Phytoremediation of heavy metals: A strategy for the removal of toxic metals from the environment using plants
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Abstract
Heavy metals constitute a heterogeneous group of elements; a relatively high density of approximately 6 g cm$^{-3}$ is their common characteristic with atomic weight more than that of iron (Alloway, 1997) [3]. Sources of heavy metal contaminants in soils include metaliferous mining and smelting, metallurgical industries, sewage sludge treatment, warfare and military training, waste disposal sites, agricultural fertilizers and electronic industries (Alloway 1995) [2]. Toxic heavy metals cause DNA damage, and their carcinogenic effects in animals and humans are probably caused by their mutagenic ability (Knasmüller et al., 1998; Baudouin et al., 2002) [46, 8]. Metal-contaminated soil can be remediated by chemical, physical or biological techniques (Mc Eldowney et al., 1993) [56]. Chemical and physical treatments irreversibly affect soil properties, destroy biodiversity and may render the soil useless as a medium for plant growth. Phytoremediation involves the use of plants to remove, transfer, stabilize and/or degrade contaminants in soil, sediment and water (Hughes et al., 1997) [43]. This plant based technology has gained acceptance in the past ten years as a cheap, efficient and environment friendly technology especially for removing toxic metals. Plant based technologies for metal decontamination are extraction, volatilization, stabilization and rhizofiltration. Various soil and plant factors such as soil’s physical and chemical properties, plant and microbial exudates, metal bioavailability, plant’s ability to uptake, accumulate, translocate, sequester and detoxify metal amounts for phytoremediation efficiency. Use of transgenic to enhance phytoremediation potential seems promising. Despite several advantages, phytoremediation has not yet become a commercially available technology. Progress in the field is hindered by lack of understanding of complex interactions in the rhizosphere and plant based mechanisms which allow metal translocation and accumulation in plants.

Keywords: Phytoremediation, heavy metals, strategy, removal, toxic metals, environment

Introduction
Heavy metals constitute a heterogeneous group of elements; a relatively high density of approximately 6 g cm$^{-3}$ is their common characteristic with atomic weight more than that of iron (Alloway, 1990) [1]. Over recent decades, the annual worldwide release of heavy metals reached 22,000 t (metric ton) for cadmium, 939,000 t for copper, 783,000 t for lead and 1,350,000 t for zinc (Singh et al., 2003) [79]. Sources of heavy metal contaminants in soils include metaliferous mining and smelting, metallurgical industries, sewage sludge treatment, warfare and military training, waste disposal sites, agricultural fertilizers and electronic industries (Alloway, 1995) [2]. Ground-transportation also causes metal contamination. Highway traffic, maintenance, and de-icing operations generate continuous surface and ground- water contaminant sources. Tread ware, brake abrasion, and corrosion are well documented heavy metal sources associated with highway traffic (Ho and Tai 1988; Fatoki1996; Garcia and Millán 1998; Sánchez Martínez, 2006) [32, 33, 35, 76].

The ability of plant to germinate and establish under heavy metal stress is an early indication of tolerance of the plant. Seed germination was the first physiological process affected by heavy metals when present in the culture medium (Peralta et al., 2001) [56]. Decrease in root growth is a well-documented effect due to heavy metals in trees and crops (Breckle, 1991). Shoot growth is an important morphological parameter related to growth and development of whole plant which is severely affected by Cr and other heavy metals (Khan et al., 2000; Rout et al., 1997) [45].
Toxic heavy metals cause DNA damage, and their carcinogenic effects in animals and humans are probably caused by their mutagenic ability (Knasmuller et al., 1998; Baudouin et al., 2002) [46, 8]. Exposure to high levels of these metals has been linked to adverse effects on human health and wildlife. Lead poisoning in children causes neurological damage leading to reduced intelligence, loss of short term memory, learning disabilities and coordination problems. The effects of arsenic include cardiovascular problems, skin cancer and other skin effects, peripheral neuropathy (WHO 1997) and kidney damage. Cadmium accumulates in the kidney, sand is implicated in a range of kidney diseases (WHO1997) [93]. The principal health risks associated with mercury are damage to the nervous system, with such symptoms as uncontrollable shaking, muscle wasting. Partial blindness, and deformities in children exposed in the womb (WHO 1997) [93].

Metal-contaminated soil can be remediated by chemical, physical or biological techniques (Mc Eldowney et al., 1993) [50]. Chemical and physical treatments irreversibly affect soil properties, destroy biodiversity and may render the soil useless as a medium for plant growth. These remediation methods can be costly. Table 1summarizes the cost of different remediation technologies. Among the listed remediation technologies, Phyto extraction is one of the lowest cost techniques for contaminated soil remediation. There is a need to develop suitable cost-effective biological soil remediation techniques to remove contaminants without affecting soil fertility. Phytoremediation could provide sustainable techniques for metal remediation.

The term phytoremediation (“Phyto” meaning plant, and the Latin suffix “remedium” meaning to clean or restore) refers to the use of plants to remove, transfer, stabilize and/or degrade contaminants in soil, sediment and water (Hughes et al., 1997) [43]. Some plants which grow on metalliferous soils have developed the ability to accumulate massive amounts of indigenous metals in their tissues without symptoms of toxicity (Reeves and Brooks 1983; Baker and Brooks 1989; Baker et al., 1991; Entry et al., 1999) [4, 6, 65, 32]. The idea of using plants to extract metals from contaminated soil was reintroduced and developed by (Utsunamyia, 1980) [88] and Chaney (1983) [16]. The first field trial on Zn and Cd phyto extraction was conducted by (Baker et al., 1991) [4].

