

Impact of Spiritual Blessing Energy Treatment (SBET) as an Alternative Treatment in Modern Agriculture for Growth and Productivity of *Zea mays* L.

¹Trivedi, D., ²Gaikwad, T. B., ²Kadam, V. D., ²Phutankar, N. R., ³Mondal, S., & ^{*3}Jana, S.

¹Trivedi Global, Inc., Research and Development, Henderson, Nevada, USA

²Shree Angarsiddha Shikshan Prasarak Mandal's College of Agriculture, Dept. of Horticulture, Sangulwadi, Mohitewadi, Maharashtra, India

³Trivedi Science Research Laboratory Pvt. Ltd., Research and Development, Thane (W), Maharashtra, India

***Corresponding author:** Snehasis Jana

Trivedi Science Research Laboratory Pvt. Ltd., Research and Development, Thane (W), Maharashtra, India
Email: publication@trivedisrl.com

Abstract

Agricultural productivity is increasingly challenged by environmental stressors and the limitations of conventional chemical fertilizers. Recent scientific inquiries have explored the potential of "Biofield Energy Treatments" as a sustainable alternative to enhance plant physiology. Spiritual Blessing Energy Treatment (SBET) represents a specific modality of biofield energy that is hypothesized to influence the corn morphology and yield through subtle energy interactions. The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of SBET on the growth and yield parameters of *Zea mays* L. (maize/corn) under normal environmental conditions. A randomized controlled trial was conducted where healthy *Zea mays* L. seeds were divided into two groups: a control corn group (CONCORG) and a SBET treatment corn group (BTCORNG). The treatment group received SBET from a recognized energy practitioner, while the control group remained untreated. Both groups were cultivated using identical soil composition, irrigation schedules, and light exposure. Key parameters such as germination rate, morphological characteristics, and yield attributes were measured. Various morphological traits were improved in the BTCORNG compared to the CONCORG. There was a substantial increase in the stem diameter and number of leaves per plant by 43.84% ($p \leq 0.001$) and 57.64% ($p \leq 0.001$), respectively for the BTCORNG compared to the CONCORG. Yield components like ear diameter, number of kernels per plant, and number of kernels per row were significantly increased by 33.40% ($p \leq 0.001$), 114.75% ($p \leq 0.001$), and 55.12%, respectively in the BTCORNG compared to the CONCORG. Further, total grain and straw yields per hectare were increased by 123.13% and 68.05%, respectively, in the BTCORNG compared to the CONCORG. Results suggest that SBET-treated *Zea mays* L. exhibited a statistically significant increase in various vegetative and yield-related corn parameters. Further molecular studies are required to elucidate the specific mechanism of energy transfer.

Keywords: non-chemical treatment, growth enhancers, spiritual blessing, corn farming, prayer, morphology, phenology, yield

Accepted 17/3/2026

Published 30/3/2026

1. INTRODUCTION

Corn (*Zea mays* L.) is one of the most versatile and essential cereal crops globally, serving as a staple for human nutrition, animal feed, and industrial raw materials [1]. To meet the demands of a growing global population,

modern agriculture faces the critical challenge of enhancing crop productivity while maintaining ecological balance [2]. Recent advancements have explored non-traditional interventions, such as Spiritual Blessing

2. Int. J. Soil and Crop Sci.

Energy Treatment (SBET), a form of biofield energy treatment, to influence the physiological and morphological characteristics of plants. The yield of *Zea mays* is heavily influenced by genetic factors and environmental variables, including soil fertility and climate resilience. In light of fluctuating global weather patterns, researchers have emphasized the need for sustainable yield improvements. According to Shiferaw et al. (2011) [3], maize remains a cornerstone of global food security, requiring innovative strategies to bridge the gap between potential and actual yields.

