



## **Bio-monitoring of Mangroves Sediments and Tissues for Heavy Metal Accumulation in the Mangrove Forest of Cross River Estuary**

**E. A. B. Edu<sup>1</sup>, O. U. Udensi<sup>2\*</sup> and M. O. Ononyume<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Botany, University of Calabar, PMB 1115, Calabar, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Genetics and Biotechnology, University of Calabar, PMB 1115, Calabar, Nigeria.

### **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Author EABE designed the study, wrote the protocol, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author MOO managed the literature searches, while author OUU analyzed the data, interpreted, discussed and finally wrote the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

### **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/JAERI/2015/15801

#### Editor(s):

(1) Alejandro E. Ferrari, Department of Science and Technology, UNQ, Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, Argentina.

#### Reviewers:

(1) Anonymous, University Federal of Rio de Janeiro – UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

(2) Anonymous, Damanhour University, Egypt.

Complete Peer review History: <http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/9878>

**Original Research Article**

**Received 18<sup>th</sup> December 2014**

**Accepted 8<sup>th</sup> April 2015**

**Published 19<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

### **ABSTRACT**

**Aims:** The need to periodically monitor the mangroves of heavy metals pollution should not be overemphasized given the high premium placed on this ecosystem. The present study was aimed at evaluating mangrove sediments and tissues for heavy metals accumulation in the different tidal levels, which will be an indicator for pollution.

**Methodology:** Ten random samples of composite surface sediments (0-5 cm) were collected from low, mid and high tidal levels using a modified Van Veen (0.1 m<sup>2</sup>) grab sampler. Also samples of senescent leaves, barks and roots of randomly selected ten individual plants of *Nypa fruticans* (low tide), *Rhizophora racemosa* (mid tide) and *Avicennia africana* (high tide) were also collected for heavy metal analyses during the year 2011.

**Results:** Our results showed that there were significant variations ( $P < 0.05$ ) in heavy metals deposition across the tidal levels. In the mangrove sediments, iron (Fe) content (415.8 mg/g dry

\*Corresponding author: Email: [princeudensi@unical.edu.ng](mailto:princeudensi@unical.edu.ng);

weight) was highest in the high tidal level where *A. africana* was predominantly sampled while *N. fruticans* (low tide) had the lowest deposition of the metal (304.4 mg/g dry weight). The accumulation of heavy metals in the mangrove tissues took the general trend of root > bark > leaves, the mangrove notwithstanding. It was also observed that cadmium deposition in sediments was comparatively higher than RSV indicating possible cadmium pollution.

**Conclusion:** Generally, accumulation of heavy metals in the mangrove forest of Cross River estuary was within permissible limits. Although the concentrations obtained for the heavy metals studied are generally below documented toxic levels, however, the increasing level of urbanization and industrialization in Calabar municipality and its environs calls for continuous vigilance, surveillance and monitoring of this sensitive and all important ecosystem to protect and ensure that heavy metal pollution is minimal.

**Keywords:** Cross River; mangroves; heavy metals; pollution.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Mangroves are halophytic trees that dominate the intertidal zone along coastlines, estuaries and islands in tropical and sub-tropical regions of the world where they exist under conditions of high salinity, extreme tides, strong winds, high temperature with muddy, anaerobic soil [1,2]. They thrive in tropical estuaries, which receive evenly distributed heavy rainfall throughout the year. Mangroves are among the most productive intertidal ecosystems on earth [3,4]. They serve as nursery and breeding grounds for several commercially important species of marine fauna.

However, in spite of their economic and ecological importance, mangrove forests are under threat from over-exploitation, destruction and pollution with heavy metals and petroleum [5-8]. According to [9], mangrove ecosystems serve as sink for the deposition of heavy metals from anthropogenic sources such as domestic, industrial and agricultural discharges. This has led to their use as bio-indicators for pollution monitoring programmes as well as phyto-infiltration and phyto-extraction technology [10].

