

This is a repository copy of *Phytoremediation of metals using lemongrass (Cymbopogon citratus (D.C.) Stapf.) grown under different levels of red mud in soil amended with biowastes*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/114700/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Gautam, Meenu, Pandey, Divya and Agrawal, Madhoolika (2016) Phytoremediation of metals using lemongrass (*Cymbopogon citratus* (D.C.) Stapf.) grown under different levels of red mud in soil amended with biowastes. *International journal of phytoremediation*. pp. 555-562. ISSN 1522-6514


<https://doi.org/10.1080/15226514.2016.1267701>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Phytoremediation of metals using lemongrass (*Cymbopogon citratus* (D.C.) Stapf.) grown under different levels of red mud in soil amended with bio-wastes

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Phytoremediation</i>
Manuscript ID	BIJP-2016-0266.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Oct-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Gautam, Meenu; Science, Botany Pandey, Divya ; Stockholm Environment Institute Agrawal, Madhoolika; Banaras Hindu University, Ecology Research Laboratory, Department of Botany
Keywords:	Cymbopogon citratus, Phytoremediation, Red mud

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

**Phytoremediation of metals using lemongrass (*Cymbopogon citratus* (D.C.) Stapf.)
grown under different levels of red mud in soil amended with bio-wastes**

Author(s): Meenu Gautam¹, Divya Pandey², Madhoolika Agrawal³

¹Meenu Gautam

Research Scholar

Laboratory of Air Pollution and Global Climate Change,

Department of Botany, Institute of Science,

Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi-221005, India

Email ID: meenu400@gmail.com

²Divya Pandey

AXA Junior Research (Post-doctoral) Fellow,

Stockholm Environment Institute at York,

Grimston House, University of York,

Heslington, York, YO10 5DD

Email ID: pandey.divyaa85@gmail.com

³**Corresponding author**

Prof. Madhoolika Agrawal

Laboratory of Air Pollution and Global Climate Change,

Department of Botany, Institute of Science,

Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi-221005, India.

Phone no. 0091-542-2368156

Fax no.: 0091-542-2368174

Email ID: madhoo.agrawal@gmail.com

Abstract

Due to hostile condition of red mud (RM), its utilization for vegetation is restricted. Therefore, RM with bio-wastes as soil amendment may offer suitable combination to support plant growth with reduced risk of metal toxicity. To evaluate the effects of RM on soil properties, plant growth performance and metal accumulation in lemongrass, a study was conducted using different RM concentrations (0, 5, 10 and 15 % w/w) in soil amended with bio-wastes (cowdung manure (CD) or sewage-sludge (SS)). Application of RM in soil with bio-wastes improved organic matter and nutrient contents, and caused reduction in phytoavailable metal contents. Total plant biomass was increased under all treatments, maximally at 5 % RM in soil with SS (51.7 %) and CD (91.4 %) compared to control (no RM and bio-wastes). Lemongrass acted as a potential metal tolerant plant due to metal tolerance index >100 %. Based on translocation and bioconcentration factors, lemongrass acted as potential phytostabilizer of Fe, Mn and Cu in roots and was found efficient in translocation of Al, Zn, Cd, Pb, Cr, As and Ni from roots to shoot. The study suggests that 5 % RM with bio-wastes preferably SS may be used to enhance phytoremediation potential of lemongrass.