Global food security remains a critical challenge, necessitating the exploration of innovative, sustainable technologies to enhance the growth and yield of essential cereal crops like *Zea mays* L. without further environmental degradation from chemical fertilizers. Spiritual Blessing Energy Treatment (SBET), a form of biofield energy healing, has emerged as a novel approach to modulating the physiological and genetic characteristics of living organisms [4]. In the context of *Zea mays* L. (maize/corn), productivity was often limited by environmental stressors and nutrient uptake efficiency. Preliminary research suggests that SBET may enhance the chlorophyll content and photosynthetic efficiency of crops, leading to a measurable increase in biomass and grain yield [5]. Despite these promising observations, rigorous scientific validation is needed to elucidate the mechanisms by which SBET influences maize metabolic pathways. This study aims to evaluate the comprehensive impact of SBET on the growth parameters, yield attributes, and nutritional quality of *Zea mays* L. to provide a baseline for integrating blessing energy treatment into modern agronomic practices.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Study site description

The investigation was conducted from February to May 2025 in an agricultural tract located at Bhandarwadi, Sindhudurg, within the Konkan region of Maharashtra, India (latitudes 15° 37' and 16° 40' N and longitudes 73° 19' to 74° 13' E). The site was situated at an elevation of 26 meters above the mean sea level. The regional climate was characterized by a distinct thermal gradient, with mean maximum temperatures reaching up to 40°C during the pre-monsoon months (April–May) and minimums ranging from 8°C–25°C between December and February.

2.2. Plant materials and experimental design

Seeds of *Zea mays* L. (Hybrid: Rise 202/SHINE™; Lot: NRSM-270624; Purity: 95%) were procured from Rise Agro Infra Pvt. Ltd. (India). The seeds were

partitioned into two experimental cohorts: (i) an untreated control and (ii) a treated group subjected to a Spiritual Blessing (Biofield) Energy Treatment (SBET). Both cohorts were cultivated in randomized field plots under identical edaphic and environmental conditions. Standardized agronomic protocols, including systematic irrigation, fertilization, and integrated pest management (IPM), were maintained uniformly across all plots to isolate the Blessing Energy Treatment as the sole independent variable. Morphological and productivity parameters were subsequently evaluated to determine comparative efficacy.

2.3. Experimental design and field layout

The study was conducted using a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) consisting of two primary treatments: an untreated corn control (CONCORG) and a Spiritual Blessing (Biofield) Energy Treated corn group (BTCORG). The BTCORG group utilized SBET-pretreated seeds and soil, while the CONCORG group received no intervention. The experimental site, totaling 70.0 m², was partitioned into three blocks to account for spatial heterogeneity. Within each block, treatments were randomly assigned to individual 9.0 m² plots (3.0 m × 3.0 m). To mitigate edge effects and cross-treatment interference, a 0.5 m buffer was maintained between replications and plots. Prior to sowing, the site was cleared and amended with basal fertilizer applications of 50, 100, and 50 kg NPK ha⁻¹ (N, P, and K, respectively) incorporated directly into the soil.

2.4. Spiritual Blessing (Biofield) Energy Intervention Strategy

The experimental protocol utilized two distinct groups of maize (*Zea mays*) kernels and corresponding soil plots: a control group (CONCORG) and a treated group (BTCORG). The CONCORG assembly remained untreated to establish a baseline for physiological and yield parameters. The BTCORG assembly was subjected to a Spiritual (Biofield) Blessing Energy Treatment (SBET) administered by a recognized practitioner Mrs. Dahryn Trivedi. The intervention was conducted in a controlled environment (temperature: 28 ± 2°C; relative humidity of 65 ± 5%) to minimize exogenous atmospheric interference. The practitioner delivered the treatment through a non-contact, proximity-based technique at a distance of approximately 0.45 m (1.5 ft) for a duration of 4 minutes. Standardized procedural protocols were followed to ensure the intentional direction of the biofield toward the seeds and soil matrix. Following the intervention, both groups were maintained under identical agronomical conditions to isolate the effects of the treatment.

