

Role of plants, mycorrhizae and phytochelators in heavy metal contaminated land remediation

A.G. Khan¹, C. Kuek, T. M. Chaudhry, C. S. Khoo and W. J. Hayes

Faculty of Infomatics, Science and Technology,
University of Western Sydney, Macarthur, Campbelltown NSW 2560, Australia

Abstract

Phytoremediation is a site remediation strategy, which employs plants to remove non-volatile and immisible soil contents. This sustainable and inexpensive process is emerging as a viable alternative to traditional contaminated land remediation methods. To enhance phytoremediation as a viable strategy, fast growing plants with high metal uptake ability and rapid biomass gain are needed. This paper provides a brief review of studies in the area of phytoaccumulation, most of which have been carried out in Europe and the USA. Particular attention is given to the role of phytochelators in making the heavy metals bio-available to the plant and their symbionts in enhancing the uptake of bio-available heavy metals.

1. Introduction

With increasing heavy metal contamination due to various human and natural activities, ecosystems have and are being contaminated with heavy metals (HMs). Migration of contaminants into non-contaminated sites as dust or leachate through the soil, and the spreading of sewage sludge are examples of events that contribute towards contamination of our ecosystems.

Contaminated soil can be remediated by chemical, physical or biological techniques [1]. The available techniques may be grouped into two categories: (a) *ex situ* techniques which require removal of the contaminated soil for treatment on or off site, and (b) *in situ* methods, which remediate without excavation of contaminated soil. *In situ* techniques are favored over the *ex situ* techniques due to their lower cost and reduced impact on the ecosystem. For a detailed overview and analysis of these technologies, the reader is referred to the excellent reviews of [2-3].

This paper focuses on the bioremediation of heavy metal contaminated soils using *in situ* techniques. Heavy metals form the main group of inorganic contaminants [4-7]. Remediation of metal compounds presents a different set of problems when compared to organics. Organic compounds can be degraded while metals normally need to be physically removed or be immobilised [8]. Whilst a number of on-site treatment techniques are available to decontaminate soils containing organics, there are comparatively few *in situ* methods for the removal of heavy metals and inorganic contaminants [3, 9]. Traditionally, remediation of heavy metal contaminated soils involves either on site management or excavation and subsequent disposal to a landfill site [10].

In Australia, the most common remediation technique is off-site management. The metal contaminated soil is taken for burial at landfill sites [11-14]. This method of remediation merely shifts the contamination problem elsewhere [12]. Additionally there are hazards associated with the transport of contaminated soil and migration of contaminant from landfill into adjacent environment [15].

On site management of heavy metal contaminated soils can be achieved either by diluting the contaminant to safe levels by using clean soil as

¹ Corresponding author.

diluent, [16] or stripping and stockpiling clean top soils and redistributing it over the landfill. Deep ploughing to vertically mix heavily contaminated soil with less contaminated sub-soils can also be employed to dilute the heavy metal contents [17].

Immobilization of inorganic contaminants is also a possible strategy [18]. Immobilization can be achieved by complexing the contaminants [19], or by increasing the soil pH by liming. The solubility of metals such as Cd, Cu, Zn and Ni are reduced due to the formation of insoluble hydroxides [4].

Soil washing or extraction for removing inorganic compounds from contaminated soils is the only alternative to off-site burial method [14, 20]. As with organic compounds, this technique produces a residue with high heavy metal contents which require further treatment or burial [21]. This method, though effective, is costly. Use of microbial bioremediation technology, well known for decontamination of organic compounds [22], is not available for large scale transformation of inorganic contaminants.

Most of the above mentioned techniques have been shown to be efficient in lab-scale and pilot scale studies. However, only a few field studies have been conducted to test their efficiency and efficacy [3]. Furthermore, the physio-chemical technologies used for soil remediation render the land useless as a medium for plant growth as they also remove all biological activities, including useful microbes, such as nitrogen fixing bacteria and mycorrhizal fungi, as well as fauna. There is a need to develop suitable onsite techniques for the removal of non-volatile and non-mobile soil contaminants [23]. Plants that uptake heavy metals from soil offer an alternative and less expensive method to strip heavy metals directly from the soil. Plants have constitutive (present in most phenotypes) and adaptive (present only in tolerant phenotypes) mechanisms for accumulation or tolerating high contaminant concentrations in their rhizospheres. The use of such plants to clean up soils and water contaminated with organic and inorganic pollutants, a technique termed as phytoremediation, is emerging as a new tool for *in situ* remediation.

This paper provides a brief review of studies in the area of phytoremediation, most of which have been carried out in Europe and the USA. Particular attention is given to the role of phytochelators in making the heavy metals bio-available to the plant and their symbionts in enhancing the uptake of bio-available heavy metals.

2. Phytoremediation

In recent years, phytoaccumulation/phytoextraction, i.e., the use of plants to clean up soils contaminated with non-volatile hydrocarbons and immobile

inorganics is showing promises as a new method for *in situ* cleanup of large volumes of low to moderately contaminated soils. Plants can be used to remove, transfer, stabilize and/or degrade heavy metal soil contaminants [24-31]. The technique was first adapted to constructed wetlands, reed beds and floating plant systems for the treatment of contaminated ground and waste waters for years [32]. Current efforts now focus on expanding the phytoremediation strategy to address contaminated soils and air pollutants in an attempt to preserve the biodiversity of soil and its biota [29]. Phytoremediation has been tested by various green house and pilot scale field experiments in the USA and Europe [30, 31]. From this remediation method, the biological properties and physical structure of the soil is maintained, and the technique is environmentally friendly, potentially cheap, visually unobstructive and offer the possibility of bio-recovery of the heavy metals.

Contaminated sites often support characteristic plant species, some of which are able to accumulate high concentrations of heavy metals in their tissue [33-36]. Most plants that survive in toxic soils do so by either, avoiding heavy metals, or, hyperaccumulating them in their tissues. Such plants are uncommon [37], and, to date, approximately 400 hyperaccumulator species have been identified, according to the analysis of field collected specimens [38]. Most have been found in contaminated areas of temperate Europe and the USA, New Zealand and Australia. Examples of reported hyper-accumulators have been tabulated by Chaudhry et al. [34] and Bonaventura and Johnson [39]. Besides the limited distribution of hyperaccumulators in the wild, such plants also tend to be contaminant specific. No plant species has yet been found that will demonstrate a wide spectrum of hyperaccumulation [40]. Cultivating such plants on low to moderately contaminated industrial waste sites can provide a clean, cheap alternative to the suck, muck and truck cleaning approach to contaminated soil clean up. In addition to the removal of contaminants, the technique also offers containment of leachates and maintenance / improvement of soil structure, fertility and biodiversity [32, 40]. Phytoremediation covers a range of methods such as phytodegradation, phytostabilization, rhizofiltration, enhanced biodegradation and phytoaccumulation (for references and description of each, refer to Chaudhry et al. [34]).

