products.

- **Movement into the food chain.** The extensive release of nanomaterials into the environment may pose risks to human and animal health, and researchers stress the need for careful toxicological assessment before these risks can be considered resolved (Babu et al., 2021; Zulfiqar et al., 2019; Seleiman et al., 2020).
- **Higher production costs**, as discussed above, tied to raw material expense and specialized handling requirements (Yadav et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2026).
- **Lack of standardized application rates.** Unlike conventional fertilizers, which have decades of agronomic guidelines behind them, nano-fertilizer dosage recommendations are still being worked out across different crops and regions (Kekeli et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2026; Yadav et al., 2023).
- **Regulatory gaps.** Many regions lack clear regulatory frameworks specifically governing nano-fertilizer production, labelling, and use (Kekeli et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2026; Yadav et al., 2023).
- **Limited long-term, field-scale evidence.** Much of the existing research comes from laboratory or greenhouse settings rather than large commercial farms operating over multiple seasons (Upadhyay et al., 2023; Akhtar et al., 2022).
- **Variable performance across soil and moisture conditions.** Nutrient delivery can behave differently depending on soil physicochemical properties and moisture levels, which makes consistent performance harder to guarantee across diverse farming environments (Jakhar et al., 2022; Nongbet et al., 2022).

Should Farmers Replace Conventional Fertilizers with Nano-Fertilizers?

Based on the evidence, the honest answer is: not entirely, and not yet. The strongest results so far don't come from nano-fertilizers replacing conventional ones outright they come from combining the two. The maize-wheat and pearl millet-mustard trials that matched full-nitrogen yields using 75% nitrogen plus nano-urea and nano-zinc (Upadhyay et al., 2023), and the rice trials where NPK plus nano-NPK outperformed either approach alone (Valojai et al., 2021), both point in the same direction: nano-fertilizers currently function best as a complementary, precision-nutrition tool, layered on top of sound conventional fertilizer management, rather than as a wholesale substitute for it. This is an important nuance for extension professionals to communicate clearly. Farmers experimenting with nano-fertilizers should think in terms of integration reducing conventional fertilizer inputs modestly and supplementing with nano-formulations rather than switching over entirely based on promotional claims.

The Way Forward

For nano-fertilizers to move from promising research to dependable farm practice, several things still need to happen:

- **Long-term field trials** across multiple seasons and real farm conditions, not just controlled laboratory or greenhouse studies.
- **Standardized dosage and application guidelines** tailored to specific crops, soil types, and climates.
- **Crop- and soil-specific recommendations**, since performance clearly varies with local conditions.
- **Rigorous toxicological and environmental safety assessments**, to properly understand any risks to soil organisms, water systems, and the food chain.
- **More affordable production technologies**, to close the cost gap with conventional fertilizers.
- **Stronger, clearer regulatory frameworks** governing manufacturing, labelling, and safe use.
- **Farmer awareness and extension education**, so that adoption is guided by evidence rather than marketing claims alone.

Conclusion: From More Fertilizer to Smarter Fertilization

For most of modern farming history, the answer to a nutrient-deficient field has been simple: apply more fertilizer. Nano-fertilizers represent a different kind of answer one built not on quantity, but on precision. The evidence so far is genuinely promising: better nutrient-use efficiency, reduced losses, and yields that hold up even with reduced nitrogen inputs in several cropping systems. But the evidence is also incomplete production costs remain high, standardized guidelines are still being developed, and long-term environmental questions haven't been fully answered. Perhaps the most useful way to think about nano-fertilizers is not as a replacement for the fertilizer bags farmers already know, but as a new tool that, used carefully and in combination with sound conventional practice, could help agriculture do more with less. The future of crop nutrition is unlikely to be about applying more fertilizer it's about applying it smarter.

