The Bottle That Could Replace the Bag

The Adoption Paradox of Nano Liquid Fertilizers in India's Wheat Belt

Rishab Biswas & Sanjiv Kumar
ICAR-National Academy of Agricultural Research Management (NAARM), Hyderabad, Telangana, India.
Corresponding Author: rishabbiswas.pgdm24@naarm.org.in

India's wheat and rice farmers know nano liquid fertilizers work. Nearly all have heard of them. Three in four have tried them. So why is only one in four still using them?

Walk into any input shop in Rohtak or Ludhiana today and you will find it on the shelf - a small 500ml bottle, modestly priced, with a label promising what decades of fertilizer bags have failed to fully deliver: nutrients your crop actually absorbs, rather than nutrients that vanish into the soil, the air, and the groundwater before the plant ever sees them. Nano Liquid Fertilizers are not just a laboratory experiment. They are a commercial product already used by farmers across Haryana and Punjab, tested on wheat and rice fields that supply a large part of the country. The technology is proven. The economics are favorable. Awareness is nearly universal.

And yet barely one in four farmers who try it keep using it. That paradox was the starting point for a 2025 field study - 358 farmers, 13 districts, two states - and what the researchers found was not a technology problem. It was a human one.

The Waste Hidden in Every Bag

To understand why this matters, start with what conventional fertilizer practice currently costs India.

Punjab applies an average of 106 kg of nitrogen per acre to its wheat and rice fields, while Haryana applies 98 kg per acre. India's total fertilizer consumption in 2023-24 surpassed 20 million metric tonnes of nitrogen alone. The government subsidizes this use with an annual expenditure of ₹1.75-2.25 lakh crore, making it one of the largest agricultural subsidy programs worldwide.

Here is the part that belongs on the front page: Of all the nitrogen spread across India's fields, only 30-50% is actually absorbed by the crop. Of all that phosphorus, only 15-25% reaches the plant. The rest is lost—either volatilized into the atmosphere as nitrous oxide, a greenhouse gas 265 times more potent than carbon dioxide, or leached into rivers and aquifers as nitrate pollution. The annual economic cost of this inefficiency exceeds ₹1 lakh crore. India is spending more than ₹1.75 lakh crore to subsidize a system that wastes at least half of what it delivers.

What The Bottle Actually Does

Nano Liquid Fertilizers work differently. Nutrients are formulated at below 100 nanometers - smaller than a virus - in colloidal suspensions that can be sprayed directly onto crop leaves. At that scale, nutrients penetrate plant tissue through the leaf surface, bypassing the soil entirely and directly affecting the plant's physiology.

Field trials across wheat and rice in India have documented 8-12% yield gains and 15-20% fertilizer savings. Farmers who sustain NLF use across multiple seasons report these gains consistently. International studies on phosphorus uptake show efficiency improvements of 25-40% compared to conventional soil application.

The financial case is equally clear. Financial modeling across realistic yield and price scenarios - accounting for variable monsoons, price fluctuations, and different farm sizes - estimates a median net gain of ₹5,860 per acre for sustained adopters. For a Haryana farmer managing five acres, that is nearly ₹30,000 in cumulative gains. In a sector where margins are routinely squeezed between rising input costs and stagnating yields, that is not a marginal improvement.

Wheat yields in Punjab and Haryana have hovered around 4.8-5.3 tonnes per hectare for several years. Despite application rates that are among the highest in the world, the yield curve has flattened. More fertilizer is not producing more grain. Nano technology offers a fundamentally different answer to that problem - not more input, but smarter delivery.

The Paradox on The Shelf

Against this backdrop, the 2025 survey data tells a story that should trouble anyone working in agricultural innovation.

Adoption Stage	Haryana	Punjab	Overall
Awareness	99.6%	99.1%	99.4%
Trial	80.2%	68.5%	76.5%
Sustained adoption	31.2%	17.1%	26.8%
Discontinued after trial	43.3%	56.0%	49.7%

Nearly every farmer knows about nano liquid fertilizers. More than three in four have tried them. But only one in four continues using them - and in Punjab, more than half of those who try the product abandon it after the first season. If the product delivers the yields and savings that field trials indicate, why does half the user base walk away?

The Fear That Outlasts The Evidence

The answer lies not in agronomy but in how human beings make decisions when the stakes are high and the outcome is uncertain.

The survey's behavioral analysis identified the strongest single barrier to sustained adoption as something no agrochemical trial can fix: fear of yield loss from reducing conventional fertilizer **use**. This fear - the tendency to weigh a potential loss more heavily than an equivalent potential gain - reduced the probability of sustained adoption by nearly 22 percentage points, a larger effect than price sensitivity, farm size, access to credit, or any other variable measured.