3. Limitation of phytoremediation

Phytoremediation is not a cure-all for contaminated soils. As with many new technologies,

various mechanisms are either still unknown or poorly understood. Before this technology can become a technically efficient and cost-effective on a commercial scale, there are some limitations that need to be overcome. For example, very little is known about the molecular, biochemical and physiological processes that characterize hyperaccumulation. Many hyperaccumulator plants remain yet to be discovered and identified, as pointed out by Raskin et al. [28]. Furthermore, a long duration is needed before remediation to an acceptable level is achieved. Most heavy metal accumulating plants have root penetration to only shallow depths and a small biomass and are slow growing. To allow remediation within a reasonable period (e.g. <5 yr), the plant yield and metal uptake have to be enhanced dramatically. This may be achieved by cultivating rapid growing plants or, by engineering common plants with as yet unidentified hyperaccumulating genes. Another limitation is the potential contamination of the food chain if animals graze on the heavy metal contaminated vegetation. Also, the disposal of the harvested biomass is still to be resolved. Various techniques including air drying, ashing or incineration, composting, pressing and compacting for landfill and leaching are some of the options [27]. Recovery of rare and expensive trace metal contaminants from the post harvest biomass (phytomining) is currently an option of great interest. The phytoremediation technique has long term applicability and is not a quick fix strategy. The costs, however, are lower than those of conventional methods and can have large-scale applications. Its source of energy is mostly solar and it allows the maintenance of soil ecosystems.

4. Role of mycorrhizae in phytoremediation

4.1 Arbuscular mycorrhizae

Since heavy metal uptake and tolerance depend on both plant and soil factors including soil microbes, we require information on interactions between plant root and their symbionts such as arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungi and nitrogen-fixing microbes. It is the generally held view that the majority of plants growing under natural conditions have mycorrhizae [41]. Mycorrhizal colonization of roots results in an increase in root surface area for nutrient acquisition. The extramatrical fungal hyphae can extend several cm into the soil and uptake large amounts of nutrients, including heavy metals, to the host root. The effectiveness of AM root colonization in terms of nutrient acquisition differs markedly between AM fungi and host plant genotype [42, 43].

Mycorrhizae have also been reported in plants growing on heavy metal contaminated sites [34, 44–47] indicating that these fungi have evolved a HM-tolerance and that they may play a role in the phytoremediation of the site. Noyd et al. [49] reported that AM fungal infectivity of native prairie grasses increased over three seasons on a coarse taconite iron ore tailing plots which helped to establish a sustainable native grass community that will meet reclamation goals. The reported symbiotic associations in the plants colonizing heavy metal contaminated soils further suggests a selective advantage for these plants as pioneering species on such sites and that they may be largely responsible for the successful colonization of such habitats.

Various authors have reported isolating spores of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal taxa such as *Glomus* and *Gigaspora* associated with most of the plants growing in heavy metal polluted habitats [47, 50, 51]. Raman et al. [51] identified *Glomus* and *Gigaspora* spp. in the mycorrhizospheres of fourteen plant species colonising a magnesite mine spoil in India. Whereas Weissenhorn and Leyval [57] isolated only *Glomus mosseae* and Dueck et al. [52] isolated *Glomus fasciculatum* alone from the heavy metal polluted soils. Pawlowska et al. [46] surveyed a calamine spoil mound rich in Cd, Pb and Zn in Poland and recovered spores of *Glomus aggregatum*, *G. fasciculatum* and *Entrophospora* spp. from the mycorrhizospheres of the plants growing on spoil. Gali et al. [53] suggested that mycorrhizae can play a crucial role in protecting plant roots from heavy metals. The efficiency of protection, however, differs between distinct isolates of mycorrhizal fungi and different heavy metals. Joner and Leyval [54] reported that extra-radical hyphae of AM fungus *Glomus mosseae* can transport Cd from soil to subterranean clover plants growing in compartmented pots, but that transfer from fungus to plant is restricted due to fungal immobilization. The authors also reported no restriction of fungal hyphal growth into soil with high extractable Cd levels. Our preliminary [Chaudhry personal communications] studies have also showed very little, if any, translocation of Zn absorbed by mycorrhizal maize seedlings grown in contaminated soil, to the shoots. Turnau [55] studied the localization of heavy metals within the fungal mycelium and mycorrhizal roots of *Euphorbia cyparissias* from Zn contaminated wastes and found higher concentrations of Zn as crystalloids deposited within the fungal mycelium and cortical cells of mycorrhizal roots. Studies by various researchers [53, 56, 57] have shown that mycorrhizal fungal ecotypes from heavy metal contaminated sites seem to be more tolerant to heavy metals (and have developed

resistance) than reference strains from uncontaminated soils.

Galli et al. [58] reported that although there was an increase in the contents of cysteine, gamma EC and GSH in the mycorrhizal maize roots grown in quart sand with added Cu, no differences in Cu uptake were detected between non-mycorrhizal and mycorrhizal plants. These results do not support the idea that AM fungi protects maize from Cu-toxicity. Mycorrhizae are also known to produce growth-stimulating substances for plants, thus encouraging mineral nutrition and increased growth and biomass necessary for phytoremediation to become commercially viable strategy for decontamination of polluted soils.

For arbuscular mycorrhizae the results are conflicting. Some reports indicate higher concentrations of heavy metals in plants due to AM, even resulting in toxic levels in plants [45, 54, 59], whereas others have found a reduced plant concentrations of, e.g. Zn and Cu in mycorrhizal plants [60-62]. Diaz et al. [63] studied influence of Zn and Pb uptake by *Lygeum spartum* and *Anthyllis cytisoides* plants inoculated with *Glomus mosseae* and *G. macrocarpum* AM fungi in soils with different levels of these metals. The authors showed that, at low doses, mycorrhizal plants had equal or higher Zn or Pb concentrations than non-mycorrhizal controls; at higher doses, however, metal concentrations in the plants inoculated with *G. mosseae* were lower than those found in the corresponding controls, while the plants inoculated with *G. macrocarpum* showed similar or even higher levels than the controls.

In addition to the damaging effects on plants, the effect of heavy metals on the soil microorganisms and soil microbial activity also need to be considered. The impact of heavy metals in the field on *Rhizobium leguminosarum* bv. *Trifolii* and AM were estimated by various workers [18, 45]. A negative effect of Zn on the indigenous rhizobial population was suggested by Mench et al. [18]. On the contrary, no adverse effect was found on spore number and mycorrhizal colonization of maize [64]. Various soil factors such as the clay contents and mobility of heavy metals effect plants and soil biota. As metal uptake by plant roots depends on soil and their associated symbionts, it is important to monitor metal mobility and availability to plant and its symbionts when assessing the effect of soil contamination on plant uptake and related phytotoxic effects.