Table 1: Cost of different remediation technologies (Glass 1999) [38]

| Process                | Cost (US$/ton) | Other factors                    |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Verification           | 75–425         | Long-term monitoring             |
| Land filling           | 100–500        | Transport/excavation/Monitoring   |
| Chemical Treatment     | 100–500        | Recycling of contaminants        |
| Electro kinetics       | 20–200         | Monitoring                       |
| Phytoextraction        | 5–40           | Disposal of phyto mass           |

Categories of Phytoremediation

Depending on the contaminants, the site conditions, the level of clean-up required, and the types of plants, phytoremediation technology can be used for containment(phyto immobilization and phyto stabilization) or removal (phyto extraction and phyto volatilization) purposes (Thangavel and Subhuram 2004) [84]. The four different plant-based technologies of phytoremediation, each having a different mechanism of action for remediating metal-polluted soil, sediment, or water:

1. Phyto stabilization, where plants stabilize, rather than remove contaminants by plant roots metal retention;
2. Phytoremediative techniques, involving plants to clean various aquatic environments;
3. Phyto volatilization, utilizing plants to extract certain metals from soil and then release them into the atmosphere by volatilization; and
4. Phyto extraction, in which plants absorb metals from soil and translocate them to harvestable shoots where they accumulate.

Phytostabilization

Phytostabilization uses certain plant species to immobilize contaminants in soil, through absorption and accumulation by roots, adsorption onto roots or precipitation within the root zone and physical stabilization of soils. This process reduces the mobility of contaminants and prevents migration to groundwater or air. This can re-establish vegetative cover at sites where natural vegetation is lacking due to high metal concentrations (Tordoff et al., 2000) [85]. Metal-tolerant species may be used to restore vegetation to such sites, thereby decreasing the potential migration of contaminants through wind, transport of exposed surface soils, leaching of soil and contamination of groundwater (Stoltz and GREGER, 2002) [81]. Unlike other phytoremediative techniques, phyto stabilization is not intended to remove metal contaminants from a site, but rather to stabilize them by accumulation in roots or precipitation within rootzones, reducing the risk to human health and the environment. For phytostabilization of metals a combination of trees and grasses work best. Fast-transpiring trees such as ‘Poplar’ maintain an upward flow to prevent downward leaching, while grasses prevent wind erosion and lateral runoff with thin dense root system. Further, grasses do not accumulate as much metals in their shoots as dicot species, minimizing exposure of wildlife to toxic elements (Pilon Smits., 2005) [61]. Phytostabilization is most effective for fine-textured soils with high organic-matter content, but it is suitable for treating a wide range of sites where large areas are subject to surface contamination (Cunningham et al., 1997; Berti and Cunningham 2000) [19, 9]. However, some highly contaminated sites are not suitable for phyto stabilization, because plant growth and survival is impossible (Berti and Cunningham 2000) [9]. Phyto stabilization has advantages over other soil-remediation practices in that it is less expensive, easier to implement, and preferable aesthetically. (Berti and Cunningham 2000; Schnoor 2000) [9, 76].

Phytofiltration

Phytofiltration is the use of plant roots (rhizofiltration) or seedlings (bastic filtration) to absorb or adsorb pollutants, mainly metals, from water and aqueous waste streams (Prasad and Freitas, 2003) [64]. Plant roots or seedlings grown in aerated water absorb, precipitate and concentrate toxic metals from polluted effluents (Dushenko and Kapulnik 2000; Elless et al., 2005) [25, 30]. Mechanisms involved in bio sorption include chemisorption, complexation, ion exchange, micro precipitation, hydroxide condensation onto the bio surface, and surface adsorption (GARDEA-TORRESDEY et al., 2004) [36]. Rhizofiltration uses terrestrial plants instead of aquatic plants because the former feature much larger fibrous root systems covered with root hairs with extremely large surface areas. Metal pollutants in industrial-process water and in groundwater are most commonly removed by
precipitation or flocculation, followed by sedimentation and disposal of the resulting sludge (Ensley 2000)\(^{[30]}\). The process of volumetrically raising plants hydroponically and transplanting them into metal-polluted waters where plants absorb and concentrate the metals in their roots and shoots (Dushenkov et al., 1995; Salt et al., 1995; Flathman and Lanza 1998; Zhu et al., 1999)\(^{[25, 73, 34, 96]}\). Root exudates and changes in rhizosphere pH may also cause metals to precipitate onto root surfaces. As they become saturated with the metal contaminants, roots or shoot plants are harvested for disposal (Flathman and Lanza 1998; Zhu et al., 1999)\(^{[34, 96]}\). Several aquatic species have the ability to remove heavy metals from water, including water hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes, Kay et al., 1984; Zhu et al., 1999)\(^{[44, 96]}\), pennywort (Hydrocotyle umbellata L., Dierberg et al., 1987)\(^{[24]}\), and duckweed (Lemna minor L., Mo et al., 1989). However, these plants have limited potential for rhizofiltration because they are not efficient in removing metals as a result of their small, slow growing roots (Dushenkov et al., 1995)\(^{[28]}\). The high water content of aquatic plants complicates their drying, composting, or incineration. In spite of limitations, Zhu et al., (1999)\(^{[96]}\) indicated that water hyacinth is effective in removing trace elements in waste streams. Sunflower (Helianthus annus L.) and Indian mustard (Brassica juncea Czern.) are the most promising terrestrial candidates for removing metals from water. The roots of Indian mustard are effective in capturing Cd, Cr, Cu, Ni, Pb, and Zn (Dushenkov et al., 1995)\(^{[28]}\), whereas sunflower removes Pb (Dushenkov et al., 1995)\(^{[28]}\), U (Dushenkov et al., 1997a), 137Cs, and 90Sr (Dushenkov et al., 1997b)\(^{[26, 27]}\) from hydroponic solutions. A novel phytofiltration technology has been proposed by Sekha et al., (2004) for removal and recovery of lead (Pb) from wastewaters. This technology uses plant-based biomaterial from the bark of the plant commonly called Indian sarsaparilla (Hemidesmus indicus). The target of their research was polluted surface water and groundwater at industrially contaminated sites.