These pollutants become trapped in mangrove sediments and eventually become partly locked up in detrital particles, making them potentially bio-available to detrital feeders [11-13]. Undoubtedly, they also become accumulated in tissues of these organisms leading to their amplification through bio-accumulation along the food chain. The cycling of heavy metals because of their toxicity, bio-accumulation capacity and persistence, is a serious question recently addressed by many studies on mangrove environments [14,15]. [16,17] observed that heavy metal-mediated pollution affect the development and biochemical activities of soil microorganisms, which might directly or/and indirectly elicit toxic influence on other flora and fauna species in the ecosystem.

The monitoring of mangrove ecosystems for heavy metal pollution become imperative given the high premium placed on this economic and ecological important ecosystem. Recently, the upsurge of human activities along the Great Kwa Basin, urbanization and industrialization, uncontrolled and mismanagement of open dumpsters in Cross River State, Nigeria has ignited severe panic for eco-toxicologists, especially as it concerns heavy metal pollution. This paper is aimed at evaluating the extent of pollution using heavy metal bio-indicators on the mangrove sediments and tissues.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Sampling Site

The study area covered the mangrove forests of the Great Kwa River, East of the Cross River estuary, which flows into the Gulf of Guinea. This area lies within latitudes 04° 45' and 04° 15' North of the Equator and longitudes 008° 15' and 008° 30' East of Greenwich Meridian along the eastern border of the University of Calabar, Nigeria. The research was undertaken 2011 spanning January to December.

### 2.2 Sampling Methods

Ten random samples of composite surface sediments (0-5 cm) were collected from low, mid and high tidal levels using a modified Van Veen (0.1 m<sup>2</sup>) grab sampler. Samples of senescent leaves, barks and roots of randomly selected ten individual plants of *Nypa fruticans*, *Rhizophora racemosa* and *Avicennia africana* were also collected for heavy metal analyses. It should be clearly noted that in the Great Kwa River estuary, *N. fruticans* is predominantly found in low tidal level while *R. racemosa* and *A. africana* are

found in the mid and high tidal levels, respectively.

### 2.3 Sample Preparation and Heavy Metal Analysis

The tissue samples were rinsed with de-ionized water, placed in black polyethylene bags, tagged and stored in cool boxes at  $-4^{\circ}\text{C}$  to avoid oxidation. Sediments and plant tissue samples were then oven-dried at  $80^{\circ}\text{C}$  to constant weight. The dry samples were ground, and sieved through a  $250\ \mu\text{m}$  mesh screen. 1 g of the each sample was digested in Kjeldahl Digester using a mixture of concentrated  $\text{HNO}_3$  and  $\text{HCl}$ . The digested samples were analyzed for heavy metals (Iron (Fe), manganese (Mn), cadmium (Cd), chromium (Cr), copper (Cu), zinc (Zn), nickel (Ni), and lead (Pb) by flame atomic absorption spectrophotometry (FAAS) (Perkin Elmer- Model 3030, Germany).

### 2.4 Statistical Analysis

Data collected from the analyses were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW), version 18.0 while significant means were separated using Least Significant Difference Test Statistics (LSD). The results were compared with global average shale and fossil rhine (ASV) concentrations of metal [18] while concentration factor (CF) was calculated using [19] method.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1 Heavy Metal Deposition in the Mangrove Sediments

There were significant differences ( $P < 0.05$ ) in the deposition and accumulation of heavy metals in the mangrove sediments. In the mangrove sediments, iron (Fe) content ( $415.8\ \text{mg/g}$  dry weight) was highest in the high tidal level where *A. africana* was predominantly sampled while *N. fruticans* (low tide) had the lowest deposition of the metal ( $304.4\ \text{mg/g}$  dry weight). However, there was no significant differences ( $P > 0.05$ ) observed in zinc (Zn), Nickel (Ni) and chromium (Cr) deposit in the mangrove sediments in the low and high tidal levels. For manganese (Mn), there were no significant variations among the tidal levels. The deposition of cadmium was highest in the low tide inhabiting *N. fruticans* while lead (Pb) and copper (Cu) were observed to be high in the sediment of *R. racemosa* (Mid tide) comparing with the sediments in other tidal levels (Fig. 1).