The prospect of symbionts existing in heavy metal contaminated soils has important implications for phytoremediation. Mycorrhizal associations increase the absorptive surface area of the plant due to extra-matrical fungal hyphae exploring rhizospheres beyond the root hair zone, which in turn enhance

water and mineral uptake. The protection and enhanced capability of greater uptake of minerals result in greater biomass production, a pre-requisite for successful remediation. The potentials of phytoremediation of contaminated soil can be enhanced by inoculating hyperaccumulator plants with mycorrhizal fungi most appropriate for contaminated site.

4.2 Ectomycorrhizae

Evidence for the role of ectomycorrhizal fungi in ameliorating heavy metal toxicity in their hosts is still developing. It is possible that protection against heavy metals is by mycelia affording a physical barrier or mantle [41, 66] and may include metabolic processes such as intracellular metal accumulation and the extracellular precipitation of metals by metabolites in exudates as is known in saprophytic fungi but this has been shown in only a few mycorrhizal fungi [67]. In most of the studies which report ectomycorrhizal fungi to be beneficial, the mechanism suggested for the protective effect of the fungus is the prevention of translocation of heavy metals into the host. For example, in *Picea abies* mycorrhizal with *Laccaria laccata*, most Cd was found to be associated with cell walls of the latter [68]. The outer pigmented layer of the cell wall of *Pisolithus tinctorius* was where Cd, Cu and Fe were revealed to accumulate [69]. In ecto- and endomycorrhizal fungi heavy metals were demonstrated to be bound to cell wall components such as chitin, cellulose derivatives and melanin [53]. Extrahyphal slime and polyphosphate linkage of Cu and Zn was observed to be the amelioration mechanism in *P. tinctorius* [70]. All this means that protective effect is directly proportional to the amount of extramatrical mycelium, as has been found in a study of Cd and mycorrhizal *Pinus sylvestris* [71]. Concentrations of heavy metals were usually found to be little altered in roots of mycorrhizal birch, pine and spruce but were high in extramatrical hyphae of the symbionts *Amanita*, *Paxillus*, *Pisolithus*, *Rhizopogon*, *Scleroderma*, and *Suillus* spp. [72]. In *Rhizopogon roseolus* and *Pinus sylvestris* associations, Cd and Al were found to accumulate in the fungal mantle and their concentrations were found to decrease along the Hartig net towards the root interior [73]. A few studies report that ectomycorrhizal fungi do not limit heavy metal concentration in their hosts. For example, *Thelephora terrestris* was claimed to increase Zn concentration in its host [74] and the tolerance of *Picea abies* to Cd conferred by *Paxillus involutus* could not be related to decreased Cd uptake [75]. However, whether Zn transport is allowed through pine ectomycorrhiza to the host has been shown to be dependent in part, on the concentration of

the metal external to the ectomycorrhiza [76]. At low external concentrations, Zn uptake is increased. At high concentrations, ectomycorrhiza can maintain shoot tissue concentration at a low level. It is possible that this effect also applies to other heavy metals and may explain some contradictory reports on uptake.

The tolerance of ectomycorrhizal fungi to heavy metals varies. In growth studies on agar and liquid culture, *Laccaria laccata* proved sensitive at 10 ppm to Cu and Al but not Zn [77]. The same study revealed high tolerance of *Thelephora terrestris* to Cu (500 ppm) and Zn (1000 ppm). A liquid culture study indicated that *Hymenogaster* spp., *Scleroderma* spp. and *Pisolithus tinctorius* were able to withstand high concentrations of Al, Fe, Cu and Zn [70]. Naturally, all this has implication for the selection of appropriate ectomycorrhizal fungi for use in remedial plantings on contaminated sites. However, neither selection based on *in vitro* growth trials nor selection of presumably adapted fungi will guarantee success. For example, *in vitro* tolerance of an ectomycorrhizal fungus to Zn did not always predict its tolerance as a symbiont [74]. Isolation of different *Paxillus involutus* Fr. strains from polluted and non-polluted sites did not influence their tolerance to aluminium [78]. Similarly, Cd contaminated soil was not found to be a better source of Cd tolerant ectomycorrhizal fungi [74]. Mycorrhizal fungi adapted to contaminated soil did not increase plant growth compared to fungi from uncontaminated sites [79].

Good initiation of mycorrhiza is a necessary first step in exploiting the benefits of mycorrhizal fungi. There is evidence from work on *Pisolithus tinctorius* and *Eucalyptus urophylla*, that at high enough concentrations, Cr and Ni can reduce the percentage of root tips colonized by the fungus [80]. While this would have a consequence for natural revegetation of contaminated sites by plants which would normally become ectomycorrhizal but for the contamination, this might be a lesser problem in remedial plantings because the required ectomycorrhizal seedlings can be produced in nurseries. Thus, the contaminated sites would be outplanted with plants with ectomycorrhiza already established. If the mechanism of protection of plants against heavy metal toxicity by ectomycorrhizal fungi is interception by the fungal sheath and extramatrical mycelium, then two issues can be attended to with benefit. Firstly, fungal types which can initiate a high percentage of mycorrhizal roots and which can also subsequently produce much extramatrical biomass under the prevailing environmental conditions should prove the most useful. The fungus chosen should also be appropriate for the stage of growth of the host (usually seedling). Secondly, the conditions which optimize the soil environment for mycorrhizal

initiation and extramatrical growth should be identified and applied if possible. These conditions include the soil nutrient, water, pH and porosity regimes. While studies to date have understandably concentrated on challenges with concentrations of heavy metals, the confounding effect of choice of ectomycorrhizal fungus and soil conditions other than that of contaminant presence and concentration, will require investigation in future studies.

5. Role of plant chelating agents in phytoremediation

The ultimate sink for heavy metal pollutants is a atmospheric deposition and burial in soils and sediments. They often accumulate in the top layer of soil, and are, therefore, accessible for uptake by plant roots which are the principal entry points of metals into the food chain. The success of phytoremediation depends upon the selection of plant species and soil amendments that maximize the removal of heavy metals from this top layer of contaminated soil. For phytoremediation to be possible, the contaminant(s) must be within the plant's root zone, be bioavailable and biologically absorbed. Heavy metals are retained by soil in three ways: by adsorption onto the surfaces of mineral particles, by complexation by humic substances in organic particles, and by precipitation reactions [81]. Recently, byproduct of industrial processes such as berings and steel shots and sewage sludge have been used to immobilize heavy metals [18]. Amendment of contaminated soils with lime, phosphate and organic acids generally reduce the bioavailability of heavy metals [43].

Plants, depending on their species and genotype, differ in their efficiency in acquisition and utilization of nutrients [82]. Some plants release phytosidophores (PS) under Zn or Fe deficiencies [43, 65, 83] which mobilizes Mn, Zn and Cu in the rhizosphere, uptake of which is also enhanced [84, 85].