Key words: *Cymbopogon citratus*; phytoremediation; red mud

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

23 **1 Introduction**

24 Bauxite residue, commonly referred as red mud (RM) is generated in large quantities during
25 Bayer’s process of alumina extraction. It is highly alkaline and saline residue mainly
26 composed of Fe_2O_3 , Al_2O_3 , CaO , Na_2O , TiO_2 , SiO_2 , P_2O_5 and VO_5 ¹. Globally, \approx 150 million
27 tons of RM is generated annually; management of such a quantity of waste is an increasing
28 problem because utilization of only 2-3 % of generated residue has been estimated in a
29 productive way ². Nowadays, several applications of RM have been suggested viz.
30 manufacturing of ceramics, building materials, pigments, paints, as adsorbent and catalyst,
31 but challenge remains to find economically viable options to utilize significant amount of
32 residue generated every year ². A decade ago, slurry disposal was practiced in adjoining
33 areas, nearby estuaries/lagoons, as filler at depleted mine- and quarry sites or stored in nearby
34 dammed valley ³. Improper disposal of poorly treated residue results in several environmental
35 problems including contamination of surface and ground water through leaching, alteration in
36 soil properties and plant community structure, and several other health issues related to
37 human and wildlife ³. For an instance, Ajka spill in Hungary caused contamination of vast
38 areas of agricultural land with RM that contained elevated levels of toxic metals with
39 consequent impacts on plants ⁴. To date, dry stacking is the most popular choice of RM
40 disposal with relatively lower risk of environmental contamination. However, study by Power
41 *et al.* “see ref. 5” reported air pollution as major problem associated with its dry disposal
42 practice.

43 To manage such waste dumps, different phytotechnologies have been developed, which are
44 cost effective, and also offer sustainable and eco-friendly options ⁶. Phytoremediation of RM
45 is, however, a challenging task due to its high alkalinity, salinity, elevated levels of
46 potentially toxic metals, poor water retention and nutrient supplying capacities that limit
47 establishment of plants on RM dumps ⁷. Therefore, prior to establishment of vegetation on

such dumps, its unfavorable properties need to be improved to support plant growth coupled with enhanced phytoremediation potential. Studies have been conducted with RM in combination with bio-wastes (sewage-sludge, vegetative dry dust, animal manures, bacteria and mycorrhiza) as soil amendments, which improved soil properties and plant performance with low phytotoxic effects^{7,8}. These studies have prompted us to assess the utilization of animal manure and sewage-sludge in combination with RM, which may boost the levels of dissolved organic carbon and nutrient availability, and lower phytoavailability of toxic metals. This strategy offers twin benefits in industrial as well as organic waste management^{9,10}.

Cymbopogon citratus (D.C.) Stapf., commonly known as lemongrass, is a metal tolerant plant that withstand the harsh environmental conditions¹¹. Israila *et al.* “see ref. 12,” have identified lemongrass as a potential metal (Cd, Ni and Pb) accumulator grown on scrap-metal dumpsite at Dakace, Zaria-Nigeria, and suggested its suitability for phytoremediation of metal contaminated sites. Lemongrass cultivation is also widely practiced for stabilization of slopes and restoration of alkaline and saline soils¹³.

The present study was conducted using lemongrass grown under varying red mud treatments in soil amended with cowdung manure or sewage-sludge (1) to assess the physico-chemical properties of soil under different soil treatments (2) to evaluate the phytoremediation potential of lemongrass, and (3) to assess the influence of metals on plant growth performance under varying soil treatments.

2 Materials and methods

The experiment was conducted in Botanical Garden, Banaras Hindu University (25°18' N 82° 01' E and 76.19 m above sea level) from February 03 to August 03, 2013. During the experiment, mean monthly maximum and minimum temperature were 41.4 and 12.5° C,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

71 respectively. Mean monthly maximum and minimum relative humidity were 89.4 and 29.3
72 %, respectively, and total rainfall during the period was 110.0 mm.

73 Red mud was obtained in the form of dry lumps (≈ 70 % solid cake) from the dumping yard,
74 situated nearly 900 m from the premises of HINDALCO Industries Ltd., Renukoot, India.

