



Effect of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Sprayed Herbicides on the Soil Properties and Nutrient Availability in *Rabi* Groundnut

Chandana Mudigiri ^{a*}, RamPrakash T. ^b, Padmaja B. ^b,
Jayasree G ^a and Latha P.C. ^c

^a Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, College of Agriculture, PJTAU, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana - 500 030, India.

^b AICRP on Weed Management, PJTAU, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana - 500 030, India.

^c ICAR - Indian Institute of Rice Research, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana - 500 030, India.

Authors' contributions

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

Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajsspn/2024/v10i4446>

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/127810>

Original Research Article

Received: 05/10/2024

Accepted: 07/12/2024

Published: 28/12/2024

ABSTRACT

Herbicides are normally applied by manually operated knapsack sprayers, which are laborious, uneven and prone to human mistakes. Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) are a promising agricultural spraying alternative to manual operation. Drone herbicide spraying was compared to knapsack sprayers in this study. A two year field experiment was conducted at Regional Agriculture Research Station, Research Farm, Palem, Nagarkurnool, Telangana during *rabi* 2022-23 and

*Corresponding author: Email: chandanamudigiri@gmail.com;

2023-24. A ready-mix post emergence herbicide with combination of Imazethapyr 3.75% + propaquizafop 2.5% ME was applied to groundnut at 20-25 DAS. The experiment consisted of 12 treatments viz., 75% recommended dose (RD), 100% RD and 125% RD which were applied with drone using 20 and 40 L ha⁻¹ spray fluid and sprayed from 2.0 and 2.5 m height from canopy, Checks (5) were also maintained (manual spray of 75% RD, 100%RD and 125% RD, weedy check and weed free) in the experiment for comparative evaluation of drone applied and manually applied herbicides. Experiment was laid out in 3X2X2 FRBD and replicated thrice. Results of the experiment showed that application of different doses of ready mix herbicide did not significantly influence the soil physical and chemical properties observed after harvest of the crop. Similarly, the available macro-nutrient status was also not significantly influenced by drone sprayed herbicide application compared to manual spraying using knapsack sprayer.

Keywords: Available nutrients; soil properties; unmanned aerial vehicle; herbicide.

1. INTRODUCTION

Groundnut is an important oilseed crop grown in Southern Telangana agro-climatic zone. In groundnut, the loss in pod yield due to weeds ranges from 13 to 100% depending on the season, cultivars, weed composition and duration of crop weed and the package of practices adopted [1]. Use of effective weed management options or efficient herbicides will reduce the competition from weeds to the crop. In Telangana, farmers rely on pre-emergence herbicides followed by manual weeding or pre-emergence application followed by post-emergence herbicides for managing the weeds. A ready-mix herbicide combination of imazethapyr and propaquizafop provides good control of broadleaf weeds, grasses and sedges when applied as post-emergence at 20-25 days after sowing and it is a popular herbicide used by farmers. This product is a selective post-emergence herbicide for broad spectrum control of weeds in groundnut [2].

Spraying of herbicides with knapsack sprayer is a conventional method usually adopted by most farmers. However, major disadvantages include its limited field capacity, exposure of applicator to the herbicide, problem of accuracy of application etc. In this context, Spraying techniques continuously developed in recent decades, "Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), or aerial drones, are an emerging technology with significant market potential" [3] could contribute to the more sustainable use of pesticides; however, these potential benefits drones can help the farmers in avoiding the troubles of manual spray in conjunction with the benefits of green technology. The use of drone as a modern pesticide application technique would not only ensure accuracy and uniformity in spraying across the fields, but also reduce the overall use

of the chemicals within the area and also ensures the safety to the operators.