Some plants are able to tolerate an excess of heavy metals by involving processes like sequestration in the cell vacuole with organic acids and complexation with metal detoxifying peptides induced on their exposure to heavy metals [86-88].

The unique superfamily of thiol-containing metal binding proteins called metallothioneins (MT) are known to modulate internal levels of metal concentrations between deficient and toxic levels by binding toxic metals through closely spaced cysteine thiol groups. These polypeptides have been given the name phytochelators. Various researchers in the past two decades have provided evidence to show that plants, algae and certain fungi also produce MT, which differs from the classical MT first discovered

by Margoshes and Vallee [89]. Rauser [87] tabulated the eukaryotic organisms in which MT have been found. Glutathione (GSH) is the most abundant cellular thiol-rich heavy metal-binding peptide (PC) in plants, animals and fungi [90]. The role of PCs in metal detoxification has largely been studied using Cd and plant cell suspension cultures. Cd-tolerant cells bound most of the cellular Cd as Cd-binding complexes; little binding of Cd occurred in non-tolerant cells, which grew poorly and subsequently died [101]. Formation of Cd-binding complexes allowed the Cd-tolerant cells to survive excess Cd due to lower contents of the free metal in the cells, allowing undisturbed metabolism. Sequestration of heavy metals by PCs confers protection for heavy metal sensitive enzymes. Keltjens and Vanbeusichem [91] tested the use of PCs as biomarkers and concluded that PCs seem to be a useful early warning system for heavy metals stress in plants.

Leopold and Gunther [92] reported the induction of PCs and the binding of heavy metals to these complexes by exposure of *Silene vulgaris* cell cultures to different concentrations of Cd, Cu, Pb, and Zn. Choi et al. [93] found that different ratios of PC:Cd complexes were stimulated in Cd-treated seedlings of *Canavalia lineata*. Salt and coworkers [94] reported Cd-binding PCs in Indian mustard seedlings exposed to Cd. Zenk [95] isolated PC from plants and plant suspension cultures and suggested that PC synthase will be an interesting target for biotechnological modifications of heavy metal tolerance/ accumulation in higher plants. Gwozdz et al. [96] showed that there is a complex defense system, comprising of specific proteins, antioxidant enzymes and PCs, against metal phytotoxicity in the roots of *Lupinus luteus* L. exposed to Pb, Ca and Cu. Recently Schaefer et al. [97] found massive formation of PCs in the roots of *Brassica juncea* L. exposed to Cd, indicating Cd-induced PC synthesis. PCs occurred in roots of *Acer pseudoplatanus* and *Silene cucubalus* growing on a Zn mine waste site [98]. Harmens et al. [99] studied SH-GSH concentrations in Zn-sensitive and Zn-tolerant *Silene vulgaris* exposed to Zn and found higher concentrations of SH-GSH in the roots of Zn-sensitive plant compared to that of the tolerant plant due to the production of PCs as well as cystein and non-identified thiols. Tukendorf [100] reported stimulation of PC contents in spinach plants exposed to higher levels of Cd and Cu. Klapheck et al. [101] reported the formation of metal-induced HM-PCs in several species of *Poaceae* exposed to Cd. Guo and Marschner [102] also suggested that PCs induced in Cd exposed plants may be involved in the translocation of Cd from roots to shoot. Inouhe et al. [103] reported that the synthesis of a Cd-binding complex containing PCs in cereal roots exposed to Cd

and that this has an important role in its tolerance of Cd. Grill et al. [98] showed that roots of plants growing in a HM-contaminated mine dump contained 10 to 100 times greater concentrations of PCs than in the leaves. Exposure of intact plants or their cell cultures to relatively high concentrations of metals such as Cd, Cu, Zn causes the appearance of Cd-binding complexes [87]. As suggested by Rauser [87] integrated biochemical and physiological studies in roots are most likely to clarify the phenomena of phytoaccumulation.

Macnair [104] reviewed the genetics of the phenomenon of metal tolerance in vascular plants and discussed the role of phytochelatins and metallothionein-like proteins in metal tolerance. Much has been learned in recent years on how plants and certain fungi chelate and transport heavy metals. Fission yeast is shown to produce PCs in response to excess Cd [105, 106] and target genes for heavy metal tolerance have been identified in it [107, 108]. The sequence of these target genes can be modified for expression in a host plant cultivar for commercial use in phytoremediation. Hunter and Mehra [109] transformed a Cd-sensitive mutant *Candida glabrata* with a gene from the wild type to restore Cd tolerance and formation of Cd-glutathione and Cd-phytochelatin complexes. As plant nutrient uptake is intrinsically linked to associations with mycorrhizal fungi, elucidating metal sequestration in these fungi offers additional opportunities for engineering mycorrhizal plants to assist phytoextraction. A better knowledge of the biological processes governing heavy metal uptake and accumulation should allow the application of modern genetic engineering techniques to improve the application of phytoremediation. A study of the genetics of tolerance and hyperaccumulation is of importance in unraveling tolerance mechanisms and in breeding plants for heavy metal tolerance.

Plant roots exude organic acids, for example malic and citric acids, and/or acid phosphatases under P deficiency [110-112]. This localized enhanced excretion of organic acids increases the effectiveness of exudates for the mobilization of nutrients such as P, Zn, Fe and Mn [113]. The population density and composition of symbiotic and non-infecting microorganisms in the rhizosphere can enhance root exudation and the concentration of organic acids, chelators, and acid phosphatases released as ectoenzymes from roots, or from microorganisms including arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi as microbial metabolites [114, 115].

6. Phytoremediation assisted by synthetic metal chelators

Metals can exist in various chemical forms (or species). These forms often exist in a complex

equilibrium governed by many soil factors and properties. For any given heavy metal, only a fraction is bioavailable and thus potentially it is only this fraction that can be taken by the plants. More of the metal could be converted to the bioavailable fraction as it is gradually removed by the plant but the extent to which this happens and the kinetics of such processes are not known and would invariably be soil specific.