75 Lemongrass, known for its medicinal value was found growing naturally in the planted areas
76 of RM dumps under plantation project called “Sanjeevani.” Sewage-sludge (SS) and
77 cowdung manure (CD) were collected from Dinapur municipal sewage treatment plant,
78 Varanasi and dairy farm, B.H.U., respectively. Garden soil (C) was dug out upto 30 cm depth
79 from Botanical Garden, B.H.U. Lemongrass was incurred from Faculty of Ayurveda, Institute
80 of Medical Sciences, B.H.U. After removing stone and plant materials, RM, SS, CD and C
81 were air dried, crushed, passed through sieve (2 mm mesh size) and mixed in a definite
82 proportion to obtain varying soil treatments (Table S1-1). Prior to the present study, an
83 experiment was conducted using lemongrass grown under varying RM concentrations (0, 10,
84 20, 30, 40 and 50 % w/w) in soil amended with CD or SS and maximum biomass was
85 obtained under 10 % RM treatment. Therefore, we have selected 5, 10 and 15 % RM w/w
86 with CD or SS for the present study.

87 Different soil treatments thus obtained were filled into cylindrical plastic pots (diameter, 25
88 cm; height, 50 cm). In total, there were 90 pots (9 treatments \times 10 replicates); each filled with
89 10 kg of different soil treatments. Pots were left at experimental site for 14 days for pathogen
90 destruction, physico-chemical stabilization and proper conditioning of treated soil due to bio-
91 waste amendments ¹⁴. On fifteenth day, one plant slip (shoot length: 15 cm, root length: 5
92 cm) of lemongrass was transplanted into each pot. Amount of water was standardized to
93 avoid the leakage from the pots at different ages. Amounts of watering were 0.4, 0.6, 0.8 and
94 1.0 L between 0-40, 41-80, 81-120, 121-180 DAT, respectively given in each pot, every
95 alternate day.

For physico-chemical analyses of different soil treatments, samples from three pots per treatment were taken out using soil corer (5 cm diameter and 10 cm depth) just before transplantation. Each sample was air dried, crushed and passed through sieve of 2 mm mesh size. The pH and EC of samples were measured in aqueous suspension of 1:5 (w/v) using pH meter (Model EA940, Orion, U.S.A) and conductivity meter (Model 303, Systronics, India), respectively. Total organic carbon (TOC) and total nitrogen (TN) contents were determined following Walkley and Black's rapid titration method "see ref. 15" and Gerhardt automatic N analyzer (Model KB8S, Germany), respectively. Available phosphorous (AP) was estimated by Olsen's method ¹⁶. Cation exchange capacity (CEC) through exchangeable cations extraction was determined following repeated leaching method ¹⁷. Phytoavailable metals in different soil treatments were extracted using 0.05 M EDTA solution ¹⁸. Exchangeable cations and EDTA extractable metal contents were determined using Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (Analyst-800, Perkin Elmer Inc., Norwalk, CT, USA).

Harvesting was done in triplicate by taking out entire plant along with roots and soil from the pots at 180 days after transplantation (DAT). Plants were gently jerked and after separating easily removable soil, roots were washed under running water to remove adhering soil particles. Thereafter, plant parts were washed twice using de-ionized water to avoid metal contamination. Afterwards, roots and shoot were separated and oven dried at 80° C until constant weights were attained. Dry weights of roots and shoot were measured for biomass determination.

Dried samples of roots, shoot and soil in triplicate were homogenized by grinding to fine powder using mortar and pestle. Contents of Al, Fe, Zn, Cu, Mn, Ni, Pb, Cr and Cd were determined on Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (AAS) (Analyst-800, Perkin Elmer Inc., Norwalk, CT, USA) after acid digestion (HNO₃ and HClO₄ in 9:4 ratio) following method of Gaidajis "see ref. 19". Moreover, AAS equipped with mercury hydride system

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

121 (MHS-15, Perkin Elmer Inc., Shelton, CT, USA) was used to determine As content in acid
122 digested plant- and soil samples following the method by Welz and Šucmanová “see ref. 20”.

123 The choice of metals viz. Fe, Al, Ni, Cr, Cd, Ni, As and Pb was based on their high
124 concentrations in RM and potentially phytotoxic effects ²¹. Micronutrients such as Zn, Mn
125 and Cu showed low phytoavailabilities at circum-neutral to alkaline pH ²².