### 3.2 Heavy Metal Deposition in the Mangrove Tissues

Heavy metals accumulation in the mangrove tissues varied significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) across the tidal levels as well as specific to mangrove tissues. Iron (Fe) accumulation was more in the roots of the mangrove, the species notwithstanding but however, was lowest on the bark of *R. racemosa* (mid tide). For manganese, its accumulation in the roots of *A. africana* (high tide) was the same with that of the bark of *R. racemosa* while its deposition in the leaves of *N. fruticans* was significantly higher than the leaves of *R. racemosa* and *A. Africana*, respectively. The bark of *A. Africana* accumulated more cadmium. However, other mangrove tissues showed no significant differences, except the leaves of *N. fruticans* and *R. racemosa*.

Accumulation of zinc was high in the bark of *A. Africana* when compared with other tissue parts of the different mangroves. For copper, its accumulation was highest in the barks of *N. fruticans* and *A. Africana*. Although there were instances of deviations, the general trend in the deposition and accumulation of heavy metals was sediments>roots>barks> leaves (Table 1).

Additionally, the Average Shale Value (ASV) for the metals was within permissible range except for cadmium, where ASV was lower than its accumulation in the sediments and plant tissues. It was also observed that the concentration factor (CF) for zinc (Zn) was in the three tidal levels (Figs. 2&3). This was followed by copper and manganese. However, the concentration of cadmium was very low comparatively.

## 4. DISCUSSION

Industrial wastes laden with toxic metals are of great concern in the marine ecosystem given that they are not easily degradable, leading to their persistency in the ecosystem.

Worst still is the fact that these metals accumulate in different trophic levels of food chain. Pollution monitoring, especially in the mangrove ecosystem is very strategic. This is premised on the menace orchestrated by this condition and which has caused government and her agencies globally huge sums of money. While acting as reservoir for the phyto-filtration and extraction of metals [10], mangrove is also used as bio-indicators for heavy metal pollution.




Fig. 1. Map of the mangrove where samples were collected





Fig. 2. Concentration heavy metals in the mangrove sediments

**Table 1. Average concentration of heavy metals (mg g<sup>-1</sup>, dry weight) in plant tissues and sediments of mangrove species in the mangrove forest of Great Kwa River, East of the Cross River estuary, Nigeria**

Mangrove species	Samples parts	Heavy metal (mg/g dry weight)							
		Fe	Mn	Cd	Zn	Pb	Ni	Cr	Cu
<i>N. fruticans</i>	Root	81.47c±0.46	24.11b±0.23	1.73b±0.32	28.02d±1.23	0.42b±0.01	1.49b±0.02	5.17c±0.21	15.87b±0.34
	Bark	52.52a±1.21	27.25c±0.37	2.21b±0.32	32.61e±0.46	0.018b±0.48	1.54b±0.37	1.66b±0.03	26.48d±0.25
	Leaves	67.73b±2.02	19.88b±0.43	0.83a±0.01	11.54b±0.05	0.038b±0.001	0.84b±0.01	0.61a±0.01	20.44c±0.78
<i>R. racemosa</i>	Root	88.78c±1.34	24.19b±0.38	1.77b±0.48	25.35c±0.56	0.11b±0.001	1.54b±0.01	6.76d±0.04	15.88b±0.24
	Bark	64.01a±1.23	37.84d±0.76	2.20b±0.02	29.17d±0.34	0.014a±0.0001	1.67b±0.01	1.58b±0.02	21.34c±0.45
	Leaves	64.94b±0.78	19.54a±0.54	1.32a±0.03	11.54a±0.45	0.04b±0.001	0.66a±0.01	0.77b±0.01	21.25c±0.32
<i>A. africana</i>	Root	82.23c±0.32	32.82d±0.76	1.73b±0.85	25.12c±0.53	0.102b±0.001	1.63b±0.14	6.53c±0.05	13.27a±0.11
	Bark	81.20c±0.33	29.52c±0.86	3.04c±0.23	29.55d±0.67	0.014a±0.001	1.56b±0.24	1.91b±0.02	24.33d±0.07
	Leaves	67.68b±0.35	19.67a±0.45	1.59b±0.46	10.81a±0.54	0.038b±0.002	0.70a±0.05	0.69a±0.001	21.85c±0.06
Average Shale value (ASV)		4700	600	1.31	45	20	68	83	45



**Fig. 3. Concentration factor for heavy metals in the mangrove sediment and plant tissues**

However, their accumulation and subsequent distribution according to [20], depend on various factors, which includes redox conditions and organic contents of the sediments in the ecosystem. These factors as also observed by [21] may influence the toxicity of metals through processes such as mercury methylation as well as controlling metals' availability for living organisms. [22,23], observed that metals can be absorbed onto the surface of minerals like clay, iron and/or manganese oxy-hydroxides, thus hindering their availability.