References

1. Akhtar, N., Ilyas, N., Meraj, T. A., Pour-Aboughadareh, A., Sayyed, R., Mashwani, Z., & Poczai, P. (2022). Improvement of Plant Responses by Nanobiofertilizer: A Step towards Sustainable Agriculture. *Nanomaterials, 12*. https://doi.org/10.3390/nano12060965
2. Ayenew, B. M., Satheesh, N., Zegeye, Z., & Kassie, D. A. (2024). A review on the production of nanofertilizers and its application in agriculture. *Heliyon, 11*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e41243
3. Babu, S., Singh, R. P., Yadav, D., Rathore, S., Raj, R., Avasthe, R., Yadav, S., Das, A., Yadav, V., Yadav, B., Shekhawat, K., Upadhyay, P., Yadav, D., & Singh, V. (2021). Nanofertilizers for agricultural and environmental sustainability. *Chemosphere*, 133451. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.133451
4. Ding, Y., Zhao, W., Zhu, G., Wang, Q., Zhang, P., & Rui, Y. (2023). Recent Trends in Foliar Nanofertilizers: A Review. *Nanomaterials, 13*. https://doi.org/10.3390/nano13212906
5. Jakhar, A. M., Aziz, I., Kaleri, A. R., Hasnain, M., Haider, G., J., & Abideen, Z. (2022). Nano-fertilizers: A sustainable technology for improving crop nutrition and food security. *NanoImpact*, 100411. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.impact.2022.100411
6. Kekeli, M. A., Wang, Q., & Rui, Y. (2025). The Role of Nano-Fertilizers in Sustainable Agriculture: Boosting Crop Yields and Enhancing Quality. *Plants, 14*. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants14040554
7. Nongbet, A., Mishra, A. K., Mohanta, Y. K., Mahanta, S., Ray, M. K., Khan, M., Baek, K.-H., & Chakrabartty, I. (2022). Nanofertilizers: A Smart and Sustainable Attribute to Modern Agriculture. *Plants, 11*. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants11192587
8. Seleiman, M., Almutairi, K. F., Alotaibi, M. A., Shami, A., Alhammad, B. A., & Battaglia, M. (2020). Nano-Fertilization as an Emerging Fertilization Technique: Why Can Modern Agriculture Benefit from Its Use? *Plants, 10*. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants10010002
9. Semenova, N., Burmistrov, D. E., Shumeyko, S., & Gudkov, S. (2024). Fertilizers Based on Nanoparticles as Sources of Macro- and Microelements for Plant Crop Growth: A Review. *Agronomy*. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy14081646
10. Upadhyay, P. K., Singh, V. K., Rajanna, G., Dwivedi, B. S., Dey, A., Singh, R., Rathore, S. S., Shekhawat, K., Babu, S., Singh, T., Kumar, Y., Singh, C., Rangot, M., Kumar, A., Sarkar, S., Dash, S., Rawat, S., Srivastava, S., & Fincheira, P. (2023). Unveiling the combined effect of nano fertilizers and conventional fertilizers on crop productivity, profitability, and soil well-being. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2023.1260178
11. Upadhyay, P. K., Dey, A., Singh, V., Dwivedi, B. S., Singh, T., A, R. G., Babu, S., Rathore, S., Singh, R., Shekhawat, K., Rangot, M., Kumar, P., Yadav, D., Singh, D., Dasgupta, D., & Shukla, G. (2023). Conjoint application of nano-urea with conventional

fertilizers: An energy efficient and environmentally robust approach for sustainable crop production. *PLOS ONE*, *18*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0284009

12. Valojai, S. T. S., Niknejad, Y., Amoli, H. F., & Tari, D. B. (2021). Response of rice yield and quality to nano-fertilizers in comparison with conventional fertilizers. *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, *44*, 1971–1981. https://doi.org/10.1080/01904167.2021.1884701
13. Yadav, A., Yadav, K., & Abd-Elsalam, K. (2023). Nanofertilizers: Types, Delivery and Advantages in Agricultural Sustainability. *Agrochemicals*. https://doi.org/10.3390/agrochemicals2020019
14. Yadav, A., Yadav, K., & Abd-Elsalam, K. (2023). Exploring the Potential of Nanofertilizers for a Sustainable Agriculture. *Plant Nano Biology*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plana.2023.100044
15. Zhang, J., Zhang, T., & Rui, Y. (2026). From Nanomaterials to Nanofertilizers: Applications, Ecological Risks, and Prospects for Sustainable Agriculture. *Plants*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants15030415
16. Zulfiqar, F., Navarro, M., Ashraf, M., Akram, N., & Munné-Bosch, S. (2019). Nanofertilizer use for sustainable agriculture: Advantages and limitations. *Plant Science: An International Journal of Experimental Plant Biology*, *289*, 110270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2019.110270