Recently, low toxicity multidentate chelating agents such as EDTA, have been used to enhance the bioavailability of heavy metals for plant uptake [55, 56]. The resulting chelates are very stable and do not normally release their metal ions back into a free form, unless there is a significant drop in soil pH. Salt et al. [27] have shown that the shoots of Indian mustard plant (*Brassica juncea*) grown for 4 weeks in soil containing 0.9 mmol/kg Cd and 1 mmol/kg EDTA yielded 875 µgCd/g dry weight of plant. This compared to only 164 µgCd/g dry weight of plant in the absence of the chelator. Glasshouse studies using heavy metal contaminated soil from an abandoned gold mine in Australia have shown that after a six week growth period there was enhanced uptake of Fe, Mn, and Cu by *Zea mays* if the soil was dosed with EDTA or DTPA (1g chelator/kg soil) prior to planting [Chaudhry unpublished results]. In a pot experiment, using Zn-contaminated soil amended with EDTA, Ebbs and Kochian [116] compared the phytoextraction of Zn by oat, barley and Indian mustard and found that the addition of EDTA to soil significantly increased Zn accumulation by plants. Barley accumulated 2-4 times more Zn than oat in the presence of EDTA, suggesting it has a phytoremediation potential equal to, if not greater than, that for Indian mustard. Huang et al. [117] investigated the effect of organic acids amendment of uranium contaminated soils and found that citric acid was the most effective in increasing metal availability and enhancing uranium accumulation many fold in the shoots of selected plants. These and other studies indicate that the accumulation of heavy metals in plant shoot can be enhanced through the application of synthetic chelates to the soil and that with proper management, chelate-assisted heavy metal phytoextraction may provide a cost effective decontamination strategy. Care needs to be taken, however with the addition of metal chelators as the resultant increased mobility of the metals may lead to its increased leaching into surrounding water systems.

7. Conclusion

Phytoremediation is a newly emerging as a biobased and low cost, alternative technology in the cleanup of contaminated soils. The future of the

technique is still in the development and research phase and there are some technical barriers which need to be addressed such as optimization of the process, greater understanding of how plants absorb, translocate and metabolize heavy metals, the identification of genes responsible for uptake and/or degradation of the contaminant, decreasing the length of time needed for phytoremediation to work, disposing biomass so produced and protecting wild life form feeding on plants used for remediation. In addition, since contaminant uptake and tolerance depend on both plant and soil factors including soil microbes, information on microbial interactions such as nitrogen fixing bacteria and the ubiquitous mycorrhizal fungi are also required. The contribution of mycorrhizal, actinorrhizal and rhizobial symbionts to soil productivity and enhanced heavy metal uptake have not yet been seriously considered and is hitherto neglected or overlooked. In addition to optimizing metal bioavailability, it is recommended to introduce actinorrhizal, mycorrhizal and rhizobial plants as soil improvers to rehabilitate polluted sites by optimizing the uptake of bioavailable metals due to modification of the root/rhizosphere systems.

References

1. S. McEldowney, D. J. Hardman, and S. Waite, Treatment Technologies. In *Pollution Ecology and Biotreatment Technologies* (Edited by S. McEldowney, J. Hardman, and S. Waite). Longman Singapore Publishers, Singapore (1993).
2. P. S. C. Rao, G. B. Davis, and C. D. Johnston, Technologies for enhanced remediation of contaminated soils and aquifers: an overview, analysis, and case studies. In *Contaminated and the Soil Environment in the Australia Pacific Region*. (Edited by R. Naidu, R. S. Kookana, D. P. Oliver, S. Rogers and M. J. McLaughlin), pp. 361-410. Kluwer Academic Publishers, London (1996).
3. R. G. Burns, S. Rogers and I. McGhee, Remediation of inorganics and organics in industrial and urban contaminated soils. In *Contaminants and the Soil Environment in the Australia Pacific Region*. (Edited by R. Naidu, R. S. Kookana, D. P. Oliver, S. Rogers and M. J. McLaughlin), pp. 361-410. Kluwer Academic Publishers, London. (1996).
4. D. C. Adriano, *Trace Elements in the Terrestrial Environment*, p.533. Springer-Verlag, New York (1986).
5. D. C. Adriano, Bioengineering of Trace Metals. In *Advances in Trace Substances Research*. p. 513. Lewis Boca Raton, Florida. (1992).
6. B. J. Alloway, Soil processes and behaviour of metals. In *Heavy Metals in Soils* (Edited by B. J. Alloway), Blackie, Glasgow. (1990).
7. J. C. L. Meeuseen, M. G. Keizer, W. H. van Reimsdijk and F. A. M. de Haan, Solubility of cyanide in