**Phytoextraction**

Phytoextraction is the release of pollutants from the plant to the atmosphere as a gas. Although it works well for organics, this can be used for a few inorganics that can exist in volatile form i.e. Se, Hg and As (Hansen et al., 1998; Rugh et al., 1996)\(^{[40, 69]}\). Members of the Brassica genus and some microorganisms are particularly good volatilizers of Se (Terry et al., 1992)\(^{[81]}\). Among the aquatic species, rice, rabbit foot grass, Azolla and pickle weed are the best Se volatilizers (Hansen et al., 1998; Lin et al., 2000; Pilon-Smits et al., 1999; Zayad et al., 2000)\(^{[40, 95, 62]}\). Volatilization of Se involves assimilation of inorganic Se into the organic selenocysteine (Se Cys) and selenomethionine (Se Met). The latter can be methylelated to form dimethylselenide (DMSe), which is volatile (Terry et al., 2000)\(^{[95]}\). Volatilization of As and Hg has been demonstrated for microorganisms, but these elements do not appear to be volatilized to significant levels by nontransgenic plants (Rugh et al., 1996)\(^{[69]}\). In Hg-contaminated soils and sediments, microbial activity converts the highly toxic Hg (II) into organomercurials and, under optimum conditions, elemental Hg (which is far less toxic) enters the global biogeochemical cycle upon volatilization (Bizily et al., 2000)\(^{[11]}\). Because volatilization completely removes the pollutant from the site as a gas, without need for plant harvesting and disposal, this is an attractive technology. A risk assessment study for volatile Se and Hg reported that the pollutant was dispersed and diluted to such an extent that it did not pose a threat (Lin et al., 2000; Meagher et al., 2000)\(^{[95, 11]}\). Although phytovolatilization is a passive process, it may be maximized by using plant species with high transpiration rates, by overexpression of enzymes such as cystathionine-V-synthase that mediates S/Se volatilization (Van Huyzen et al., 2003)\(^{[88]}\) and by transferring gene for Se volatilization from hyper accumulators to non-accumulators (Le Duc et al., 2004)\(^{[48]}\).

**Phytovolatilization**

Phytovolatilization is the release of pollutants from the plant to the atmosphere as a gas. Although it works well for organics, this can be used for a few inorganics that can exist in volatile form i.e. Se, Hg and As (Hansen et al., 1998; Rugh et al., 1996)\(^{[40, 69]}\). Members of the Brassica genus and some microorganisms are particularly good volatilizers of Se (Terry et al., 1992)\(^{[81]}\). Among the aquatic species, rice, rabbit foot grass, Azolla and pickle weed are the best Se volatilizers (Hansen et al., 1998; Lin et al., 2000; Pilon-Smits et al., 1999; Zayad et al., 2000)\(^{[40, 95, 62]}\). Volatilization of Se involves assimilation of inorganic Se into the organic selenocysteine (Se Cys) and selenomethionine (Se Met). The latter can be methylelated to form dimethylselenide (DMSe), which is volatile (Terry et al., 2000)\(^{[95]}\). Volatilization of As and Hg has been demonstrated for microorganisms, but these elements do not appear to be volatilized to significant levels by nontransgenic plants (Rugh et al., 1996)\(^{[69]}\). In Hg-contaminated soils and sediments, microbial activity converts the highly toxic Hg (II) into organomercurials and, under optimum conditions, elemental Hg (which is far less toxic) enters the global biogeochemical cycle upon volatilization (Bizily et al., 2000)\(^{[11]}\). Because volatilization completely removes the pollutant from the site as a gas, without need for plant harvesting and disposal, this is an attractive technology. A risk assessment study for volatile Se and Hg reported that the pollutant was dispersed and diluted to such an extent that it did not pose a threat (Lin et al., 2000; Meagher et al., 2000)\(^{[95, 11]}\). Although phytovolatilization is a passive process, it may be maximized by using plant species with high transpiration rates, by overexpression of enzymes such as cystathionine-V-synthase that mediates S/Se volatilization (Van Huyzen et al., 2003)\(^{[88]}\) and by transferring gene for Se volatilization from hyper accumulators to non-accumulators (Le Duc et al., 2004)\(^{[48]}\).

**Fig 1:** Chromium uptake in shoots of different crops grown in two Cr contaminated soils (soil 1 texture- silty loam and soil 2 – sandy soils)
Deepali and Gangwar 2009 [21] found in their study that the Cr accumulation in the roots and shoots of *Spinach oleracea* in percent are shown fig 3 were higher at minimum concentration. Similarly, Verma *et al.*, (2005) observed that metal take up by water hyacinth (*Eichornia crassipes*) was higher at low concentration (20%) and decreased thereafter with increase in concentration. From the above result it is also concluded that metal accumulation is higher in roots as compare to shoots.

M. Ghosh and S. P. Singh 2005 [37] in their comparative study found that the order of Cr extraction in five different weeds and two brassica species was *Ipomoea carnea* > *Datura innoxia* > *Cassia tora* > *Phragmites karka* > *Brassica juncea* > *Lantana camara* > *Brassica campestris*, *Phragmites karka* how and much greater tolerance to metals than other plants but the uptake was less. Other than *Lantana camara*, all the tested weeds were better for chromium extraction than the accumulator *Brassica species*. This indicates that weeds can be used in place of *brassica species* and it requires very less cure (fig 4).

**Table**: Average dry biomass (g) grown in chromium treated soils (n= 6) on 90th day

| Total Cr added in Soil (μg kg⁻¹) | *Brassica campestris* | *Brassica juncea* | *Datura innoxia* | *Ipomoea carnea* | *Phragmites karka* | *Cassia tora* | *Lantana camara* |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Control                          | 3.28                 | 3.31             | 12.32            | 19.59            | 11.46             | 12.45        | 5.43            |
| 5                                | 1.86**               | 2.89**           | 8.57**           | 15.01**          | 7.66**            | 7.90**       | 2.27**          |
| 10                               | 1.47**               | 2.16**           | 7.24**           | 11.33**          | 5.93**            | 7.30**       | 1.93**          |
| 20                               | 1.36**               | 1.17**           | 6.49**           | 10.50**          | 7.64**            | 7.21**       | 1.76**          |
| 50                               | NG                   | NG               | NG               | NG               | 1.51**            | NG           | 1.09**          |
| 100                              | NG                   | NG               | NG               | NG               | 1.06**            | NG           | NG              |
| 200                              | NG                   | NG               | NG               | NG               | 0.78**            | NG           | NG              |

Significantly different * (p ≤ 0.05) & ** (p ≤ 0.005) in comparison to control plant.