Our results showed that there were significant variations in the depositions and accumulation of these heavy metals in the mangrove sediments along the tidal levels. Among the heavy metals, iron deposition was highest in the sediments of *A. africana* in the high tide while cadmium and lead were in highest deposition in the *N. fruticans* sediment that was sampled in the low tide. However, in the mid tide (*R. racemosa*) sediment, copper was found to be high. The elevated concentration of iron in the high tidal level might probably be due to redox conditions in sedimentary columns and the relation of the iron in the organic fractions as well as in the water soluble and exchangeable fractions [24-26]. Undoubtedly, the extent of pollution in the mangrove ecosystem is proportional to anthropogenic disturbances of the mangrove due

to the rate of urbanization and industrialization in the municipality [5,6,7] and adjoining communities surrounding the mangrove. Such perturbations affect sediment properties as water currents, tidal flow and the ability of mangrove trees to capture sediments are altered [27].

Our current results on the accumulation of these heavy metals in mangrove tissues revealed that there were significant variations in their concentrations in the mangrove plants, which indicated that the trend in the accumulation was roots > barks > leaves, the mangrove notwithstanding. The significant variation in the accumulation of heavy metals in the tissues of mangrove plants might be basically due to (a) the metal need of the specific tissues (b) the amount/quantity of metals deposition in the sediments of the mangrove and (c) sea water intrusion during high tide. Expectedly, besides the high deposition of these metals on the mangrove sediments, their accumulation was more in the roots than other plant tissues. The explanation probably is that the roots first receive the metals and depending on the need of the other tissues, roots supply. This alteration occasioned by the perturbation may as well affect the heavy metals that get deposited in the sediments of the different tidal levels where the different mangroves were sampled.

According to [19], metals such as chromium and lead, have low rates of translocation and as such are much more concentrated in the roots than in stems or leaves. Apart from copper whose concentration was higher in the leaves, concentrations of other metals were least in the leaves. This obviously suggests active translocation, transport and biomass production processes [28,29]. This is also suggests that copper can be sequestered from the leaves while monitoring copper pollution in the mangrove forest of Cross River estuary. The concentration factor (CF) indicated that zinc was high in the soil for the plants to assimilate. Though this factor increases the risk of the metal entering into food chain, however, zinc is a micronutrients and its accumulation might not pose threat to the plant. The implication is that there is the possibility that a metal can be present in the soil but not available for plant to absorb or assimilate. This might be case of other heavy metals whose CF was not high.

The high CF of zinc, copper and manganese in the tissues of the mangrove plants across the tidal levels might suggest active uptake and possible storage of these metals needed for the plant growth and development. Bioavailability of metals and their transfer from soil to plants are affected by physicochemical parameters [25,30,31]. Although the concentration of cadmium in the sediments was very high, CF in the mangrove species was low. This may be due to the high concentrations of other metal ions, especially zinc in the soil, which had been reported to inhibit uptake of cadmium [32]. The low CF obtained for nickel and lead may be indications of lack of storage of these metals in plant tissues [30]. This might presuppose that there may be cadmium and lead pollution given the high presence of these metals.

The accumulation and the seeming tolerable and permissible limits of the heavy metals sampled except cadmium notwithstanding, the levels of these metals could obstruct the food chain of aquatic organisms inhibiting the mangrove. This was the positions of [33-35].

It should be understood that copper and zinc are micronutrients essential for plant growth, thus their concentrations in the leaves and barks may reflect physiological requirements of the mangroves. According to [10], the shoot of mangrove trees may act as a good absorber for the remediation of metal ion polluted environments. Going by our result, the possibility of the leaves and barks of these mangrove

species being used as copper sink might not be in contention. This low bioaccumulation of heavy metals in the mangrove leaves might indirectly imply also low accumulation of these metals in the tissue of organism in the ecosystem. This is premised on the fact that leaf litter constitutes major components of detrital food chain. Comparing heavy metals in sediments and plant tissues may be convenient for assessment of some measure of pollution, the limitations of this method, notwithstanding [36].