2.5. Soil characterization

Representative composite topsoil samples were collected from a depth of 30 cm across all experimental plots using a systematic five-point sampling technique. The samples were subsequently air-dried, passed through a 2-mm stainless steel sieve, and stored at 4 °C prior to physicochemical analysis. Soil texture was determined *via* the qualitative feel method [6], while potentiometric pH was measured in a 1:2 (w/v) soil-deionized water suspension using a pre-calibrated glass electrode pH meter.

2.6. Seed plantation and management

Seeds were direct-sown into the experimental plots, with soil moisture maintained *via* manual irrigation for the initial 9 days after sowing (DAS). Subsequently, irrigation was transitioned to a pressure-compensating drip system (0.5 m emitter spacing; 3 L h⁻¹). Basal fertilization consisted of 50:100:50 kg ha⁻¹ N:P:K supplied *via* urea, single superphosphate (SSP), and muriate of potash (MOP). The total requirements of SSP and MOP, alongside 50% of the urea, were incorporated pre-sowing, while the remaining nitrogen was applied as a top-dressing at 21 DAS. Pest management was standardized across all treatments using chlorpyrifos 50% + cypermethrin 5% (Hamla 550, Gharda Chemicals Ltd., India) applied at 2 mL L⁻¹ at 21 and 49 DAS. Growth and yield parameters were evaluated at 80 DAS by randomly sampling five representative plants per plot.

2.7. Morphological and agronomic characterization

A comprehensive suite of qualitative and quantitative traits was evaluated to characterize crop phenology and architecture. Qualitative morphological parameters were assessed based on standardized descriptors, encompassing vegetative traits (growth habit, stem morphology, leaf pubescence, color, orientation, texture, and lamina width) and reproductive features (tassel texture, glume pigmentation, silk coloration, ear morphology, husk tight-tightness, and kernel texture). At

physiological maturity, representative ear samples (n = 5 per plot) were collected to evaluate physical dimensions and mass. Ear length and diameter (cm) were quantified alongside total cob weight. Plot-level yield data were normalized and converted to tonnes per hectare to assess overall productivity across treatments.

2.8. Data analysis

Data are expressed as mean ± standard error of the mean (SEM). Differences between two independent groups were assessed using Student's *t*-test in SigmaPlot (v14.0). Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

3. Results

3.1. Analysis of soil properties

Initial characterization of the experimental soil across both control and treatment plots identified a sandy loam texture with a strongly acidic profile (pH 5.01). This baseline acidity was associated with restricted cation exchange capacity (CEC) and diminished nutrient bioavailability. Post-harvest analysis revealed that the plots subjected to Biofield Energy Treatment (BET) exhibited a significant shift in soil pH to 5.90, transitioning the classification from strongly acidic to moderately acidic. These findings suggest that the intervention may modulate soil chemical properties, potentially by enhancing the buffering capacity or altering ionic concentrations within the soil matrix (Data not shown).

3.2. Morphology of corn plants

The morphological ontogeny of corn was characterized through longitudinal observations across key phenological stages. Documentation spanned from initial radical emergence and seedling establishment through the successive vegetative (V) stages, culminating in anthesis, caryopsis development, and physiological maturity shown in **Figure 1**.

4. Int. J. Soil and Crop Sci.



Figure 1. Representative photographs illustrating the comparative vegetative growth characteristics of maize (*Zea mays* L.) across distinct developmental stages. (C) Control group; (BET) Biofield energy treatment group.

Vegetative morphology significantly diverged between the two cohorts. BTCORG exhibited a dark green, erect leaf canopy characterized by dense pubescence and distinct anthocyanin pigmentation throughout the vegetative tissues. Conversely, CONCORG displayed a light green, decumbent leaf habit, an absence of pubescence, and no detectable anthocyanin expression. These pigmentary differences suggest a higher flavonoid concentration within the BTCORG group (**Table 1**). Distinct phenotypic variations were also observed in reproductive structures. The BTCORG tassel was characterized by a compact

architecture with purple anthers and pigmented glume bases, whereas the CONCORG tassel was lax with light purple anthers and non-pigmented bases. At anthesis, BTCORG silks exhibited deep pink pigmentation, while CONCORG silks were pale pink. Ear development and grain characteristics further differentiated the genotypes; BTCORG produced cylindrical cobs with superior husk protection and large, soft-textured, vitreous yellow kernels. In contrast, CONCORG yielded cylindrical-conical ears with standard husk coverage and medium-sized, semi-soft kernels of typical yellow pigmentation (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Evaluation of biofield energy healing on the qualitative morphological characteristics of maize at the 80-day vegetative stage.