NG = No Growth observed
n = number of plants

**Fig 3**: Cr accumulation (%) in root and shoot of spinaches oleracea

**Fig 4**: Average dry biomass (g) grown in chromium treated soils (n= 6) on 90th day
Although, it has been known since the late 1800s that a special category of plants, the so called hyper accumulators can accumulate extraordinary levels of metals, the idea of using these plants for phytoextraction only appeared in the literature in the Zn up to levels that are 100 to 1,000 times of those normally accumulated by plants grown under the same conditions (Baker et al., 2000; Ma et al., 2001; Brooks, 1998) [67]. A number of these species are members of Brassicaceae, including a species of Arabidopsis, A. halleri, which can hyper accumulate Zn in its shoots (Reeves and Backer, 2000) [68]. Recently, Sonchus asper and Corydalis pterygogetata grown on lead – zinc mining area in China have been identified as heavy metal hyper accumulators (Yanqun et al., 2005) [93]. Environment Canada has developed a database (PHYTOREM) of 775 plants with capabilities to accumulate or hyper accumulate one or several key metallic elements. Table 2 lists some important hyper accumulators including the recently discovered ones. Despite these properties hyper accumulators are of limited use for large scale applications because they are often slow growing and attain low biomass. So far only one hyper accumulator species, the Ni hyper accumulator. Alyssum bertolonii, has been used for phytoremediation in the field (Chaney et al., 2000; Li et al., 2003) [18]. Pteris vittata, an Arsenic (As) hyper accumulating fern may also show promise for phytoextraction of As. Brake fern, Pteris vittata, a fast growing plant is reported to tolerate soils contaminated with arsenic as much as 1500 p.p.m and its fronds concentrate the toxic metal to 22,630 p.p.m in 6 weeks (Ma et al., 2001). However, in the coming years, mining of the genomic sequences from Arabidopsis thaliana and rice and availability of new genomic technologies should lead to identification of novel genes important for heavy metal remediation. The relevant genes from these hyper accumulators may then be introduced into higher biomass producing non-accumulators for an improved phyto remediation potential, making it a commercially viable technology.

### Table 2: Several metal hyper accumulator species with respective metal accumulated

| S.no | Plant species               | Metal      | References |
|------|-----------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1    | Thlaspi caerulescens        | Zn, Cd     | Reeves and Brooks (1983) [65]; Baker and Walker (1990) [5] |
| 2    | Ipomea alpine               | Cu         | Baker and Walker (1990) [5] |
| 3    | Seberitia acuminate         | Ni         | Jaffre et al., (1976) |
| 4    | Haumaniastrum robertii      | Co         | Brooks (1977) |
| 5    | Astragalus racemosus        | Se         | Beath et al., (2002) [10] |
| 6    | Arabidopsis thaliana        | Zn, Cu, Pb, Mn, P | Lasat (2002b) [97] |
| 7    | Brassica oleracea           | Cd         | Salt et al., (1995b) [73] |
| 8    | Hemidesmus indicus          | Pb         | Chandra Sekhar et al., (2005) [15] |
| 9    | Pteris vittata              | As         | Ma et al., (2001); Zhang et al., (2004) [51]; Tu and Ma (2005) |
| 10   | Helianthus anus             | Cd, Cr, Ni | Turgut et al., (2004) [86] |

**Fig 5:** Arsenic (As) concentration in the fronds of Pteris vittata after growing in uncontaminated soil (6 ppm As) and Arsenics contaminated soil (400 ppm As)

### Role of metal chelators

As mentioned earlier, the complex root secretions from plants contain natural chelating agents that affect pollutant solubility and uptake. Inside plant tissues such chelator’s compounds also play a role in tolerance, sequestration and transport (Ross, 1994). Phytosiderophores are chelators that facilitate uptake of Fe and perhaps other metals in grasses (Higuchi et al., 1999) [4]. Organic acids (e.g. citrate, malate, acetate) not only can facilitate uptake of metals with roots but also play a role in transport, sequestration, and tolerance of metals (Salt et al., 1995b; Von Wieren et al., 1999) [73, 91]. As a tolerance and detoxification mechanism, chelated metals are effluxed from cytoplasm and sequestered in the vacuolar compartment, which excludes them from cellular sites where processes such as cell division and respiration occur, thus providing an effective protective mechanism (Chaney et al., 1997; Hall, 2002) [17, 39]. Detoxification of Cd and Zn in Thlaspi caerulescens is achieved by vacuolar compartmentalization (Ma et al., 2005).
Phytoremediation using trees

Trees have been suggested as a low-cost, sustainable and ecologically sound solution to the remediation of heavy metal-contaminated land (Dickinson., 2000) [23], especially when it is uneconomic to use other treatments or there is no time pressure on the reuse of the land (Riddell-Black, 1994) [66]. Studies of tree establishment on contaminated land have considered a number of different species, e.g. Salix (Willow), Betula (Birch), Populus (Poplar), Alnus (Alder) and Acer (Sycamore). While many of these studies were interested primarily in metal uptake, distribution within the plant and tolerance mechanisms, for the purposes of phytoremediation, most attention has been paid to fast growing species, such as willow. The genus Salix is a member of the Salicaceae plant family. There are 400 species of willow, with more than 200 listed hybrids (Newsholme, 1992) [58]. The majority of the genus Salix grow in lowland wetland habitats and have evolved a number of varieties and hybrids (Sommerville., 1992) [79]. A characteristic of willow, which makes it a very suitable tree for use in phytoremediation, is that it can be frequently harvested by coppicing, yielding as much as 10–15 dry thaw−1 year−1 (Riddell-Black., 1993) [66].