- contaminated soil. *J. Environ. Qual.* **23**, 785-792 (1994).
8. P. M. Kroopnick, Vapor abatement cost analysis methodology for calculating life cycle costs for hydrocarbon vapor extracted during soil venting. In *Remediation of Hazardous Wastes* (Edited by D. L. Wise and D. J. Trantolo), pp. 779-790. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York (1994).
 9. R. W. Peters and L. Shem, Use of chelating agents for remediation of heavy metal contaminated soil. In *Environmental Remediation Removing Organic and Metal Ion Pollutants* (Edited by G. F. Vandegrift, D. T. Reed, and I. R. Tasker), pp. 70-84 (1992).
 10. R. Parker, *Environmental restoration technologies*. pp. 169-171. EMIAA, Yearbook, (1994).
 11. K. R. McNeil and S. Waring, Vitriification of contaminated soils. In *Contaminated Land Treatment Technologies* (Edited by J. F. Rees), pp. 143-159. Society of Chemical Industry. Elsevier Applied Sciences, London (1992).
 12. B. Smith, Remediation update funding the remedy. *Waste Manage. Environ.* **4**, 24-30 (1993).
 13. L. Shoebridge, A review of soil remediation practices in Australia. *Proceedings of the Second National Workshop on the Health Risks Management of Contaminated sites*. South Australian Health Commission, Adelaide, Australia (1993).
 14. H. A. Elliott, J. H. Linn, and G. A. Shields, Role of Fe in extractive decontamination of Pb-polluted soils. *Haz. Waste Haz. Mater* **6**, 223-228 (1989).
 15. G. M. Williams, Integrated Studies into Ground Water Pollution by Hazardous Wastes. In *Land Disposal of Hazardous Waste, Engineering and Environmental Issues* (Edited by J. R. Gronow, A. N. Schofield and R. K. Jain). Horwood Ltd. Chichester, Sussex, U.K. (1988).
 16. S. Musgrove, An Assessment of the Efficiency of Remedial Treatment of Metal Polluted Soil, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Land Reclamation*, University of Wales. Elsevier Science Publication, Essex, U. K. (1991).
 17. E. T. Thompson-Eagle and Jr. W. T. Frankenburger, Bioremediation of Soils Contaminated with Selenium. In *Advances in Soil Sciences* (Edited by R. Lal and B. A. Stewart), pp. 261-310. Springer Verlag, New York (1992).
 18. M. J. Mench, V. L. Didier, M. Loffler, A. Gomez and P. Masson, A mimicked in-situ remediation study of metal contaminated soils with emphasis on cadmium and lead. *J. Environ. Qual.* **23**, 58-63 (1994).
 19. B. Wills, *Mineral Processing Technology* (4th Edn), Pergaman Press, Oxford (1988).
 20. B. J. W. Tuin and M. Tels, Continuous treatment of heavy metal contaminated clay soil by extraction in stirred tanks and counter current column. *Environ. Technol.* **12**, 178-190 (1991).
 21. R. M. Dennis, D. Dworkin and A. J. Zupko, Soil Washing Processes for Site Remediation. In *Hazardous Waste Contaminated Soils* (Edited by D. L. Wise and D. J. Trantolo), pp. 745-778. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York (1994).
 22. P. E. Flathman, D. E. Jerger and J. H. Exner, *Bioremediation Field Experiences*, pp. 548. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida (1994).
 23. W. Wheeler, Site Remediation: An Australian perspective on best practice. In *Environmental Management Industry Association of Australia Year Book 1994*. (Edited by J. Cole). pp.156-160. Executive Media Pty. Ltd., Waterloo, NSW, Australia (1994).
 24. J. Kling, Phytoremediation of organics moving rapidly into field trials. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **31**, A129 (1997).
 25. M. C. Negri and R. R. Hinchman, Plants that remove contaminants from the environment. *Lab. Med.* **27**, 36-40 (1996).
 26. T. A. Anderson and J. R. Coats, Bioremediation Through Rhizosphere Technology. ACS Symposium Series No. 563. American Chemical Society, Washington, DC, USA. (1994).
 27. D. E. Salt, M. Blaylock, P. B. A. N. Kumar, V. Dushenkov, B. D. Ensley, I. Chet and I. Raskin, Phytoremediation: a novel strategy for the removal of toxic metals from the environment using plants. *Bio/Technology* **13**, 468-478 (1995).
 28. I. Raskin, P. B. A. N. Kumar, V. Dushenkov and D. E. Salt, Bioconcentration of heavy metals by plants. *Current Opin. Biotech.* **5**, 285-290 (1994).
 29. B. Markert, *Plants as Biomonitors for Heavy Metal Pollution of the Terrestrial Environment*. VCH, Weinheim (1994).
 30. A. J. M. Baker, S. P. McGrath, C. D. M. Sidoli and R. D. Reeves, The possibility of *in situ* heavy metal decontamination of polluted soils using crops of metal-accumulating plants. *Resour. Conserv. Recyc.* **11**, 41-49 (1994).
 31. P. B. A. N. Kumar, V. Dushenkov, H. Motto and I. Raskin, Phytoextraction - the use of plants to remove heavy metals from soils. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **29**, 1232-1238 (1995).
 32. S. D. Cunningham, W. R. Berti and J. W. Huang, Phytoremediation of contaminated soils. *Trends in Biotech.* **13**, 393-397 (1995).
 33. A. J. M. Baker and R. R. Brooks, Terrestrial higher plants which hyperaccumulate metallic elements. A review of their distribution, ecology and phytochemistry. *Biorecovery* **1**, 81-126 (1989).
 34. T. M. Chaudhry, W. J. Hayes, A. G. Khan and C. S. Khoo, Phytoremediation - focusing on accumulator plants that remediate metal contaminated soils. *Australasian J. Ecotoxicol.* (1998 in press).
 35. A. G. Khan, T. M. Chaudhry, W. J. Hayes, C. S. Khoo, L. Hill, R. Fernandez and P. Gallardo, Physical, chemical and biological characterization of a steelworks waste site at Port Kembla, NSW, Australia. *Water, Air Soil Pollut.* **104**, 389-402 (1998).
 36. R. S. Hegde and J. S. Fletcher, Influence of plant growth stage and season on the release of root phenolics by mulberry as related to development of phytoremediation technology. *Chemosphere* **32**, 2471-2479 (1996).
 37. S. D. Cunningham and D. W. Ow. Promises and prospects of phytoremediation. *Plant Physiol.* **110**, 715 – 719 (1996).