When applied with a knapsack sprayer, volatilization and drift losses are generally minimal as the nozzle is very close to the surface on which the pesticide is applied as compared to drone. Such changes may bring in a significant change in the quantity of the herbicide active ingredient that reaches the surface of the soil/ plant, which may significantly influence the soil pH, Physico-chemical properties and nutrient availability. Hence, the present experiment was conducted to study the impact of herbicides applied using drones and knapsack sprayer on the soil physico - chemical properties and available nutrients.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted for two years at Regional Agricultural Research Station Farm, Palem, Nagarkurnool, Telangana during *rabi* 2022-23 and 2023-24. Field is situated at 16° 31' 8.0328" N and 78° 14' 45.8628" E for experimental field 2022-23 and 16°31'05.9"N 78°14'50.4"E for experiment field 2023-24. The soil of the experimental field was sandy loam.

Bioefficacy and drift studies were carried out with AGRICOPTER AG 365 with UIN UA00132S1EX drone with a capacity of 10L tank. Effective spraying width for treatments was adjusted to 4 m.

A ready-mix post emergence herbicide with combination of (Imazethapyr 3.75% + propaquizafop 2.5% was applied. The experiment consisted of 12 treatments viz., 75% recommended dose (RD), 100% RD and 125% RD which were applied with drone using 20 and 40 L/ha spray fluid and sprayed from 2.0 and

2.5m height from canopy. Checks (5) were also maintained (manual spray and controls) in the experiment for comparative evaluation of drone applied and manually applied herbicides. The design opted was Factorial RBD and all the treatments were replicated thrice. Details of the treatments are provided in Table 1.

Groundnut variety K-6, a bunch type released from Agricultural Research Station, Kadiri, ANGRAU was used as test variety. The duration of the variety is 120 days. The crop was supplied with fertilizers according to the recommendation of PJTAU, 20 kg N, 40 kg P₂O₅ and 50 kg K₂O in the form of urea, single super phosphate and muriate of potash respectively to all the plots and all the recommended package of practices were adopted in conducting the experiment.

Soil Chemical properties: The soil sample was collected from each plot before initiation of experiment, at flowering and at harvest of the

crop. Surface soil from 0-15 cm depth was collected at different spots from each plot. The composite soil samples collected were shade dried, pounded and passed through 2mm sieve, labeled and stored in polythene covers. The soil samples collected were analyzed for soil physico- chemical properties and available nutrients following standard procedures.

Soil Reaction (pH): pH of the soil was determined by soil suspension (1:2.5 soil: water) by glass electrode method pH meter (ELICO pH analyser) after equilibrating soil with water for 30 minutes with occasional stirring [4].

Electrical conductivity (EC): EC was determined in soil suspension (1:2.5 soil: water) after equilibrium of soil with water and keeping the sample undisturbed till the supernatant solution was obtained and measured by a conductivity meter (ELICO CM EC-TDS analyser) [4].