In plain language: farmers know the new product probably works. They have tried it. But the thought of reducing their urea application - of trusting a 500ml bottle over the 50kg bag that has anchored their practice for decades - carries a psychological risk that financial calculations alone cannot overcome. The farmers themselves explain it most clearly.

"I tried it once but didn't see a big difference in yield. The cost was higher, so I went back to urea." - Punjab, Ludhiana

"The dealer said it works best with less urea, but I was afraid my crop would suffer." - Punjab, Sangrur

These are not irrational responses. A tenant farmer - and 78% of Punjab's farmers are tenants, farming land they do not own on short rental cycles - has every rational incentive to prioritize certainty over optimization. A single bad season can mean losing tenancy. Under those conditions, any technology that requires reducing a proven input carries a psychological cost that the product's actual performance cannot easily offset.

The Neighbour Who Changes Everything

The same behavioral framework that explains the adoption gap also points directly toward the solution.

The research found that **peer influence** - having visible NLF adopters within a farmer's immediate social network - measurably increased the probability of sustained adoption. The extension contact doubled that effect. The mechanism is social proof: in conditions of uncertainty, people look to the behavior of credible peers for guidance. A yield improvement statistic in a brochure does not move a conservative farmer. His cousin's harvest does.

"When my cousin used it and got better wheat, I bought some for my field the next season." - Haryana, Rohtak

This is why Rohtak district - where early adopters are visible, and the extension network is relatively active - shows 38.2% sustained adoption, more than double Bathinda's 14.2%. The technology is identical. The social context is different. The implication for anyone trying to scale this market is direct: invest in making early adopters visible. Field demonstrations using local varieties, on local soils, with results shared through WhatsApp farmer groups in the local language, do more to move conservative farmers than any amount of national advertising. Every credible early adopter is a free sales force for the next hundred.

The Market is Waiting to be Unlocked

Adoption forecasts indicate that, at current rates, nano-liquid fertilizers will reach 50% market penetration among Haryana-Punjab wheat-rice farmers in approximately 8 years. With targeted interventions - peer demonstrations, credit-linked incentives, digital evidence sharing - that timeline compresses to five years.

The difference between Year 8 and Year 5 in a ₹1,680 crore projected market is not a footnote. It is three years of compounding environmental benefit, three years of improved farmer income, and three years of manufacturing scale that drive down production costs for the products that follow.

The interventions required are not expensive. QR codes on NLF packaging linked to district-level trial results give the hesitant farmer hyperlocal evidence - not national averages, but yield data from fields he can visit, in soils he recognizes, with varieties he grows. Performance-based credit rebates for farmers who sustain use across multiple seasons reframe the cost question from "this bottle is more expensive than urea" to "this approach saved me ₹8,000 last year." Bringing NLFs under the Fertilizer Control Order would unlock subsidy eligibility and signal to dealers that the product has institutional backing, warranting reliable stocking. None of this is technically complex. All of it requires institutional will.

Why The World is Watching

There is a dimension to this story that extends well beyond Punjab and Haryana.

India's wheat and rice compete in export markets - the EU, the Middle East, Southeast Asia - where sustainability standards are tightening consistently. Residue requirements, environmental certification, and low-input protocols are moving from optional to mandatory for market access. A kilogram of wheat grown with precision nano-fertilizer application, documented through QR-linked traceability and showing measurable reductions in nitrous oxide emissions, is more exportable than one grown under the current broadcast application regime.

NLF adoption is not merely a domestic efficiency story. It is an export positioning story. The supply chains that build traceability and sustainability credentials today will

have the documentation that tomorrow's buyers require. The ones that do not will face market access barriers that no policy intervention can retroactively cure.

India is spending over ₹1.75 lakh crore annually to subsidize a fertilizer system that recovers, at best, half of what it delivers. A technology that measurably improves on that recovery rate is sitting on the shelf in every input shop from Rohtak to Sangrur. Three in four farmers have already tried it. The problem is not awareness. It is not availability. It is not even, at its core, a price.

It is the deep human reluctance to trust something new when the cost of being wrong is a failed harvest. Solve for that - through the neighbour who succeeded, the demonstration on familiar soil, the data from the next village - and the bottle does not just replace the bag. It changes what Indian farming can become.

Sources: Primary survey data - 358 farmer surveys and 83 channel partners interviews across 13 districts of Haryana and Punjab (2025) | CACP Price Policy Report 2024 | FAO World Fertilizer Trends 2024 | Fertilizer Association of India Statistics 2023-24 | DES, Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare (2023) | Chhipa (2019) Environmental Chemistry Letters | Prajapati et al. (2022) Journal of Plant Nutrition

* * * * * * * * *