38. U. Kramer, R. D. Smith, W. W. Wenzel, I. Raskin and D. E. Salt, The role of metal transport and tolerance in nickel hyperaccumulation by *Thelapsi geosingense* Halacsy. *Plant Physiol.* **115**, 1641-1650 (1997).
39. C. Bonaventure and F. M. Johnson, Healthy environments for healthy people. Bioremediation today and tomorrow. *Environ. Health Perspect* **105**, 5-20 (1997).
40. M. E. Watanabe, Phytoremediation on the brink of commercialization. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **31**, 182-186 (1997).
41. S. E. Smith and D. J. Reed. *Mycorrhizal Symbiosis* (2nd Edn), p. 589. Academic Press, London (1997).
42. B. D. Ahiabor and H. Hirata, Influence of growth stage on the association between some tropical legumes and two variant species of *Glomus* in an Andosol. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutri.* **41**, 481-496 (1995).
43. H. Marschner, *Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants* (2nd Edn). Academic Press, London (1995).
44. K. G. Shetty, M. K. Banks, B. A. Hetrick and A. P. Schwab, Effects of mycorrhizae and fertilizer amendments on zinc tolerance of plants. *Environ. Pollut.* **88**, 307-314 (1995).
45. I. Weissenhorn and C. Leyval, Root colonization of maize by a Cd-sensitive and a Cd-tolerant *Glomus mosseae* and cadmium uptake in sand culture. *Plant Soil* **175**, 233-238 (1995).
46. T. E. Pawlowska, Blaszkowski and A. Ruhling, The mycorrhizal status of plants colonizing a calamine spoil mound in southern Poland. *Mycorrhiza* **6**, 499-505 (1996).
47. T. M. Chaudhry, L. Hill, A. G. Khan and C. Kuek, Colonization of iron and zinc-contaminated dumped filtercake waste by microbes, plants and associated mycorrhizae. In *Remediation and Management of Degraded Land* (Edited by Wong M. H, Wong J. W. C. and A. J. M. Baker). Ann Arbor Press, USA. (1980 in press).
48. A. G. Khan and T. M. Chaudhry, Effects of metaliferous mine pollution on the vegetation and their mycorrhizal associations at the Sunny Corner - A Silver Town of 1880's. In *Abstract, First International Conference on Mycorrhiza* (Edited by T. M. Szaro and T. D. Bruns), p. 70. University of California, Berkeley, USA. (1996).
49. R. K. Noyd, F. L. Pflieger and M. R. Norland, Field responses to added organic matter, arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, and fertilizer in reclamation of torbonite iron ore tailing. *Plant Soil* **179**, 89-97. (1996).
50. N. Raman and S. Sambandan, Distribution of VAM fungi in tannery effluent polluted soils of Tamil Nadu, India. *Bull. Environ. Contamin. Toxicol.* **60**, 142-150 (1998).
51. N. Raman, N. Nagarajan, S. Gopinathan and K. Sambandan, Mycorrhizal status of plant species colonizing a magnesite mine spoil in India. *Biol. Fertil. Soil* **16**, 76-78. (1993).
52. T. A. Duek, P. Visser, W. H. O. Ernst and H. Schat, *Soil Biol Biochem.* **18**, p. 331. (1986).
53. U. Galli, H. Schuepp and C. Brunold, Heavy metal binding by mycorrhizal fungi. *Physiol. Plantarum* **92**, 364-368 (1994).
54. E. J. Joner and C. Leyval, Uptake of ¹⁰⁹Cd by roots and hyphae of a *Glomus mosseae/Trifolium subterraneum* mycorrhiza from soil amended with high and low concentration of cadmium. *New Phytol.* **135**, 353-360. (1997).
55. K. Turnau. Heavy metal content and localization in mycorrhizal *Euphorbia cyparissias* from zinc wastes in Southern Poland. *Acta Soci. Bot. Poloniae* **67**, 105-113 (1998).
56. C. Leyval, B. R. Singh and E. J. Janer, Occurrence and infectivity of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in some Norwegian soils influenced by heavy metals and soil properties. *Water, Air Soil Pollut.* **83**, 203-216 (1995).
57. B. A. D. Hetrick, G. W. T. Wilson and D. H. Figge, The influence of mycorrhizal symbiosis and fertilizer amendments on establishment of vegetation in heavy metal mine spoil. *Environ. Pollut.* **86**, 171-179 (1994).
58. U. Galli, H. Schuepp, and C. Brunold, Thiol of Cu-treated maize plants inoculated with the arbuscular-mycorrhizal fungus *Glomus intraradices*. *Physiol. Plantarum* **94**, 247-253 (1995).
59. K. Killham and M. K. Firestone, Vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizal mediation of grass response to acid and heavy metal deposition. *Plant Soil* **72**, 39-48. (1986).
60. H. Schuepp, B. Dehn and H. Sticher, Interaktionen zwischen VA-Mycorrhizen und schwermetallbelastungen. *Agnew. Botanik* **61**, 85 – 96 1987.
61. M. El-Kherbawy, J. S. Angle, A. Heggo, and R. L. Chaney, Soil pH, rhizobia, and vesicular mycorrhizae inoculation effects on growth and heavy metal uptake of alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.). *Biol. Fertil. Soils* **8**, 61-65 (1989).
62. A. Heggo, A. Angle and R. L. Chaney, Effects of vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on heavy metal uptake by soybeans. *Soil Bio. Biochem.* **22**, 865-869 (1990).
63. G. Diaz, C. Azconaguilar and M. Honrubia, Influence of arbuscular mycorrhizae on heavy metal (Zn and Pb) uptake and growth of *Lygeum spartum* and *Anthyllis cytisoides*. *Plant Soil* **180**, 241-249 (1996).
64. I. Weissenhorn, C. Leyval and J. Berthelin, Bioavailability of heavy metals and abundance of arbuscular mycorrhiza in soil polluted by atmospheric deposition from a smelter. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* **19**, 22-28 (1992).
65. A. Walter, V. Romheld, H. Marschner, and S. Mori, Is the release of phytosiderophores in zinc-deficient water plants a response to impaired iron utilization. *Physiol. Plant* **92**, 493-500 (1994).
66. P. K. Donnelly and J. S. Fletcher, Potential use of mycorrhizal fungi as bioremediation agents. In *Bioremediation Through Rhizosphere Technology* (Edited by T. A. Anderson and J. R. Coats), pp. 93-99. American Chemical Society Symposium Series 563. ACS Chicago, Illinois (1994).
67. K. Turnau. Mycorrhiza in toxic metal polluted sites, *Wiadomosci Botaniczne* **37**, 43-58 (1993).
68. U. Galli, M. Meier and C. Brunold, Effects of cadmium on non-mycorrhizal and mycorrhizal Norway spruce seedlings (*Picea abies* (L.) Karst.) and its ectomycorrhizal fungus *Laccaria laccata* Scop. Ex. Fr.) Bk. And Br.: Sulphate reduction, thiols and