Table 1. Treatment details of the experiment

| Treatment No. | Treatment Details |
|-----------------|--|
| T ₁ | D ₁ S ₁ H ₁ 75% Recommended dose (56.25 g ha ⁻¹ + 37.5 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 25 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2m above the crop canopy |
| T ₂ | D ₁ S ₁ H ₂ 75% Recommended dose (56.25 g ha ⁻¹ + 37.5 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 25 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2.5m above the crop canopy |
| T ₃ | D ₁ S ₂ H ₁ 75% Recommended dose (56.25 g ha ⁻¹ + 37.5 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 40 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2m above the crop canopy |
| T ₄ | D ₁ S ₂ H ₂ 75% Recommended dose (56.25 g ha ⁻¹ + 37.5 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 40 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2.5m above the crop canopy |
| T ₅ | D ₂ S ₁ H ₁ 100% recommended dose (75 g ha ⁻¹ + 50 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 25 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2m above the crop canopy |
| T ₆ | D ₂ S ₁ H ₂ 100% recommended dose (75 g ha ⁻¹ + 50 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 25 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2.5 m above the crop canopy |
| T ₇ | D ₂ S ₂ H ₁ 100% recommended dose (75 g ha ⁻¹ + 50 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 40 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2m above the crop canopy |
| T ₈ | D ₂ S ₂ H ₂ 100% recommended dose (75 g ha ⁻¹ + 50 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 40 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2.5 m above the crop canopy |
| T ₉ | D ₃ S ₁ H ₁ 125% recommended dose (93.75 g ha ⁻¹ + 62.5 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 25 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2m above the crop canopy |
| T ₁₀ | D ₃ S ₁ H ₂ 125% recommended dose (93.75 g ha ⁻¹ + 62.5 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 25 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2.5m above the crop canopy |
| T ₁₁ | D ₃ S ₂ H ₁ 125% recommended dose (93.75 g ha ⁻¹ + 62.5 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 40 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2m above the crop canopy |
| T ₁₂ | D ₃ S ₂ H ₂ 125% recommended dose (93.75 g ha ⁻¹ + 62.5 g ha ⁻¹) with spray volume 40 L ha ⁻¹ and spray height 2.5m above the crop canopy |
| T ₁₃ | KS _(0.75x) 7 75% Recommended dose (56.25 g ha ⁻¹ + 37.5 g ha ⁻¹) with Knapsack sprayer |
| T ₁₄ | KS _(1x) 0 100% Recommended dose (75 g ha ⁻¹ + 50 g ha ⁻¹) with Knapsack sprayer |
| T ₁₅ | KS _(1.25x) 1 125% recommended dose (93.75 g ha ⁻¹ + 62.5 g ha ⁻¹) with Knapsack sprayer |
| T ₁₆ | C Unweeded check, control |
| T ₁₇ | WF Weed Free check, (WF) (Manual weeding at 20, 40, 60 DAS) |

Organic carbon (%): It was determined by the procedure given by Walkley and Black [5]. Soil samples passed through 0.5 mm sieve were used for determining Organic carbon. One gram of soil was taken in an Erlenmeyer flask to this 10 ml of 1N potassium dichromate and 20 ml of concentrated H₂SO₄ were added and was allowed for reaction to occur for 30 min. To this solution, 100 ml of distilled water were added followed by a pinch of NaF and few drops of diphenylamine indicator was added. The contents turn to violet colour. It was titrated against 0.5N ferrous ammonium sulphate till the colour changes to green colour.

$$\text{Organic carbon (\%)} = (\text{vol of K}_2\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_7 \times [(B-S)/B] \times 0.003 \times 100) / \text{weight of soil}$$

B= blank titre value S = sample titre value.

Cation exchange capacity (CEC): Five grams of soil was taken in a centrifuge tube to which 1N sodium acetate (pH 8.2) was added and centrifuged at 8000 rpm for 5 minutes. The supernatant was discarded, and the procedure was repeated thrice. The excess sodium was removed by washing with 33 ml of isopropyl alcohol and the supernatant was discarded and repeated thrice. The adsorbed sodium was extracted by 1N ammonium acetate (pH 7) and the supernatant was collected and stored in a 100 ml volumetric flask. The sodium ions present in the extract were determined by a flame photometer [6].

Available nitrogen: Available nitrogen in soil samples was determined by using alkaline permanganate method as described by Subbiah and Asija [7]. The procedure involved distilling the soil with alkaline potassium permanganate solution and determining the ammonia liberated by titrating against standard sulphuric acid (0.02 N).

$$\text{Available N (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)} =$$

$$\frac{2.24 \times 10^6 \times 100 \times Y \times 0.00028}{20 \times 100}$$

1 ml of 0.02 N H₂SO₄ = 0.00028

Y = volume of 0.02 N H₂SO₄ utilized for neutralizing of NH₃ in ml.