The ability of any plant to accumulate heavy metals in its tissues is genetically controlled as well as its capacity to withstand heavy metal pollution. Genetic engineering approach can be used for further studies to understand and enhance the phyto-remediation properties of these mangroves [37].

## 5. CONCLUSION

Although the concentrations obtained for the heavy metals studied are generally below documented toxic levels, however, the increasing level of urbanization and industrialization in Calabar municipality and its environs calls for continuous vigilance, surveillance and monitoring of this sensitive and all important ecosystem to protect and ensure that heavy metal pollution is minimal.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Hogarth PJ. The biology of mangroves. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1999.
2. Middleton BA, McKee KL. Degradation of mangrove tissues and implications for peat formation in Belizean Island forest. *Journal of Ecology*. 2001;89:818-828.
3. Wafar S, Untawale AG, Wafar M. Litterfall and energy flux in a mangrove ecosystem. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*. 1997;44:111-124.
4. Clough BF, Tan DT, Phuong DX, Buu DC. Canopy leaf area index and litter fall in stands of the mangrove *Rhizophora apiculata* of different age in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. *Aquatic Botany*. 2000; 66:311-320.
5. Rate AWW, Robertson AE, Borg AT. Distribution of heavy metals in near-shore

- sediments of the Swan River estuary, Western Australia. *Water, Air and Soil Pollution*. 2000;124:155–168.
6. Ray AK, Tripathy SC, Patra S, Sarma VV. Assessment of Godovari estuarine mangrove ecosystem through trace metals studies. *Environment International*. 2006; 32:219–233.
  7. Pekey H. Heavy metal pollution assessment in sediments of the Izmit Bay. Turkey. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 2006;123:219–231.
  8. Kairo JG, Dahdouh-Guebas F, Bosire J, Koedam N. Restoration and management of mangrove systems – a lesson for and from the East African region. *South African Journal of Botany*. 2001;67:383-389.
  9. Mackey AP, Mackay S. Spatial distribution of acid-volatile sulphide concentration and metal bioavailability in mangrove sediments from the Brisbane River, Australia. *River, Australia. Environmental Pollution*. 1996;93:205–209.
  10. Wankasi D, Horsfall M. Jr. Spiff Al. Sorption kinetics of  $Po^{2+}$  and  $Cu^{2+}$  ions from aqueous solution by Nipah palm (*Nypa fruticans*. Wurmb) shoot biomass; 2006. Available:<http://www.ejbiotechnology.info/content/vol9/issues/full/5index.int> (Retrieved 02/06/07).
  11. Chindah AC, Braide AS, Sibeudu OC. Distribution of hydrocarbons and heavy metals in sediment and a crustacean (Shrimp – *Proneus notrilis*) from the Bonny/New Calabar River estuary, Niger Delta. *African Journal of Environmental Assessment and Management –Review Africaine de Gestion et d’Evaluation Environnementales (AGEAM-RAGEE)*. 2004; 9:1-17.
  12. Igwe JC, Nnorom IC, Gbarako BCG. Kinetics of radionuclides and heavy metals behaviour in soils: implications for plant growth. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. 2005;4(6):1541–1547.
  13. Islam MO, Khan HR, Das AK, Akthar MS, Oki Y, Adochi T. Impacts of industrial effluents on plant growth and soil properties. *Soil and Environment*. 2006; 25:(2)113–118.
  14. Mackey AP, Hodgkinson MC. Concentration and spatial distribution of trace metals in mangrove sediments from the Brisbane River, Australia. *Environmental Pollution*. 1995;90:181-186.
  15. Clark MW, McConchie D, Lewis DW, Saenger P. Redox stratification and heavy metal partitioning in Avicennia-dominated mangrove sediments: a geochemical model. *Chemical Geology*. 1998;149:147-171.
  16. Phillip Z. International approach to accessing soil quality by ecological related biological parameters. *Journal of Agricultural Ecosystem Environment*. 2002; 83:169-174.
  17. Ramasamy MS, Murugan A. Coral and mangrove-problems and management strategies. In: Edward JKP, Murugan A, Patterson J. (eds.). Proceedings of the national seminar on marine and coastal ecosystems Suganthi Davadanson Marine Research Institute (SDMRI) Resource Publication. 2002;2:181–184.
  18. Turekian KK, Wedepohl KH. Distribution of the elements in some major units of the earth’s crust. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America*. 1961;72:175-192.
  19. Alberts JJ, Price MT, Kania M. Metal concentrations in tissues of *Spartina alterniflora* (Loisef) and sediments of Georgia salt marshes. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*. 1990;30:47-58.
  20. Guo T, DeLaune RD, Patrick WH. The influence of sediment redox chemistry on chemically active forms of arsenic, cadmium, chromium, and zinc in estuarine sediment. *Environment International*. 1997; 23:305-316.
  21. Mason RP, Fitzgerald WF, Morel FFM. The biogeochemical cycling of elemental mercury: anthropogenic influences. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*. 1994; 58:3191-3198.
  22. Quémerais B, Cossa D, Rondeau B, Pham TT, Fortin B. Mercury distribution in relation to iron and manganese in the water of the St. Laurent River. *Science of The Total Environment*. 1998;213:193-201.
  23. Dong D, Nelson YM, Lion LW, Shuler ML, Ghiorse WC. Adsorption of Pb and Cd onto metal oxides and organic material in natural surface coatings as determined by selective extractions: new evidence for the importance of Mn and Fe oxides. *Water Research*. 2000;34:427-436.
  24. Sundby B, Silverberg N, Chesselet R. Pathways of manganese in an open estuarine system. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*. 1981;45:293–307.
  25. Izquierdo C, Usero J, Gracia I. Speciation of heavy metals in sediments from salt marshes on the Southern Atlantic coast of Spain. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*. 1997; 34:123-128.