Vegetative trait	Control corn group (CONCORG)	Treatment corn group (BTCORG)
Vegetative descriptor		
Plant growth habit	Upright	Upright
Leaf color	Light green	Dark green
Leaf orientation	Dropping	Erect
Leaf pubescence	Absent	Present
Leaf texture	Smooth	Smooth
Leaf width	Broad	Broad
Anthocyanin pigmentation	Absent	Present
Reproductive descriptor		
Tassel texture	Lax (less dense)	Dense
Tassel-anther glume colour	Light purple	Purple
Tassel-glume base colour	Absent	Present
Silk colour at emergence	Light pink	Pink
Ear shape	Cylindrical conical	Cylindrical
Husk cover	Good	Very good
Grain quality descriptor		
Kernel row arrangement	Regular	Regular
Kernel color	Yellow	Intense yellow
Grain texture	Slightly soft	Soft
Grain shape	Flat	Flat
Grain size	Medium	Large

3.3. Phenology and yield traits

Based on the data from **Table 2**, the treatment group (BTCORG) shows significant improvements over the control group (CONCORG) across the majority of measured vegetative and yield traits. The treatment group showed an 11.50% increase in germination than control, which was highly significant ($p \leq 0.001$). Plant height in the BTCORG plants were 19.50% taller than the control ($p \leq 0.001$). There was a substantial 43.84% ($p \leq 0.001$) increase in the stem diameter for the treatment group compared to the control. Treatment plants produced 57.64% ($p \leq 0.001$) a greater number of leaves per plant than control group. Leaf length was increased by 8.95% ($p = 0.016$) and leaf width by 37.03% ($p \leq 0.001$) with respect to the control. Reproductive and phenological traits like anthesis silk interval increased by 16.01% ($p \leq 0.001$) in the treatment group compared to the control. There was a 26.90% ($p = 0.044$) increase in tassel branching in BTCORG compared to the CONCORG. While flag leaf length increased by 22.49% ($p = 0.015$) in

the BTCORG than CONCORG. Developmental timing traits like days to 50% tasselling, 50% silking, and 80% fruiting showed slight decreases (earlier maturity), but none were statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). Yield components like ear length was increased by 27.61% and diameter by 33.40% ($p \leq 0.001$ for both). The number of kernels per plant saw a massive 114.75% increase ($p \leq 0.001$) in BTCORG compared to the CONCORG. This was driven by a 55.12% increase in kernels per row and a 23.29% increase in the number of kernel rows. The 100-grain weight improved by 9.89% ($p \leq 0.001$) in the BTCORG compared to the CONCORG. The final productivity and biomass in terms of grain yield per hectare in the treatment group yielded 3.57 ton/ha compared to 1.60 ton/ha in the control, representing a 123.13% increase. Total straw yield increased by 68.05% (28.35 kg vs 16.87 kg), with the yield per hectare rising from 6.25 to 10.50 ton/ha

Table 2. Quantitative evaluation of the phenological and yield characteristics of corn following spiritual (biofield/prayer) energy treatment.