126 Precision and accuracy of analysis was assured through repeated analysis of samples against
127 National Institute of Standard and Technology, Standard Reference Material (NBS SRM-
128 1570) for all metals. Blank and drift standards (Sisco Research Laboratories Pvt. Ltd., India)
129 were run after every five sample runs to calibrate the instrument. Results were found within
130 ±2 % of the certified value. Coefficients of variation of replicate analysis were determined for
131 different determinations and precision of analysis. Variations were found to be less than 10
132 %.

133 Metal tolerance ability of the plant was determined through metal tolerance index (MTI) “see
134 ref. 23,” whereas its phytoextraction potential was estimated using translocation (TF) and
135 bioconcentration factors (BCF_{plant}), calculated using the formulae by Qihang *et al.* “see ref.
136 24”.

$$MTI (\%) = \frac{\text{Total plant biomass under treatment}}{\text{Total plant biomass under control}}$$

$$TF = \frac{\text{Metal contents in shoot tissue}}{\text{Metal contents in root tissue}}$$

$$BCF_{plant} = \frac{\text{Metal contents in plant tissue}}{\text{Metal contents in soil}}$$

137 Statistical significance of differences between physico-chemical properties of different soil
138 treatments, total and phytoavailable metal contents, plant biomass, metal contents in plant, TF
139 and BCF values for different treatments were tested by one way analysis of variance

(ANOVA) followed by Duncan's multiple range test as post hoc. Prior to conducting significance testing, normality and homoscedasticity of data were tested with Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Levene's test, respectively and distribution was found normal based on resulted p values above 0.05 in all cases. Pearson's correlation and linear regression analysis were performed for metal contents in soil and plants grown under different treatments. All the statistical tests were performed using SPSS software, IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA).

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Soil properties before transplantation

Due to high alkalinity and EC value of RM (Table S1-2), its increasing concentrations in bio-waste amended soil resulted in significant increases in their levels (Table 1). The pH of RM was above, whereas EC value was below threshold levels suggested as remediation target²⁵. However, RM treated soils exhibited circum-neutral pH and were in the range of remediation target (pH, 5.5-9.0 and EC, $< 4\text{mS cm}^{-1}$)²⁵. High pH and EC may be ascribed to utilization of caustic soda during Bayer's process, resulting in an increase in soluble and free forms of caustic soda content in RM¹. Insignificant change in CEC values from CD_{RM0} to CD_{RM15} and SS_{RM0} to SS_{RM15} treatments may be due to its low value in RM compared to CD and SS, respectively (Table 1). In RM, more than 50 % of exchangeable cations are dominated by Na^+ , whereas in both CD and SS, the same is dominated by exchangeable Na^+ , Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} ions. Bio-wastes in combination with RM are known to ameliorate the low CEC value of RM thereby prompting exchange of other macronutrients (Ca^{2+} , Mg^{2+} and K^+ ions), essential for better plant growth²⁶.

Notably higher levels of TOC, TN and AP were observed in CD and SS compared to RM (Table S1-2) and C (Table 1). Being low in TOC (0.63 %), TN (trace to 0.02 %) and AP

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(0.09 %), RM is limited in major nutrients required for plant's growth and development ²⁷. Organic matter and humus are crucial for soil pedogenesis ²⁸. Addition of CD and SS in soil prior to RM addition resulted in significant increases in the levels of TOC, TN and AP in CD_{RM0} and SS_{RM0} treatments, respectively compared to control (Table 1). However, increasing RM treatments in CD or SS amended soil caused gradual decline in TN and AP, whereas TOC showed insignificant change across treatments. However, their levels were significantly higher compared to control. Organic carbon in soil is of paramount importance in determining soil aggregate stability which consequently influences gaseous exchange, phytoavailable nutrients, water storage and transport ²⁹. Jones *et al.* "see ref. 9" found that addition of poultry manure to RM stimulated active microbial biomass, thus enhancing soil aggregate stability. RM was found deficient in TN content; therefore its increasing proportions in bio-waste amended soil may have caused reduction in its value across treatments. A decline in AP may be attributed to appreciable amount of sesquioxides (>50 %) in RM resulting in high P retention capacity due to formation of insoluble metal phosphates ²².