Bushy Salix species with erect stems, rapid growth and good rooting ability are the most suitable for biomass coppice, with S. viminalis being one of the most widely used species (Ahman and Larsson, 1994) [1]. In addition to high biomass productivity, Salix trees also have an effective nutrient uptake, high evapotranspiration rate and a pronounced clone specific capacity for heavy metal uptake. Possible end-product uses of Salix biomass include fuel for direct burning as wood chips, raw material for the production of paper, chipboard and charcoal, a source of viscose for the textile industry, basket weaving and the production of briquettes, ethanol and ruminant livestock feed supplement (McElroy and Dawson, 1986). Use as wood fuel could allow possible heavy metal recovery through the scrubbing of smoke gases and proper handling of ashes (Perttu and Kowalik, 1997; Dahl, 2000) [59].

Transgenic plants in phytoremediation

The plant species currently being developed for phytoremediation seem capable of effective bioaccumulation of targeted contaminant, but efficiency might be improved through the use of transgenic (genetically engineered) plants. Naturally occurring plant species that can be genetically engineered for improved phytoremediation include Brassica juncea for phytoremediation of heavy metals from soil (Dushenkov et al., 1995) [28], Helianthus anus (Dushenkov et al., 1995) [28] and Chenopodium amaranthicolor (Eapen et al., 2003) [29] for rhizofiltration of uranium. In general, any dicotyledon plant species can be genetically engineered using the Agrobacterium vector system, while most monocotyledon plants can be transformed using particle gun or electroporation techniques. The increase in metal accumulation as the result of these genetic engineering approaches in typically two to threefold more metal per plant, which potentially enhances phytoremediation efficiency by the same factor. It is not yet clear how applicable these transgenic are for environmental clean up, since no field studies have been reported except one using transgenic Indian mustard plant that overexpresses enzymes involved in sulfate/selenate reduction. (Pilon Smits et al., 1999; Zhu et al., 1999) [62, 96]. Potential environmental impacts of transgenics such as competitiveness of transgenic to wild type, effect on birds, insects, etc., that might feed on plant biomass containing high concentration of toxic metals and possibility of gene transfer to other plants by pollination require continuous monitoring. Genetic engineering of the chloroplast genome offers a novel way to obtain high expression without the risk of spreading the transgene via pollen (Ruiz et al., 2003) [70]. In future, as more data on field trials and associated risk assessment would be available, transgenics will play an important role in commercial phytoremediation.

Conclusions

Phytoremediation is still in its research and development phase, with many technical issues needing to be addressed. The results, though encouraging, suggest that further development is needed. Phytoremediation is an interdisciplinary technology that can benefit from many different approaches. Results already obtained have indicated that some plants can be effective in toxic metal remediation. The processes that affect metal availability, metal uptake, translocation, chelation, degradation, and volatilization need to be investigated in detail. Better knowledge of these biochemical mechanisms may lead to: (1) Identification of novel genes and the subsequent development of transgenic plants with superior remediation capacities; (2) Better understanding of the ecological interactions involved (e.g. plant-microbe interactions); (3) Appreciation of the effect of the remediation process on ecological interactions; and (4) Knowledge of the entry and movement of the pollutant in the ecosystem. In addition to being desirable from a fundamental biological perspective, findings will help improve risk assessment during the design of remediation plans, as well as alleviation of risks associated with the remediation. It is important that public awareness of this technology be considered, with clear and precise information made available to the general public to enhance its acceptability as a global sustainable technology. So far, most phytoremediation experiments have taken place on a laboratory scale, with plants grown in hydroponic settings fed heavy metal diets. Both agronomic management practices and plant genetic abilities need to be optimized to develop commercially useful practice.