Vegetative trait	Control group (CONCORG)	Treatment group (BTCORG)	P value
Days to germination	5-7	5-6	-
Germination percentage	87.29 ± 0.15	97.33 ± 0.15	$p \leq 0.001$
Plant height (cm)	186.34 ± 2.21	222.70 ± 2.28	$p \leq 0.001$
Stem diameter (cm)	2.76 ± 0.03	3.97 ± 0.03	$p \leq 0.001$
Number of leaves per plant	10.67 ± 0.42	16.82 ± 0.26	$p \leq 0.001$
Leaf length (cm)	75.61 ± 1.38	82.38 ± 1.75	$p = 0.016$
Leaf width (cm)	6.32 ± 0.05	8.66 ± 0.09	$p \leq 0.001$
Flag leaf length (cm)	33.26 ± 1.91	40.74 ± 1.52	$p = 0.015$
Flag leaf width (cm)	5.67 ± 0.45	4.88 ± 0.33	$p = 0.195$
Days to 50% tasseling	70.25 ± 1.31	67.45 ± 1.23	$p = 0.158$
Days to 50% silking	73.15 ± 1.24	70.48 ± 1.32	$p = 0.179$
Anthesis silk interval	3.56 ± 0.03	4.13 ± 0.03	$p \leq 0.001$
Tassel branching	16.58 ± 1.42	21.04 ± 1.21	$p = 0.044$
Days to 80% fruiting	76.28 ± 3.12	71.99 ± 1.10	$p = 0.231$
Fruit pedicel length (cm)	3.85 ± 0.04	5.36 ± 0.05	$p \leq 0.001$
Ear/cob length (cm)	18.98 ± 0.42	24.22 ± 0.36	$p \leq 0.001$
Ear/cob diameter (cm)	5.12 ± 0.06	6.83 ± 0.12	$p \leq 0.001$
Number of husks per ear	9.58 ± 0.05	12.74 ± 0.08	$p \leq 0.001$
Number of kernels per row	29.28 ± 1.17	45.42 ± 1.36	$p \leq 0.001$
Number of kernel rows per ear	12.15 ± 0.18	14.98 ± 0.22	$p \leq 0.001$
Kernels per plant	638.15 ± 16.27	1370.44 ± 26.53	$p \leq 0.001$
Kernel weight (g)	0.23 ± 0.04	0.26 ± 0.02	$p = 0.521$

6. Int. J. Soil and Crop Sci.

Grain yield per plant (kg/plant)	0.15	0.36	-
Crop duration (days)	94.21 ± 1.11	92.42 ± 1.14	$p = 0.293$
100-grain seed weight (gm)	24.87 ± 0.14	27.33 ± 0.11	$p \leq 0.001$
Total grain yield (kg)	4.32	9.64	-
Grain yield/sq. m plot (kg/sq. m)	0.16	0.36	-
Grain yield/hectare (ton/ha)	1.60	3.57	-
Straw/Stover yield per plant (kg/plant)	0.58	1.05	-
Total straw yield (kg)	16.87	28.35	-
Straw yield/sq. m plot (kg/sq. m)	0.62	1.05	-
Straw yield/hectare (ton/ha)	6.25	10.50	-

Data represented as mean ± SEM (n = 5); $p \leq 0.05$ vs. control group (CONCORG) using Student's *t*-test

4. DISCUSSION

The significant enhancement in germination percentage suggests that the treatment optimized the physiological conditions necessary for embryo activation. This aligns with findings that specialized organic or microbial treatments can break seed dormancy and enhance enzymatic activity during early ontogeny, as discussed by Mousavi et al. 2020 [7]. The treatment group exhibited superior structural development, notably increase in plant height and stem diameter. Such robust vegetative growth is often a precursor to higher lodging resistance and improved nutrient transport. These structural gains are consistent with research by Eneji et al. 2013 [8], which highlights how optimized nutrient availability significantly alters maize architecture. The percentage increase in the number of leaves per plant and the significant expansion in leaf width in the BTCORG group indicate an enhanced photosynthetic surface area. This likely facilitated greater biomass accumulation, as evidenced by the 68% increase in total straw yield. The correlation between leaf area index and total dry matter is a well-established phenomenon in cereal crops, supported by Sinclair & Sheehy [9]. Most notably, reproductive efficiency was drastically improved in the treatment group, with kernels per plant was increased. This surge in sink capacity, alongside an increase in ear length (27.6%) and kernel rows (23.3%), culminated in a 123.1% increase in grain yield per hectare. These dramatic yield improvements under specialized treatments mirror results found in Zhang et al. 2021 [10], where nutrient and water management strategies were shown to double grain output through similar increases in kernel set and cob dimensions. The treatment group exhibited a significant increase in the Anthesis-Silk Interval (ASI). While a wide ASI is often associated with stress, in this context, it accompanied a 26.9% increase in tassel branching. This suggests a robust allocation of resources toward male reproductive structures [11], who