- distribution of the heavy metal. *New Phytol.* **125**, 837-843 (1993).
69. K. Turnau, I. Kottke, J. Dexheimer and B. Botton, Element distribution in mycelium of *Pisolithus arrhizus* treated with cadmium dust. *Ann. Bot.* **74**, 137-142 (1994).
 70. P. C. F. Tam, Heavy metal tolerance by ectomycorrhizal fungi and metal amelioration by *Pisolithus tinctorius*. *Mycorrhiza* **5**, 181-187 (1995).
 71. J. V. Colpaert and J.A. Vannasche, The effect of cadmium on ectomycorrhizal *Pinus sylvestris* L. *New Phytol.* **123**, 325-333 (1993).
 72. D. A. Wilkins, The influence of sheathing (ecto) mycorrhizas on the uptake and toxicity of metals. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **35**, 245-260 (1991).
 73. K. Turnau, I. Kottke and J. Dexheimer, Toxic element filtering in *Rhizopogon roseolus*/*Pinus sylvestris* mycorrhizas collected from calamine dumps. *Mycol. Res.* **100**, 16-22. (1996).
 74. J. V. Colpaert and J. A. Vanassche, Zinc toxicity in ectomycorrhizal *Pinus sylvestris*. *Plant Soil* **143**, 201-211 (1992).
 75. D. L. Godbold, G. Jentschke, S. Winter and P. Marschner, Ectomycorrhizas and amelioration of metal stress in forest trees. *Chemosphere* **36**, 757-762(1998).
 76. H. Bucking and W. Heyser, The effect of ectomycorrhizal fungi on Zn uptake and distribution in seedlings of *Pinus sylvestris* L. *Plant Soil* **167**, 203-212 (1994).
 77. D. Jones and A. Meuhlchen, Effects of the potentially toxic metals, aluminium, zinc and copper on ectomycorrhizal fungi. *J. Environ. Sci. Health, Part A – Environ. Sci. Engineer.* **29**, 949-966 (1994).
 78. M. Rudawska and T. Leski, Aluminium tolerance of different *Paxillus involutus* Fr. strains originating from polluted and non-polluted sites. *Acta Soci. Bot. Poloniae* **67**, 115-122 (1998).
 79. P. K. Shetty, B. A. D Hetrick, D. A. H. Figge and A. P. Schwab, Effects of mycorrhizae and other soil microbes on revegetation of heavy metal contaminated mine spoil. *Environ. Pollut.* **86**, 181-188 (1994).
 80. N. S. Aggangan, B. Dell and N. Malajczuk, Effects of chromium and nickel on growth of the ectomycorrhizal fungus *Pisolithus tinctorius* and formation of ectomycorrhizas on *Eucalyptus urophylla* Blake, S.T. *Geoderma* **84**, 15-27 (1998).
 81. B. T. Walton, E. A. Guthrie and A. M. Hoylman, Toxicant degradation in the rhizosphere. In *Bioremediation Through Rhizosphere Technology* (Edited by T. A. Anderson and J. R. Coats). pp. 11-26. American Chemical Society Symposium Series 563. ACS Chicago, Illinois (1994).
 82. C. Baird, *Environmental Chemistry*. W.H.Freeman. New York (1997).
 83. H. Marschner and V. Romheld, Strategies of plants for acquisition of iron. *Plant Soil* **165**, 262-274 (1995).
 84. F. S. Zhang, V. Romheld and H. Marschner, Diurnal rhythm of release of phytosiderophores and uptake rate of zinc in iron-deficient wheat. *Plant Nutri.* **37**, 671-678 (1991).
 85. M. J. Graham, C. D. Nickell, and R. G. Hoefl, Effect of manganese deficiency on seed yield of soybean cultivars. *J. Plant Nutri.* **17**, 1333-1340 (1994).
 86. W. E. Rauser, Copper-binding protein and copper tolerance in *Agrostis gigantea* *Plant Sci. Letters* **33**, 239-247 (1984).
 87. W. E. Rauser, Phytochelatin. *Ann. Rev. Biochem.* **59**, 61-86 (1990).
 88. J. C. Steffens, Heavy metal-binding peptides of plants. *Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* **41**, 553-575 (1990).
 89. M. Margoshes and B. L. Valsee, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **79**, 4813-4814 (1957).
 90. R. P. Singh, R. D. Tripathi, S. K. Sinha, R. Meheshwari and H. S. Srivastava, Responses of higher plants to lead contaminated environment. *Chemosphere* **34**, 2467-2493 (1997).
 91. W. G. Keltjnes and M. L. Vanbeusichem, Phytochelatin as biomarkers for heavy metal toxicity in maize – single metal effects of copper and cadmium. *J. Plant Nutri.* **21**, 635-648 (1998).
 92. I. Leopold and D. Gunther, Investigation of the binding properties of heavy-metal-peptide complexes in plant cell culture using HPLC-ICP-MS. *Fresenius J. Analyt. Chem.* **359**, 364-370 (1997).
 93. Choi, S. Y., E. M. Baek and S. Y. Lee, An arabidopsis cDNA induced under cadmium stress is homologous to sequences present in the plants DNA binding proteins. *Mol. Cells* **6**, 429-435 (1996).
 94. D. E. Salt, R. D. Smith and I. Raskin, Phytoremediation. *Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* **49**, 643-668 (1998).
 95. M. H. Zenk, Heavy metal detoxification in higher plants-A review. *Gene* **179**, 21-30 (1996).
 96. E. A. Gwozdz, R. Przymusinski, R. Rucinska and J. Deckert, Plant cell responses to heavy metals - molecular and physiological aspects. *Acta Physiol. Plant.* **19**, 459-469 (1997).
 97. H. J. Schaefer, A. Haagkerwer and T. Rausch, cDNA cloning and expression analysis of genes encoding GSH synthesis in roots of the heavy-metal accumulator *Brassica juncea* L.- evidence for Cd-induction of a putative mitochondrial gamma-glutamyl-cystein synthetase isoform. *Plant Mol. Biol.* **37**, 87-97 (1998).
 98. E. Grill, E. L. Winnacker and M. H. Zenk, Phytochelatin, heavy-metal binding peptides of plants are synthesized from glutathione with a specific γ -glutamyl-cysteinyl dipeptidyl transpeptidase (phytochelatin synthase). *Proc. Nat. Aca. Sci. USA* **86**, pp. 6838-6842 (1989).
 99. H. Harmens, P. L. M. Koevoets, J. A. C. Verkleij and W. H. O. Ernst, The role of low molecular weight organic acids in the mechanism of increased zinc tolerance in *Silene vulgaris* (Moench) Garcke. *New Phytol.* **126**, 615-621 (1994).
 100. A. Tukendorf, The response of spinach plants to excess of copper and cadmium. *Photosynthetica* **28**, 573-575 (1993).
 101. S. Klapheck, W. Fliegner and I. Zimmer, Hydroxymethyl-phytochelatin [(γ -glutamylcysteine)(N)-serine] are metal induced

- peptides in the *Poaceae*. *Plant Physiol.* **104**, 1325-1332 (1994).
102. Y. T. Guo and H. Marschner, Uptake, distribution and binding of cadmium and nickel in different plant species. *J. Plant Nutri.* **18**, 2691-2706 (1995).
103. M. Inouhe, S. Ninomiya, H. Tohyama, M. Joho and T. Murayama, Different characteristic of roots in the cadmium-tolerance and Cd-binding complex formation between monocotyledons and dicotyledonous plants. *J. Plant Res.* **107**, 201-207 (1994).
104. M. R. Macnair, The genetics of metal tolerance in vascular plants. *New Phytol.* **124**, 541-559 (1993).
105. R. K. Mehra, E. B. Tarbet, W. R. Gray and D. R. Winge, *Proc. Nat. Aca. Sci. USA* **85**, pp. 8815-8819 (1998).
106. L. Wu, X. Guo and G. S Banuelos, Accumulation of seleno-amino acids in legume and grass plant species grown in selenium laden soil. *J. Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* (1995 In Press).
107. D. W. Ow, Phytochelatin-mediated cadmium tolerance in *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*. *In vitro Cell. Dev. Biol.* **29P**, 213-219 (1993).
108. D. W. Ow, Heavy metal tolerance genes-prospective tools for bioremediation. *Resour. Conserv. Recyc.* **18**, 135-149 (1996).
109. T. C. Hunter, and R. K. Mehra, A role of HEM² in cadmium tolerance. *J. Inorg. Biochem.* **69**: 293-303 (1998).
110. E. Hoffland, G. R. Findenegg and J. A. Nelemans, Solubilization of rock phosphate by rape: II. Local root exudation of organic acids as a response to P-starvation. *Plant Soil* **113**, 161-165 (1989).
111. Y. Ohwaki and H. Hirata, Differences in carboxylic acid exudation from P-starved leguminous crops in relation to carboxylic acid contents in plant tissues and phospholipid level in roots. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* **38**, 235-243. (1992).
112. Z. Liu, W. Shi and X. Fan, The rhizosphere effects of phosphorus and iron in soil. *Trans. 14th Int. Cong. Soil Sci., Kyoto, Japan* **2**, 147-152 (1990).
113. H. Marschner, Role of root growth, arbuscular mycorrhiza and root exudates for the efficiency in nutrient acquisition. *Field Crops Res.* **56**, 203-207 (1998).
114. A. A. Meharg, Integrated tolerance mechanisms-constitutive and adaptive plant responses to elevated metal concentrations in the environment. *Plant Cell Environ.* **17**, 989-993 (1994).
115. J. C. Trafdar and H. Marschner, Phosphatase activity in the rhizosphere of VA mycorrhizal wheat supplied with inorganic and organic phosphorus. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **26**, 387-395 (1994).
116. S. D. Ebbs and L. V. Kochian, Phytoextraction of zinc by oat (*Avina sativa*), barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) and Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*). *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **32**, 802-806 (1998).
117. J. W. W., Huang, J. J. Chen, W. R. Berti and S. D. Cunningham, Phytoremediation of lead contaminated soils-Role of synthetic chelates in lead phytoextraction, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **31**, 800-805 (1997).