Available phosphorus: The Available phosphorus in soil samples was extracted with 0.5 M NaHCO₃ at pH 8.5 as described by Olsen et al. [8] in neutral and alkali soils. The

phosphorus in the extract was estimated colorimetrically using ascorbic acid as the reductant. The blue colour developed was measured by using the spectrophotometer at 660 nm wavelength. The available phosphorus content was calculated and expressed as kg ha⁻¹.

$$\text{Available P}_2\text{O}_5 \text{ (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)} =$$

$$\frac{\text{Graph ppm} \times \text{Vol. of extractant} \times \text{volume made} \times 2 \times 2.29 \times 10^6}{10^6 \times \text{aliquot taken} \times \text{weight of sample}}$$

Available potassium: Available potassium was extracted from soil using neutral normal ammonium acetate and potassium present in the extracts was determined by using Flame photometer (Elico CL 378) as described by Jackson [4] and expressed as kg K₂O ha⁻¹.

$$\text{Available K (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)} =$$

$$\frac{\text{Concentration of K} \times \text{volume made} \times 100 \times 2.24 \times 10^6}{10^6 \times \text{weight of sample} \times 100}$$

$$\text{Available K}_2\text{O} = \text{K} \times 1.2$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effect of the drone sprayed herbicides in comparison with knapsack sprayer on the soil physico-chemical properties: Soil pH varied from 7.27 to 7.71 in T₂ and T₅ in 2022-23 and initial pH was 7.20. In 2023-24 it ranged between 7.30 to 7.76 in T₈ and T₉, initial pH was 7.78 as shown in Table 2. Soil reaction (pH) was not significantly impacted by the different doses, spray volume and spray height of the herbicide sprayed by the UAV (drone) and knapsack sprayer for the two years of experimentation. Similarly, soil EC (Table 2) was also non significantly influenced by the herbicides applied at different doses, spray volume and spray height in drone spray and knapsack spray. EC values of soil at harvest in 2022-23 was 0.46 to 0.59 dS m⁻¹ was noticed in T₅ and KS_(1.0X) were slightly higher as compared to initial EC (0.45 dS m⁻¹). In 2023- 24, it was varied from 0.46 -0.56 dS m⁻¹ in T₃ and KS_(1.25X) compared to initial (0.51 dS m⁻¹) which might be due to repeated irrigation of the field with groundwater.

The soil CEC in 2022-23 ranged from 18.73 - 20.98 c.mol (P⁺) kg⁻¹ soil in T₆ and weed free treatment and initial 18.19 c.mol (P⁺) kg⁻¹ soil and in 2023-24 it was 17.58 to 20.40 c.mol (P⁺) kg⁻¹ soil in KS_(1.25X) and weed free, initial value 17.34 c.mol (P⁺) kg⁻¹ soil as shown in Table 2.

The initial soil organic carbon was 0.41% and 0.44% during 2022-23 and 2023-24 respectively. At harvest stage, soil organic carbon in 2022-23 was in the range of 0.42-0.53% in KS (1.25X) and weed free and in 2023-24 the SOC was 0.40-0.50% in T₂ and weed free.

Soil physic-chemical properties like pH, EC, OC did not show any significant changes with the application of the herbicides with drone and knapsack sprayer. They are not affected with the herbicide dose, spray volume and spray height in both the years. A study reported by Sudharshana et al. [9] found that imazethapyr and penimethalin application in groundnut has found non significant effect on soil properties. Studies conducted at DWSRC [10] reported that application of imazethapyr @100 g a.i ha⁻¹ or 200 g a.i ha⁻¹ or 400 g a.i ha⁻¹ did not significantly change the soil physical, physiochemical and fertility properties at the time of harvest of groundnut crop. Several studies conducted in India and abroad have also reported minimal or insignificant influence of various herbicides on soil physical and physic-chemical properties in view of the low volume/quantity application compared to the soil mass.