Contents of Al, Fe, Pb, Cd, As, Cr and Ni were higher, whereas Mn, Zn and Cu contents were found low in RM compared to CD and SS (Table S1-2). Xue *et al.* "see ref. 1" reported nutrient deficiency as a potential limiting factor for vegetative growth on RM. When compared with soil quality guidelines defined by NOAA "see ref. 30", contents of Cd and Cr (in RM and SS), Cu (in RM, SS and CD) and Zn (in SS) were higher than their suggested values. Increasing RM concentrations in bio-waste amended soil increased metal contents, but trends were different under CD and SS amendments (Table 1). Trend of total metal contents was Fe>Al>Mn>Zn>Cu>Cr>Pb>Cd>Ni>As under CD_{RM0} to CD_{RM15} and Fe>Al>Zn>Mn>Cr>Cu>Cd>Pb>Ni>As under SS_{RM0} to SS_{RM15} treatments. Higher contents of Zn, Cr and Cd than Mn, Cu and Pb, respectively in later case may be attributed to many

189 folds higher Zn, Cr and Cd contents due to SS than CD amendment in soil following RM
190 treatments. Contents of Cu, Zn, Cd and Cr under CD_{RM0} to CD_{RM15} treatments were within,
191 whereas under SS_{RM0} to SS_{RM15} treatments were above the soil quality guidelines of NOAA
192 ³⁰. Moreover, As, Pb and Ni contents in all soil treatments comply with NOAA soil quality
193 guideline. Studied metal contents when compared with their screening levels in soil required
194 for plants, Mn, Zn, Cu, Cd and Cr under all soil treatments, whereas Pb and Ni under SS_{RM5}
195 to SS_{RM15} treatments exceeded their prescribed values by NOAA ³⁰.

196 Phytoavailable metal contents were maximum in SS followed by CD, C and RM (Table S1-
197 2). Micronutrients such as Fe, Mn, Cu, Zn and Ni, were available in lower concentrations in
198 RM due to formation of immobile metal complexes under alkaline condition and adsorption
199 of metals on the surface of RM ²⁷. In soil, CD and SS amendments caused significant
200 increases in phytoavailable metals in CD_{RM0} and SS_{RM0} treatments, respectively compared to
201 C. Furthermore, increasing RM concentrations reduced phytoavailable metal contents
202 significantly compared to CD_{RM0} and SS_{RM0} , respectively (Table 1). Circum-neutral pH
203 induced by RM treatments may favor precipitation of metals followed by increase in metal
204 sorption by charged colloids of RM. Cancrinite and hematite are two principal phases of RM,
205 which provide adsorption capacity to RM ³¹. Phytoavailable metal contents under different
206 soil treatments thus showed the trend in the order of $Fe > Al > Mn > Zn > Cu > Cr > Ni > Cd > As > Pb$.
207 Low phytoavailable Mn is a major problem associated with oxidizing environment which
208 favors oxidation of Mn^{2+} to insoluble Mn^{4+} in RM ³². Moreover, increase in Fe-oxide content
209 due to RM addition might have played a significant role in reducing phytoavailable Zn, Ni,
210 Pb and Cd contents across treatments ²². Relatively low phytoavailable Cu content may be
211 ascribed to hydroxyl and carboxyl groups supplied by bio-waste amendments, which lead to
212 formation of insoluble and immobile Cu-complexes, resulting in reduced risk of Cu-
213 phytotoxicity ³³. However, higher phytoavailable Cu than Ni content may be because of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