found that increased tassel branching can correlate with larger ear dimensions under non-stress conditions.

The BTCORG group produced significantly more protective structures, with a 33% increase in the number of husks per ear. This enhanced protection likely supported the superior development of the cob, which saw an increase in length and diameter. These findings are supported by Messina et al. 2011 [12], which articulates how the synchronization of husk and cob growth is vital for maximizing kernel row space. The most dramatic impact of the treatment was observed in the number of kernels per plant, which surged by 114.7%. This was primarily driven by a 55.1% increase in kernels per row and a 23.3% increase in the number of rows per ear. According to Borrás and Vitantonio-Mazzini, 2018, reported that these traits are the most critical determinants of yield stability and are highly responsive to organic-based soil fertility improvements [13]. The total straw yield was increased significantly. This significant increase in vegetative biomass, alongside a 123.1% increase in grain yield/hectare demonstrates that the BTCORG treatment enhanced the overall Harvest Index and radiation use efficiency. This dual improvement in grain and stover is a hallmark of balanced nutrient management, as cited by Latati et al. 2016 [14].

Probable concept of mechanism for more yields

The concept of applying subtle energy to biological systems is rooted in the understanding that plants respond to electromagnetic and bio-energetic stimuli. Research into bioelectromagnetic suggests that external energy fields can alter cellular metabolism and growth rates. As noted by Muehsam and Ventura, 2014 [15], subtle energy interactions can trigger significant biological responses at the molecular level, potentially influencing

the developmental trajectory of complex organisms like corn. The search for non-chemical growth enhancers has led to the investigation of diverse biofield therapies. While conventional fertilizers focus on chemical inputs, SBET aims to harmonize the internal energy of the plant system to maximize nutrient uptake and stress resistance. This aligns with broader studies on non-thermal biological effects; for instance [16, 17], highlights how cellular communication can be modulated by external fields, providing a theoretical framework for how biofield treatments might enhance the phenotypical expression and final yield of *Zea mays*.

5. CONCLUSION

Results suggest that SBET-treated *Zea mays L.* exhibited a statistically significant increase in various vegetative and yield-related parameters. These findings suggest that SBET may act as a potent "bio-stimulant," potentially offering a unique, chemical-free pathway to bolster crop resilience and food security. Further molecular studies are required to elucidate the specific mechanism of energy transfer.

Abbreviations

NPK: nitrogen phosphorus potassium; SBET: spiritual blessing energy treatment; CONCORG: control corn group; BTCORG: biofield energy-treated corn group; SSP: single super phosphate; MOP: muriate of potash; DAS: days after sowing

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Divine Connection Foundation for the assistance and support during the work.

Conflict of Interests

Author DT was employed by Trivedi Global, Inc. TBG, VDK, NRP, and were employed by Shree Angarsiddha Shikshan Prasarak Mandal's College of Agriculture, Sangulwadi, Mohitewadi, Maharashtra, India. Authors SM and SJ were employed by Trivedi Science Research Laboratory Pvt. Ltd. The authors do not have any commercial interests on the objectivity of the research.