Effect of the drone sprayed herbicides in comparison with knapsack sprayer on the Macronutrient status of the soil: In the year 2022-23 From Tables 3 and 4, at the reproductive stage of the crop the highest available soil N among all the treatments was recorded in the weed free (248.66 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest was noticed in the weedy check (218.23 kg ha⁻¹). Among the drone treatments, the highest available N was in T₁₂ (241.58 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest was recorded in T₈ (218.66 kg ha⁻¹). However, they were below the initial soil available nitrogen of 258.20 kg ha⁻¹. At the time of the harvest of the crop, soil available N was ranged from 237.00 to 258.66 kg ha⁻¹ in weedy check and weed free. In the drone treatments, highest was in T₈ (255.00 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest was in T₄ (237.66 kg ha⁻¹). Similarly, in 2023-24, at reproductive stage the soil N was ranged from 219.76 to 237.26 kg ha⁻¹. In the drone sprayed treatments, the soil N recorded was (223.46 and 233.13 kg ha⁻¹) in T₉ and T₁₀. The highest soil N among all was observed in the weed free (237.26 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest was recorded in the weedy check (219.76 kg ha⁻¹). At the harvest stage there was an increase in the available N

and it was (229.33 and 247.10 kg ha⁻¹) in T₉ and T₁₂ whereas in manual spray it was (225.66 to 256.43 kg ha⁻¹) in weedy check and weed free treatment.

Soil available P at the reproductive stage varied from 48.01 to 55.35 kg ha⁻¹ which was lower than the initial P₂O₅ (55.40 kg ha⁻¹) in 2022-23. Similarly in 2023-24, the available P₂O₅ ranged from 51.50 to 59.30 kg ha⁻¹ which was lower than initial value (60.40 kg ha⁻¹). In the two years, highest available P₂O₅ was in the weed free treatment and lowest was in the weedy check. Among the drone treatments highest Soil P was noticed in T₄ (54.66 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest in T₉ (48.41 kg ha⁻¹) in 2022-23. In 2023-24, highest was in T₆ (54.25 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest was in T₁₂ (46.20 kg ha⁻¹) as shown in Table 3.

At harvest stage, soil available P₂O₅ range was (46.10 to 55.16 kg ha⁻¹) in weedy check and weed free and in drone treatments it was highest in T₅ (55.80 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest in T₇ (51.80 kg ha⁻¹) as in 2022-23. Similarly, in 2023-24, the soil P₂O₅ of 46.76 to 54.22 kg ha⁻¹ was recorded in T₄ and T₁₀. Among all treatments, available P₂O₅ was noticed highest in weed free (56.33 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest in weedy check (45.83 kg ha⁻¹).

The available soil potassium was estimated in different treatments at reproductive stage in 2022-23, the drone sprayed available K was high in T₆ (309.89 kg ha⁻¹) and lowest in T₇ (279.00 kg ha⁻¹). Among all treatments, lowest was in the weedy check (272.38 kg ha⁻¹) and highest was in weed free (314.68 kg ha⁻¹). In 2023- 24, soil K of 279.00 to 309.89 kg ha⁻¹ was recorded in T₇ and T₆. Among all treatments, lowest available soil K was in weedy check (272.38 kg ha⁻¹) and highest in weed free (314.68 kg ha⁻¹) as in Table 3 which was slightly less than the initial soil K (318.33 kg ha⁻¹).

At harvest stage the soil K₂O in drone herbicide application treatments ranged from 258.61 to 301.55 kg ha⁻¹ in T₁ and T₃. Among all lowest in weedy check (257.71 kg ha⁻¹) and highest in weed free (309.33 kg ha⁻¹) in 2022-23. The herbicide has a non significant effect on the available soil K₂O. Similar trend was observed in the 2023-24. Compared to other drone treated plots, lowest was seen in T₅ (265.55 kg ha⁻¹) and highest was in T₆ (308.58 kg ha⁻¹) among all the weedy check recorded lowest (264.83 kg ha⁻¹) and weed free noticed highest (307.00 kg ha⁻¹).