26. Akpan ER, Ekpe UJ. Ibok UJ. Heavy metal trends in the Calabar river, Nigeria. *Environmental Geology*. 2002;42:47-51.
27. Kaly UL, Eugelink G, Robertson AI. Soil conditions in damaged north Queensland mangroves. *Estuaries*. 1997;20:291-300.
28. Markert B. Instrumental analysis of plants. In: Markert B. (ed). *Plants as biomonitors: indicators for heavy metals in the terrestrial environment*. New York: Weinheim Press. 1993;66-103.
29. Phillips DJH. The chemistries and environmental fates of trace metals and organochlorines in aquatic ecosystems. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*. 1995;31(4):193-200.
30. Ross SM. Toxic metals: Fate and distribution in contaminated ecosystems. In: Ross SM. (ed.), *Toxic Metals in Soil-Plant Systems (189-235)* United Kingdom: Wiley Chichester; 1994.
31. Tam MFY, Wong YS. Mangrove soils as sinks for waste water-borne pollutants. *Hydrobiologia*. 1996;295:231-241.
32. Thornton I. Geochemical aspects of the distribution and forms of heavy metals in soils. In: Lepp NW. (ed). *Effect of heavy metal pollution on plants*. Vol 2: metals in environments. London: Applied Science Publishers. 1981;1-33.
33. Kramer U, Chardonnens AN. The use of transgenic plants in the bioremediation of soils contaminated with trace elements. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*. 2001;55:661-672.
34. Zhou L, Vandersteen J, Wang L, Fuller T, Taylor M, Polais B, Wittwer GT. High resolution DNA melting curve analysis to establish HLA genotypic identity. *Tissue Antigens*. 2004;64:156.
35. Uzair M, Ahmed M, Nazim K. Effect of industrial waste on seed bank and growth of wild plants in Dhabeji area, Karachi, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Botany*. 2009;41(4):1659-1665.
36. Wang W, Fan W. Sediment geochemical controls in Cd, Cr. and Zn assimilation by the clam *Ruditapes philippinerum*. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*. 2001;20(10):2309-2317.
37. Fulekar MH, Singh H, Bheduri AM. Genetic engineering strategies for enhancing phytoremediation of heavy metals. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. 2009;8(4):529-535.

© 2015 Edu et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/9878>