increase in aqueous dissolved organic carbon content due to RM addition, which may have increased the mobility of Cu followed by Ni complexed to organic matter ²¹. Reduced phytoavailable Cd and Pb contents may be ascribed to their strong antagonistic relationship with Mn and Cu, respectively. Whereas, appreciable amount of Fe-sulfate in RM at circum-neutral to alkaline pH is known to reduce labile As content efficiently in soil ³⁴. Thus, low phytoavailabilities of metals in aged bauxite residues are more pronounced than spiked one, which may be attributed to their complex nature and relative behavior of different metals ³.

3.2 Plant biomass

Root, shoot and total plant biomass were significantly higher under RM treatments compared to C (Fig. 1), indicating that they are efficient enough to tolerate high metal contents in soil and in their tissues ³⁵. Maximum increase in root and shoot biomass was observed under 5 % RM treatment followed by a decline under further treatments. Total plant biomass was significantly increased by 59.7 and 91.4 % under CD_{RM5} and SS_{RM5} treatments, respectively compared to control (Fig. 1). Reduction in plant biomass under 10 and 15 % RM treatments may be attributed to metal toxicity. In a similar study conducted with *Festuca rubra*, maximum increase in its biomass was found in soil treated with 5 % RM concentration, which was ascribed to decrease in metal contents in grass due to increased soil pH ³⁶. Decrease in biomass of plants growing in metal polluted soil is closely related to growth and development of roots, because roots are first organ exposed to elevated metal contents in soil. Due to metal toxicity, poorly developed roots may lead to decrease in nutrient transport and water uptake by plant, thereby affecting shoot and total plant biomass ³⁷.

3.3 Metal contents in lemongrass

Among all metals, content of Fe was found maximum, whereas As content was found minimum in plant biomass under different RM treatments in soil amended with CD or SS

(Table 2). Low As uptake by the plant under RM treatments may be due to its reduced phytoavailable contents³⁴. Metal contents in lemongrass when compared to phytotoxic thresholds for medicinal plants showed that all the metals were within the prescribed threshold levels³⁸. However, Cd content in plant under RM treatments in SS amended soil exceeded its threshold level (5-30 ppm)³⁸. Increase in Cd content in plant may be due to its higher level in SS compared to CD amendments in soil and low adsorption capacity of Cd (1.35 mmol g⁻¹) onto adsorbent surface of RM resulting in its increased mobility and phytoavailability³¹. It should be noteworthy that although Cd content in the plant was higher than its threshold level, no such severe phytotoxic effect of Cd on total plant biomass was reflected which may be due to synthesis of Cd induced phytochelatin complex that masks Cd-phytotoxicity³⁹. Moreover, Fe, Cu, Cr, Cd, Ni, Zn (except under C and CD_{RM0} to CD_{RM15} treatments) and Pb (except under C and CD_{RM0} treatments) contents in plant exceeded the WHO safe limits (20, 10, 1.5, 0.3, 1.5, 50 and 10 mg kg⁻¹, respectively) for medicinal plants, however, Mn and As were within their safe limits (200 and 5 mg kg⁻¹, respectively) under all treatments⁴⁰.

Pearson's correlation analysis showed that significant positive correlations exist between metal contents in plant biomass with their levels under different RM treatments in bio-waste amended soil (Table S1-3). Indeed, RM was found to be a predominant source of Al, Fe, Pb, Cd, Ni, Pb, Cr and As, whereas CD and SS acted as sources of Mn, Zn and Cu in different soil treatments (Table 1). Furthermore, linear regression models also confirmed that increasing concentrations of RM in soil amended with CD or SS significantly increased the metal contents in lemongrass (Figs. S1-1 and S1-2). Similar relationships were reported for lemongrass grown in soil treated with increasing contents of Cd, Hg and Pb³⁵. A weak magnitude of relationship for Mn ($R^2 = 0.657$) and As ($R^2 = 0.722$) in plant under different RM treatments in CD amended soil may be attributed to their antagonistic relationship with

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cd ^{14,41}. Moreover, moderate relation for Zn ($R^2=0.776$) and Ni ($R^2=0.757$) may be because of competitive behavior of Fe with Ni followed by Zn for binding sites in plant ⁴². This could also be attributed to relatively low phytoavailable Zn and Ni contents compared to Fe in treated soil.