Table 2. Effect of the UAV applied herbicides on the physico-chemical properties of the soil at harvest stage of crop in 2022-23 and 2023-24

| Trt No. | 2022-23 | | | | 2023-24 | | | |
|-----------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------|--|------------|--------------------------|-------------|--|
| | pH | EC (d Sm ⁻¹) | Soil OC (%) | Soil CEC [c.mol (P ⁺) kg ⁻¹ soil] | pH | EC (d Sm ⁻¹) | Soil OC (%) | Soil CEC [c.mol (P ⁺) kg ⁻¹ soil] |
| T ₁ | 7.36 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 19.11 | 7.43 | 0.48 | 0.42 | 18.00 |
| T ₂ | 7.27 | 0.53 | 0.45 | 19.88 | 7.50 | 0.53 | 0.40 | 19.22 |
| T ₃ | 7.69 | 0.47 | 0.45 | 19.65 | 7.63 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 19.65 |
| T ₄ | 7.45 | 0.51 | 0.45 | 18.76 | 7.59 | 0.50 | 0.40 | 18.06 |
| T ₅ | 7.71 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 19.21 | 7.53 | 0.49 | 0.47 | 19.21 |
| T ₆ | 7.37 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 18.73 | 7.49 | 0.53 | 0.43 | 18.06 |
| T ₇ | 7.57 | 0.52 | 0.45 | 18.58 | 7.53 | 0.51 | 0.45 | 18.67 |
| T ₈ | 7.43 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 19.71 | 7.30 | 0.53 | 0.45 | 19.71 |
| T ₉ | 7.68 | 0.53 | 0.44 | 19.13 | 7.76 | 0.53 | 0.43 | 19.13 |
| T ₁₀ | 7.41 | 0.51 | 0.44 | 19.04 | 7.52 | 0.50 | 0.46 | 17.98 |
| T ₁₁ | 7.60 | 0.53 | 0.42 | 19.28 | 7.46 | 0.53 | 0.40 | 19.28 |
| T ₁₂ | 7.61 | 0.53 | 0.47 | 19.58 | 7.45 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 19.60 |
| T ₁₃ | 7.64 | 0.53 | 0.42 | 20.19 | 7.61 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 18.74 |
| T ₁₄ | 7.40 | 0.59 | 0.44 | 19.37 | 7.46 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 18.30 |
| T ₁₅ | 7.57 | 0.57 | 0.41 | 18.93 | 7.40 | 0.55 | 0.44 | 17.58 |
| T ₁₆ | 7.39 | 0.56 | 0.47 | 18.75 | 7.66 | 0.56 | 0.45 | 18.56 |
| T ₁₇ | 7.50 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 20.98 | 7.72 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 20.40 |
| Initial | 7.20 | 0.45 | 0.41 | 18.19 | 7.78 | 0.51 | 0.44 | 17.34 |
| SE(m)± | 0.4 | 0.47 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| CD(p=0.05) | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |

Table 3. Effect of the UAV applied herbicides on the soil fertility status at reproductive stage at 2022-23 and 2023-24