References

1. Ahman I, Larsson S. Genetic improvement of willow (Salix) as a source of bioenergy. Norway Journal of Agricultural Science. 1994; 18:47-56.
2. Alloway BJ. Soil processes and the behavior of metals. In: Alloway B. J. (Ed), Heavy metals in soils. London: Blackie, 1995, 38-57.
3. Alloway BJ, Ayres DC. Chemical principles of Environmental Pollution, 2nd Edition, Blackie Academic and Professional, Chapman and Hall, London, 1997, 190-242.
4. Baker AJM, Brooks RR. Terrestrial higher plants which hyper accumulate metallic elements-Review of their distribution, ecology, and phytochemistry. Bio recovery. 1989; 1:81-126.
5. Baker AJM, Walker PL. Ecophysiology of metal uptake by tolerant plants. In: Heavy metal tolerance in plants: Evolutionary aspects (Ed: A.J. Shaw). CRC Press, Boca Raton, F.L., 1990, 155-177.
6. Baker AJM, Reeves RD, McGrath SP. In situ decontamination of heavy metal polluted soils using crops of metal accumulating plants – A feasibility study. In RE. Hinchee & RF. Olfenbuttel (Eds.), In-situ
bioremediation. Stoneham, M. A: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1991; 539-544.
7. Baker AJM, McGrath SP, Reeves RD, Smith JAC. Metal hyper accumulator plants: A review of the ecology and physiology of a biological resource for phytoremediation of metal-polluted soils. In: Phytoremediation of contaminated soil and water (Eds: N. Terry and G. Benuelos). Boca Raton, Lewis, 2000, 85-108.
8. Baudouin C, Charveron M, Tarrouse R, Gall Y. Environmental pollutants and skin cancer. Cell Biology and Toxicology. 2002; 18:341-348.
9. Berti WR, Cunningham SD. Phytostabilization of metals. Phytoremediation of toxic metals: Using plants to clean-up the environment (Eds: I. Raskin & B. D. Ensley, Wiley, New York, 2000, 71-88.
10. Beath OA, Eppsom HF, Gilbert GS. Selenium distribution in and seasonal variation of vegetation type occurring on seleniferous soils. Journal of American Pharmacy Association. 2002; 26:394-405.
11. Bizily SP, Rugh CL, Meagher RB. Phytotoxic detoxification of hazardous organomercurials by genetically engineered plants. Natural Biotechnology. 2000; 18:213-217.
12. Blaylock MJ, Huang JW. Phytoextraction of metals. In: Phytoremediation of toxic metals using plants to clean up the environment (Eds: I. Raskin and B.D. Ensley), Wiley, New York, 2000, 53-70.
13. Brooks RR. Copper and cobalt uptake by Haumaniastrum species. Plant Soil. 1977; 48:541-544.
14. Brooks RR. Plants that hyper accumulate heavy metals. CAB Intl. Wallingford, 1988.
15. Chandra Sekhar K, Kamala CT, Chary NS, Balaram V, Garcia G. Potential of Hemidesmus indicus for phytoextraction of lead from industrially contaminated soils. Chemosphere. 2005; 58(4):507-514.
16. Chaney RL. Plant uptake of inorganic waste constituents. In JF Parr, PB Marsh, JM, Kla (Eds.), Land treatment of hazardous wastes Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes Data Corp. 1983, 50-76.
17. Chaney RL, Malik M, Li YM, Brown SL, Brewer EP, Angle JS, Baker AJM. Phytoremediation of soil metals. Current Opinion Biotechnology. 1997; 8:279-284.
18. Chaney RL, Li YM, Brown L, Homer FA, Malik M. Improving metal hyperaccumulator wild plants to develop commercial phytoextraction systems: Approaches and progress. In: Phytoremediation of contaminated soil and water (Eds: N. Terry and G. Bñuelos). Boca Raton, Lewis, 2000, 129-58.
19. Cunningham SD, Shann JR, Crowley DE, Anderson TA. Phytoremediation of contaminated water and soil. In El, Kruger TA, Anderson JR. Coats (Eds.), Phytoremediation of soil and water contaminates. ACS Symposium series. 1997; 664:2-19.
20. Dahl J. Chemistry and behaviour of environmentally relevant heavy metals in biomass combustion and thermal ash treatment processes. PhD thesis, Institute of Chemical Engineering Fundamentals and Plant Engineering, Technical University of Graz, Austria, 2000.
21. Deepali, Gangwar KK. Chromium Uptake Efficiency of Spinach oleracea from Contaminated Soil. Journal of Applied Science and Environmental Management. 2009; 13(4):71-72.
22. Dheri GS, Brar MS, Malhi SS. Comparative Phytoremediation of Chromium-Contaminated Soils by Fenugreek, Spinach, and Raya, Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis. 2007; 38:11-12.
23. Dickinson NM. Strategies for sustainable woodland on contaminated soils. Chemosphere. 2000; 41:259-63.
24. Dierberg FE, Deutsa TA, Goulet JRN. A removal of copper and lead using a thin-film technique. In K. R. Reddy & W. H. Smith (Eds.), Aquatic plants for water treatment and resource recovery. Magnolia, 1987, 497-504.
25. Dushenko S, Kapulnik Y. Phytotranslocation of metals. In I. Raskin & B. D. Ensley (Eds.), Phytoremediation of toxic metals-Using plants to clean-up the environment. New York: Wiley, 2000, 89-106.
26. Dushenko S, Vasudev D, Kapulnik Y, Gleba D, Fleisher D, Ting KC et al., Removal of uranium from water using terrestrial plants. Environmental Science and Technology. 1997a; 31(12):3468-3474.
27. Dushenko S, Vasudev D, Kapulnik Y, Gleba D, Fleisher D, Ting KC et al., Phytoremediation: A novel approach to an old problem. In D. L. Wise (Ed.), Global environmental biotechnology. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1997b, 563-572.
28. Dushenko V, Kumar PBAN, Motto H, Raskin I. Phytotranslocation: The use of plants to remove heavy metals from aqueous streams. Environmental Science and Technology. 1995; 29:1239-1245.
29. Eapen S, D’Souza SF. Prospects of genetic engineering of plants for phytoremediation of toxic metals. Biotechnology Advances. 2005; 23:97-114.
30. Elless PM, Poynton YC, Williams AC, Doyle PM, Lopez CA, Sokkary AD et al., Pilot-scale demonstration of phytotranslocation for drinking arsenic in New Mexico drinking water. Water Research, 2005; 39(16):3863-3872.
31. Enlsy BD. Rationale for use of phytoremediation. In I. Raskin, & B. D. Ensley (Eds.), Phytoremediation of toxic metals: Using plants to clean-up the environment. New York: Wiley, 2000, 3-12.
32. Entry JA, Watrud LS, Reeves M. Accumulation of 137Cs and 90Sr from contaminated soil by three grass species inoculated with mycorrhizal fungi. Environmental Pollution. 1999; 104:449-457.
33. Fatoki OS. Trace zinc and copper concentration in roadside surface soils and vegetation: A measurement of local atmospheric pollution in Alice, South Africa. Environmental Interpretation. 1996; 22:759-762.
34. Flathman PE, Lanza GR. Phytoremediation: Current views on an emerging green technology. Journal of Soil Contamination. 1998; 7(4):415-432.
35. Garcia R, Millán E. Assessment of Cd, Pb and Zn contamination in roadside soils and grasses from Gipuzkoa (Spain).Chemosphere, 1998; 37:1615-1625.
36. Gardea-Torresdely JL, de la Rosa G, Peralta-Vide Jr. Use of phytotranslocation technologies in the removal of heavy metals: A review. Pure and Applied Chemistry. 2004; 76(4):801-813.
37. Ghosh M, Singh SP. Comparative uptake and phytotranslocation study of soil induced chromium by accumulator weed species. Applied Ecology and Environmental Research, 2005; 3(2):67-79.
38. Glass DJ. U.S. and international markets for phytoremediation, 1999–2000. Needham, MA: D. Glass Associates, 1999, 266.
39. Hall JL. Cellular mechanisms for heavy metal detoxification and tolerance. Journal of Experimental Biology. 2002; 53:1-11.
40. Hansen D, Duda PJ, Zayed A, Terry N. Selenium removal by constructed wetlands: Role of biological volatilization. Environmental Science and Technology. 1988; 32:591-597.