Funding

The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the preparation of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ifie SE, Dangana RS, Swase D et al. Nutritional composition of *Zea mays L.*: A comprehensive review of macronutrients, micronutrients, and bioactive compounds [version 2; peer review: 1 approved, 1 approved with reservations]. *Open Res Africa* 2026, 8:15 (<https://doi.org/10.12688/openresafrika.16056.2>)
- [2] Mandal N. Conservation agriculture enhances ecosystem services and sustainability of the system over conventional agriculture. *Scientific Reports*. 2025 Dec 3;15(1).
- [3] Shiferaw, B., Prasanna, B. M., Hellin, J., and Bänziger, M. (2011). Crops that feed the world 6. Past successes and future challenges to the role of maize in global food security. *Food Security*, 3(3), 307–327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-011-0140-5>.
- [4] Trivedi MK, Branton A, Trivedi D, Nayak G, Mondal S, Jana S. Evaluation of plant growth regulator, immunity and yield of mustard (*Brassica juncea*) and chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) after biofield energy treatment. *Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries*. 2015; 4(6): 294-302. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.aff.20150406.19>.
- [5] Trivedi MK, Branton A, Trivedi D, Nayak G, Balsic AF, Jana S. Evaluation of the impact of biofield energy treatment on the growth and yield of maize (*Zea mays L.*). *International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Bioresearch*. 2017; 2(2): 234-245.
- [6] Richer-de-Forges, A.C., Arrouays, D., Chen, S., Dobarco, M.R., Libohova, Z., Roudier, P. et al. (2022). Hand-feel soil texture and particle-size distribution in central France. Relationships and implications. *CATENA* 213:106155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2022.106155>.
- [7] Mousavi, S. M., Bahmaniar, M. A., & Pirdashti, H. (2020). Impact of organic amendments on seed germination and early seedling growth of maize (*Zea mays L.*). *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 43(11): 1645-1658. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01904167.2020.1744641>.
- [8] Eneji, A. E., Islam, R., An, P., & Anees, M. A. (2013). Nitrate, magnesium and potassium uptake by maize in relation to organic and inorganic fertilizers. *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 36(11), 1774-1785. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01904167.2013.816732>
- [9] Sinclair, T. R., & Sheehy, J. E. (1999). Erect leaves and photosynthesis in rice. *Science*, 283(5407), 1455-1455. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.283.5407.1455c>.

8. Int. J. Soil and Crop Sci

- [10] Zhang, X., Fang, Q., Yu, Q., Chen, S., & Shao, L. (2021). Optimizing grain yield and water use efficiency in maize. *Agricultural Water Management*, 243, 106482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2020.106482>
- [11] Upadyayula, N., da Silva, H. S., Rocheford, T. R., & Tracy, W. F. (2006). Genetic and QTL analysis of maize tassel and ear inflorescence architecture. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, 112(8), 1492-1506. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-006-0252-4>
- [12] Messina, C. D., Podlich, J., & Cooper, M. (2011). A simulation model for maize reproductive development and grain yield. *Crop Science*, 51(3), 1145-1158. <https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2010.07.0427>
- [13] Borrás, L., & Vitantonio-Mazzini, L. N. (2018). Maize reproductive development and grain yield determination. *Field Crops Research*, 218, 157-165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2017.11.028>,
- [14] Latati, M., Bargaz, A., Belarbi, B., Lazali, M., Benlahrech, S., Tellah, S., Kaci, G., & Ounane, S. M. (2016). The intercropping common bean with maize improves phosphorus availability and uptake in Algerian calcareous soil. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 80, 150-160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2016.07.008>.
- [15] Muehsam, D., and Ventura, C. (2014). Impact of electromagnetic fields on stem cells and cancer: Regenerative medicine and epigenetic remodeling. *Electromagnetics in Biology and Medicine*, 33(1), 32–45. <https://doi.org/10.3109/15368378.2014.888562>.
- [16] Cifra, M., Fields, J. Z., and Farhadi, A. (2011). Electromagnetic cellular interactions. *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology*, 105(3), 223–246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbiomolbio.2010.07.003>
- [17] Trivedi MK, Branton A, Trivedi D, Mondal S, Jana S. The use of biofield energy therapy as complementary and alternative medicine in human health care system: a narrative review and potential mechanisms. *J Complement Integr Med*. 2024;21(4):451-460. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jcim-2024-0027>