| Trt No. | 2022-23 | | | 2023-24 | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | Available N (Kg ha ⁻¹) | Available P (P ₂ O ₅) (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available K (K ₂ O) (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available N (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available P (P ₂ O ₅) (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available K (K ₂ O) (kg ha ⁻¹) |
| T ₁ | 231.00 | 50.56 | 286.33 | 232.10 | 52.40 | 310.99 |
| T ₂ | 220.90 | 52.79 | 294.33 | 225.26 | 52.40 | 292.74 |
| T ₃ | 226.00 | 54.66 | 298.85 | 226.16 | 55.00 | 285.01 |
| T ₄ | 219.20 | 54.23 | 287.34 | 225.40 | 55.30 | 307.33 |
| T ₅ | 231.66 | 48.43 | 304.04 | 232.06 | 55.80 | 292.45 |
| T ₆ | 233.59 | 48.60 | 309.89 | 236.63 | 53.90 | 288.98 |
| T ₇ | 228.42 | 50.61 | 279.00 | 228.42 | 51.80 | 285.79 |
| T ₈ | 218.66 | 49.72 | 301.33 | 226.86 | 52.70 | 308.94 |
| T ₉ | 237.77 | 48.41 | 289.94 | 233.13 | 54.30 | 308.08 |
| T ₁₀ | 233.93 | 48.83 | 302.74 | 223.46 | 51.90 | 310.59 |
| T ₁₁ | 222.46 | 51.49 | 280.39 | 233.00 | 54.40 | 284.26 |
| T ₁₂ | 241.58 | 53.53 | 285.36 | 228.16 | 52.50 | 313.84 |
| T ₁₃ | 219.83 | 49.53 | 296.96 | 232.90 | 51.90 | 326.95 |
| T ₁₄ | 223.49 | 53.24 | 293.66 | 229.96 | 53.40 | 301.00 |
| T ₁₅ | 227.68 | 51.86 | 276.00 | 230.43 | 51.70 | 313.02 |
| T ₁₆ | 218.23 | 48.01 | 272.38 | 219.76 | 51.50 | 280.66 |
| T ₁₇ | 248.66 | 55.35 | 314.68 | 237.26 | 59.30 | 333.00 |
| Initial | 258.20 | 55.40 | 318.33 | 238.33 | 60.40 | 338.80 |
| SE(m)± | 11.6 | 2.7 | 18.2 | 12.2 | 2.8 | 18.3 |
| CD(p=0.05) | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |

Table 4. Effect of the UAV applied herbicides on the soil fertility status at harvest stage at 2022-23 and 2023-24

| Trt No. | 2022-23 | | | 2023-24 | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Available N (Kg ha ⁻¹) | Available P (P ₂ O ₅) (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available K (K ₂ O) (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available N (Kg ha ⁻¹) | Available P (P ₂ O ₅) (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available K (K ₂ O) (kg ha ⁻¹) |
| T ₁ | 241.66 | 47.72 | 258.61 | 238.8 | 49.20 | 290.70 |
| T ₂ | 239.33 | 53.87 | 270.76 | 243.36 | 50.48 | 296.03 |
| T ₃ | 241.00 | 49.33 | 301.55 | 233.00 | 47.67 | 277.62 |
| T ₄ | 237.66 | 53.93 | 260.04 | 238.10 | 46.76 | 287.45 |
| T ₅ | 247.34 | 49.30 | 278.26 | 231.11 | 48.69 | 265.51 |
| T ₆ | 253.80 | 54.25 | 300.23 | 243.65 | 52.01 | 308.58 |
| T ₇ | 249.00 | 51.60 | 265.33 | 236.22 | 47.36 | 293.79 |
| T ₈ | 255.00 | 47.23 | 287.46 | 245.14 | 50.66 | 283.60 |
| T ₉ | 255.10 | 48.64 | 281.57 | 229.33 | 51.54 | 308.08 |
| T ₁₀ | 254.30 | 52.03 | 287.41 | 229.66 | 54.22 | 291.93 |
| T ₁₁ | 254.47 | 53.93 | 260.96 | 242.52 | 47.44 | 285.25 |
| T ₁₂ | 254.32 | 46.20 | 272.36 | 247.10 | 52.20 | 282.00 |
| T ₁₃ | 251.66 | 50.93 | 280.60 | 241.33 | 47.26 | 277.94 |
| T ₁₄ | 253.00 | 48.28 | 267.27 | 235.19 | 51.52 | 297.33 |
| T ₁₅ | 253.00 | 47.36 | 285.77 | 247.00 | 48.76 | 295.66 |
| T ₁₆ | 237.00 | 46.10 | 257.71 | 225.66 | 45.83 | 264.83 |
| T ₁₇ | 258.66 | 55.16 | 309.33 | 256.43 | 56.33 | 307.00 |
| SE(m)± | 13.5 | 3.3 | 18.1 | 12.7 | 3.1 | 16.9 |
| CD(p=0.05) | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |

From the above results, it was noticed that in both the years, a non significant effect with respect to soil available nutrients was found among the treatments in both the manual and drone sprayed plots applied with different doses and spray volume and spray height. Among all, highest nutrients were recorded in weed free and lowest was in weedy check. This could be attributed to differences in weed control efficiency of the used herbicides allowing variations in crop growth and uptake of the nutrient by weeds flora and crop. The present findings are in line with that of Mukhopadhyay and Biswas [11] who reported that application of the Imazethapyr @ 100, 150, 200 and 300 g a.i/ha have not resulted in any remarkable change in soil properties after application of this herbicide. Janaki et al. [12] also reported that herbicides application did not influence soil properties, pH, EC, organic C, available N, P, K in Tamil Nadu. Similarly, Ramprakash et al. [13] also reported that there were no significant changes in soil physico-chemical (pH, EC, CEC, OC) and fertility properties of the soil (available N, P₂O₅ and K₂O) due to application of bispyribac sodium.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, using drones for herbicide application in groundnut, or the use of a

knapsack sprayer, showed no significant effect on the chemical properties of the soil viz., pH, electrical conductivity, soil organic carbon, and cation exchange capacity. Similarly, the availability of soil macronutrients was not significantly impacted by herbicide application, whether applied using a drone or a knapsack sprayer.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are extremely thankful to All India Coordinated Research Project (AICRP) on weed management for the financial assistance received through the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) for the implementation and execution of this project.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Jat RS, Meena HN, Singh AL, Surya JN, Misra. Weed management in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) in India-a review. *Agricultural Reviews*. 2011;32(3): 155-171.
2. Barkani H, Catastini C, Emmelin M. Study of the photo transformation of imazaquin in aqueous solution: A kinetic approach. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A: Chemistry*. 2005;170(1): 27-35.
3. Otto A, Agatz N, Campbell J, Golden B, Pesch E. Optimization approaches for civil applications of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or aerial drones: A survey. *Networks*. 2018;00:1-48. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1002/net.21818>
4. Jackson ML. Soil chemical analysis. Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi. 1973;134-204.
5. Walkley A, Black CA. Estimation of organic carbon by chromic acid titration method. *Soil Science*. 1934;37:29-34.
6. Bower CA, Reitemeier RF, Fireman M. Exchangeable cation analysis of saline and alkali soils. *Soil science*. 1952;73(4):251-262.
7. Subbiah BV, Asija GL. A rapid procedure for determination of available nitrogen in soil. *Current Science*. 1956;25:259-260.
8. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanabe FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorous in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. 1954. United States Department of Agriculture, circular number. 1954;939.
9. Sudharshana C, Ramprakash T. Persistence of pendimethalin and imazethapyr in soil and their effect on yield, soil proper ties in ground nut (*Arachis hypogaea* l.) *Progressive Research*. 2014;9(1):39-43.
10. DWSRC. Annual Report of Directorate of Weed Science Research Centre, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh; 2010.
11. Mukhopadhyay S, Biswas PK. Effect of imazethapyr 10% sl on soil micro-organism and physico-chemical properties of soil. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*. 2019;6(2):2349-5162.
12. Janaki P, Meena S, Shanmugasundaram R, Chinnusamy C. Dissipation and impact of herbicides on soil properties in Tamil Nadu. *Herbicide residue research in India*. 2019;193-237.
13. Ramprakash T, Madhavi M, Yakadri M, Srinivas A. Bispyribac sodium persistence in soil, plant and grain in direct seeded rice and its effect on soil properties. *Nature Environment and Pollution Technology*. 2015;14(3):605-609.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/127810>