41. Higuchi K, Suzuki K, Nakanishi H, Yamaguchi H, Nishizawa NK, Mori S. Cloning of nicotianamine synthase genes, novel genes involved in the biosynthesis of phytosiderophores. Plant Physiology. 1999; 119:471-479.

42. Ho YB, Tai KM. Elevated levels of lead and other metals in roadside soil and grass and their use to monitor aerial metal depositions in Hong Kong. Environmental Pollution. 1988; 49(1):37-51.

43. Hughes JB, Shanks J, Vanderford M, Lauritzen J, Bhadra R. Transformation of TNT by aquatic plants and plant tissue cultures. Environmental Science & Technology. 1997; 31:266-271.

44. Kay SH, Haller WT, Garrard LA. Effect of heavy metals on water hyacinths [Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms]. Aquatic Toxicology. 1984; 5:117-128.

45. Khan AG, Keuk C, Chaudhry TM, Khoo CS, Hayes WJ. Role of plants, mycorrhizae and phytochelators in heavy metal contaminated land remediation. Chemosphere. 2000; 41:197-207.

46. Knasmuller S, Gottmann E, Steinkellner H, Fomin A, Pickl C, Paschke A et al., Detection of genotoxic effects of heavy metal contaminated soils with plant bioassays. Mutation Research. 1998; 420:37-48.

47. Lasat MM. Phytoextraction of toxic metals. Journal of Environmental Quality. 2002; 31:109-120.

48. Le Duc DL, Tarun AS, Montes-Bayon M, Meija J, Malit MF. Overexpression of Selenocysteine methyltransferase in Arabidopsis and Indian mustard increases selenium tolerance and accumulation. Plant Physiology. 2004; 135:377-383.

49. Li YM, Chaney R, Brewer E, Roseberg R, Angle SJ. Development of a technology for commercial phytoextraction of nickel: Economic and technical considerations. Plant Soil. 2003; 249:107-115.

50. Lin ZQ, Schemenuar RS, Cervinka V, Zayed A, Lee A, Terry N. Selenium volatilization from a soil plant system for the remediation of contaminated water and soil in the San Joaquin Valley. Journal of Environmental Quality. 2000; 29:1048-1056.

51. Lin ZQ, Schemenuar RS, Cervinka V, Zayed A, Lee A, Terry N. Selenium volatilization from a soil plant system for the remediation of contaminated water and soil in the San Joaquin Valley. Journal of Environmental Quality. 2000; 29:1048-1056.

52. Ma LQ, Komar KM, Tu C, Zhang W, Cai Y, Kennedy ED. A fern that hyper accumulates arsenic. Nature. 2001b; 409:6820-579.

53. Ma LQ, Komar KM, Tu C. A fern that accumulates arsenic. Nature. 2001; 409:579.

54. Ma X, Richter AR, Albers S, Burken JG. Phytoremediation of MTBE with hybrid poplar trees. International Phytoremediation. 2005; 6(2):157-167.

55. McElroy S, Hardman DJ, Waite S. Treatment technologies. In S. McElroy, D.J. Hardman, S. Waite (Eds.), Pollution, ecology and bio treatment. Singapore: Longman Singapore Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 1993, 48-58.

56. McElroy GH, Dawson WM. Biomass from short-rotation coppice willow on marginal land. Biomass. 1986; 10:225-40.

57. Meagher RB, Rugh CL, Kandasamy MK, Gragson G, Wang NJ. Engineered phytoremediation of mercury pollution in soil and water using bacterial genes. In: Phytoremediation of contaminated soil and water (Eds: N. Terry and G. Banuelos). Boca Raton, Lewis, 2000, 201-221.

58. Newsholme C. Willows: the genus Salix. London: Batsford, 1992.

59. Pertsu KL, Kowalik PJ. Salix vegetation filters for purification of waters and soils. Biomass Bioenergy. 1997; 12:9-19.

60. Pilon-Smits EAH. Phytoremediation. Annual Review of Plant Biology. 2005; 56:15-39.

61. Pilon-Smits EAH, Desouza MP, Hong G, Amini A, Bravo RC, Payabyab ST et al., Selenium volatilization and accumulation by twenty aquatic plant species. Journal of Environmental Quality. 1999; 28(3):1011-1017.

62. Pilon-Smits EAH, de Souza MP, Hong G, Amini AR, Bravo RC. Selenium volatilization and accumulation by twenty aquatic plant species. Journal of Environmental Quality. 1999; 28:1011-1017.

63. Prasad MNV, Freitas H. Metal hyperaccumulation in plants – Biodiversity prospecting for phytoremediation technology. Electronic Journal of Biotechnology. 2003; 6:275-321.

64. Reeves RD, Brooks RR. Hyperaccumulation of lead and zinc by two metallophytes from a mining area of Central Europe. Environmental Pollution Series A. 1983; 31:277-287.

65. Reeves RD, Baker AJM. Phytoremediation of toxic metals. Wiley, New York, 2000, 193-229.

66. Ridell-Black D. A review of the potential for the use of trees in the rehabilitation of contaminated land. WRc Report CO 3467. Water Research Centre, Medmenham, 1993.

67. Ridell-Black D. Heavy metal uptake by fast growing willow species. In: Aronsson P, Pertzut K, editors. Willow vegetation filters for municipal wastewaters and sludges. A biological purification system. Uppsala: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. 1994, 145-51.