3.4 Metal tolerance index of lemongrass

Assessing metal tolerance is of paramount importance while selecting plant for phytoremediation ⁴³. To determine metal tolerant behavior of plant, one of the most common parameters used is metal tolerance index (MTI) ⁴⁴. Based on total plant biomass, MTI of lemongrass under different soil treatments showed remarkable differences in tolerance to high metal contents compared to C. The MTI under CD_{RM0}, CD_{RM5}, CD_{RM10}, CD_{RM15}, SS_{RM0}, SS_{RM5}, SS_{RM10} and SS_{RM15} treatments were 129.7, 151.7, 126.7, 115.1, 150.1, 191.4, 167.4 and 120.7 %, respectively. Although MTI varied with increasing metal contents due to RM addition in bio-waste amended soil, its value was found >100 % under all treatments, thereby categorizing lemongrass as metal tolerant plant (Table S1-4), capable to grow in metal polluted soil. Metal tolerant plants are known to elicit their ability to tolerate metal induced reactive oxygen species by increasing their enzymatic and non-enzymatic antioxidants, proline accumulation, synthesis of phytochelatins and metallothioneins for detoxification and homeostasis ^{35,45}.

3.5 Translocation and bioconcentration factors for metals

The translocation factor (TF) determines effectiveness in metal movement from roots to shoot, whereas bioconcentration factor (BCF_{plant}) is used in determining the uptake and accumulation of metals from soil into plant biomass ⁴⁶. Plant with BCF_{plant} value >1, indicates its efficiency to uptake and accumulate metals from soil, while with BCF_{plant} value <1 is metal excluder ⁴⁷. Thus by comparing BCF_{plant} and TF values of metals under different soil

287 treatments, we can compare plant's ability in extracting metals from soil and then
288 translocating them to easily harvestable part of the plant. Plant with both BCF_{plant} and TF
289 values >1 can be used as a suitable candidate for hyper-accumulation of metals, while plants
290 with $TF < 1$ can phytostabilize metals in roots⁴⁸.

291 No significant change in TF value for Cu was found under all treatments, whereas Al, Zn, Pb,
292 Cd, Ni, Cr and As showed maximum TF values under CD_{RM0} and SS_{RM0} followed by a
293 gradual decline under increasing RM treatments (Table S1-5). A decline in TF values under
294 RM treatments may be attributed to decrease in available metals absorbed by the roots and
295 their further transport to shoot. The TF values of Fe, Mn and Cu were found < 1 indicating
296 restricted movement of metals from roots to shoot. However, TF values of Al, Zn, Pb, Cd, Ni,
297 Cr and As were found >1 which illustrates the efficiency of plant in transport of metals from
298 roots to shoot. Effectiveness of lemongrass in metal (Al, Zn, Cd, Pb, Ni, Cr and As)
299 movement from roots to shoot is more likely due to an efficient metal transporter "see ref.
300 49" and possibly due to metal sequestration in leaf vacuole and apoplast "see ref. 50". TF
301 values of Pb, Cd and Ni were higher, whereas that of Cu and Zn (except in C) were found
302 lower than those reported in lemongrass grown on scrap metal dumpsite¹². Thus based on TF
303 values, lemongrass was found efficient in translocation of Al, Zn, Cd, Pb, Ni, Cr and As from
304 roots to shoot and acted as a potential phytostabilizer of Fe, Mn and Cu in roots.