68. Ross SM. Toxic metals in soil-plant systems. Chichester: Wiley, England, 1994.

69. Rugh CL, Wilde HD, Stack NM, Thompson DM, Summers AO, Meagher RB. Mercuric ion reduction and resistance in transgenic Arabidopsis thaliana plants expressing a modified bacterial mera gene. Proceeding National Academic Science USA. 1996; 93:3182-3187.

70. Ruiz ON, Hussein HS, Terry N, Daniell H. Phytoremediation of organo mercurial compounds via chloroplast genetic engineering. Plant Physiology. 2003; 132:1344-1352.

71. Salt DE, Smith RD, Raskin I. Phytoremediation. Annual. Rev Plant Physiology. Plant Molecular Biology. 1998; 49:643-668.

72. Salt DE, Belaylock M, Kumar PBAN, Dushenkov V, Ensley BD, Chet I, Raskin I. Phytoremediation: A novel strategy for the removal of toxic metals from the environment using plants. Biotechnology. 1995a; 13:468-475.

73. Salt DE, Prince RC, Pickering LJ, Raskin I. Mechanisms of cadmium mobility and accumulation in Indian mustard. Plant Physiology. 1995b; 109:1427-1433.
74. Salt DE, Smith RD, Raskin I. Phytoremediation. Annual Review Plant Physiology. Plant Molecular Biology. 1998; 49:643-668.
75. Sánchez Martín MJ, Sánchez Camazano M, Lorenzo LF. Cadmium and lead contents in suburban and urban soils from two medium-sized cities of Spain: Influence of traffic intensity. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology. 2000; 64:250-257.
76. Schnoor JL. Phytostabilization of metals using hybrid poplar trees. In I. Raskin& B. D. Ensley (Eds.), Phytoremediation of toxic metals: Using plants to clean up the environment. New York: Wiley, 2000, 133-150.
77. Sekhar KC, Kamala CT, Chary NS, Sastry ARK, Rao TN, Vairamani M. Removal of lead from aqueous solutions using an immobilized biomaterial derived from a plant biomass. Journal of Hazardous Materials. 2004; 108:111-117.
78. Singh OV, Labana S, Pandey G, Budhiraja R, Jain RK, Phytoremediation: an overview of metal ion decontamination from soil. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology. 2003; 61:405-412.
79. Sommerville AHC. Willows in the environment. Proceeding Revised Society Edinburg Sect B. 1992; 98:215-44.
80. Stoltz E, Greger M. Accumulation properties of As, Cd, Cu, Pb and Zn by four wetland plant species growing on submerged mine tailings. Environmental and Experimental Botany. 2002; 47(3):271-280.
81. Terry N, Carlson C, Raab TK, Zayed AM. Rates of selenium volatilization among crop species. Journal of Environmental Quality. 1992; 21:341-344.
82. Terry N, Zayed AD, de Souza MP, Tarun AS, Selenium in higher plants. Annual Revised Plant Physiology. Plant Molecular Biology. 2000; 51:401-432.
83. Thangavel P, Subhuram CV. Phytoextraction– Role of hyper accumulators in metal contaminated soils. Proceedings of the Indian National Science Academy. Part B. 2004; 70(1):109-130.
84. Tordoff GM, Baker AJM, Willis AJ. Current approaches to the revegetation and reclamation of metalliferous mine wastes. Chemosphere. 2000; 41(1–2):219-228.
85. Tu C, Ma LQ. Effects of arsenic on concentration and distribution of nutrients in the trends of the arsenic Hyperaccumulator Pteris vittata. Environmental Pollution. 2005; 135(2):333-340.
86. Turgut C, Katie Pepe M, Cutright TJ. The effect of EDTA and citric acid on phytoremediation of Cd, Cr and Ni from soil using Helianthus annuus. Environmental Pollution. 2004; 131(1):147-154.
87. Utsunamya T. Japanese patent, 1980, 55-72959.
88. Van Huyten T, Abdel Ghany S, Hale KL, Le Duc D, Terry N, Pilon Smits EAH. Overexpression of cystathionine synthase enhances selenium volatilization in Brassica juncea Plantation. 2003; 218:71-78.
89. Vassil AD, Kapulmik Y, Raskin I, Salt DE. The role of EDTA in lead transport and accumulation by Indian mustard. Plant Physiology. 1998; 117:447-453.
90. Viard B, Pihan F, Promeyrat S, Pihan JC. Integrated assessment of heavy metal (Pb, Zn, Cd) highway pollution: bioaccumulation in soil, Graminaceae and land snails. Chemosphere. 2004; 55(10):1349-1359.
91. Von Wienen N, Klair S, Bansal S, Briat JF, Khodr H, Shiomi T. Nicotianamine chelates both Fe III and Fe II. Implications for metal transport in plants. Plant Physiology. 1999; 119:1107-1114.
92. WHO. Health and environment in sustainable development. Geneva: WHO, 1997.
93. Yanqun Z, Yuan L, Jianjun C, Haiyan C, Li C, Schwartz C. Hyperaccumulation of Pb, Zn and Cd in herbaceous grown on lead-zinc mining area in Yunnan, China. Environmental International. 2005; 31(5):755-762.
94. Zhang W, Cai Y, Downum KR, Ma LQ. Arsenic complexes in the arsenic hyper accumulator Pteris vittata, Chinese brake fern. Journal of Chromatography A. 2004; 1043(2):249-254.
95. Zayed A, Pilon Smits E, de Souza M, Lin QQ, Terry. Remediation of selenium polluted soils and waters by phyto volatilization. In: Phytoremediation of contaminated soil and water (Eds: N. Terry and G. Bañuelos). Boca Ratón, Lewis, 2000, 61-83.
96. Zhu YL, Zayed AM, Quian JH, De Souza M, Terry N. Phytoremediation of toxic metals: Using plants to clean up the environment. New York: Wiley 1999, 150.