305 The BCF_{plant} values for Mn, Zn, Cu, Ni and Pb increased, whereas for Al, Fe, Cd, Cr and As
306 decreased with increase in RM concentration in bio-waste amended soil, BCF_{plant} values for
307 all metals were < 1 under all soil treatments (Table S1-5). BCF_{plant} values for Zn, Cu, Pb, Cd
308 and Ni in the plant were found less than those reported in lemongrass collected from scrap
309 metal dumpsite¹². Low BCF_{plant} values for studied metals in the plant under different soil
310 treatments may be attributed to decrease in their phytoavailable contents with increase in soil

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

311 pH and metal adsorption capacity of RM ¹. In the present study, based on BCF_{plant} values,
312 lemongrass acted as a potential metal excluder.

313 **4 Conclusions**

314 The study showed that red mud in combination with sewage-sludge in soil led to more
315 significant improvement in organic matter and nutrient contents compared to cowdung
316 amended soil. Increasing red mud concentrations in bio-waste amended soil increased total
317 metal contents with simultaneous reduction in their phytoavailable contents. Studied metals
318 except Cd in lemongrass were found within the phytotoxic thresholds for medicinal plants.
319 All metals except Mn exceeded the WHO safe limit for consumption in medicinal plants. A
320 significant improvement in plant biomass was observed under red mud treatments compared
321 to control soil with maximum increase under 5 % RM treatment. Lemongrass was found to be
322 a potential metal tolerant plant as metal tolerance index was more than 100 %. Based on
323 translocation factor, lemongrass acted as a potential phytostabilizer of Fe, Mn and Cu in
324 roots, whereas it was found efficient in translocation of Al, Zn, Cd, Pb, Ni, Cr and As from
325 roots to shoot. Moreover, lemongrass was identified as a potential metal excluder due to
326 bioconcentration factors <1 for studied metals. The study suggests that 5 % RM in
327 combination with bio-wastes; preferably SS may be used as a soil quality enhancer by
328 reducing metal toxicity and also make it suitable for lemongrass cultivation coupled with
329 enhanced phytoremediation efficiency. However, a much more detailed investigation over the
330 likely environmental impacts of this strategy under field condition is needed.

331 **6 Acknowledgements**

332 Authors are thankful to the Head, Department of Botany, Institute of Science, B.H.U.,
333 Varanasi and HINDALCO Industries Ltd., Renukoot, U.P. for providing all the necessary
334 facilities during the research work. We are thankful to AXA Junior Research (Post-doctoral)

335 Fellowship, York, United Kingdom and Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR),
336 New Delhi, India for financial assistance in the form of Research Associateship (Divya
337 Pandey) and Senior Research Fellowship (Meenu Gautam), respectively. We are also grateful
338 to anonymous reviewers for their critical comments and helpful suggestions which helped us
339 in improving the manuscript.

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

References

¹Xue S, Zhu F, Kong X, Wu C, Huang L, Huang N, Hartley W. A review of the characterization and revegetation of bauxite residues (Red mud). *Environ Sci Pollut Res*. 2016; 23:1120-1132.

²Evans K. The History, Challenges, and New Developments in the Management and Use of Bauxite Residue. *J Sustain Metall*. 2016;1-6.

³Mayes WM, Burke IT, Gomes HI, Anton AD, Molnár M, Feigl V, Ujaczki E. Advances in Understanding Environmental Risks of Red Mud After the Ajka Spill, Hungary. *J Sustain Metall*. 2016;13:1-2.

⁴Ruyters S, Mertens J, Vassilieva E, Dehandschutter B, Poffijn A, Smolders E. The red mud accident in Ajka (Hungary): plant toxicity and trace metal bioavailability in red mud contaminated soil. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2011;45:1616-1622.

⁵Power G, Gräfe M, Klauber C. Bauxite residue issues: I. Current management, disposal and storage practices. *Hydrometallurgy*. 2011;108:33-45.

⁶Marques APGC, Rangel AOSS Castro PML. Remediation of heavy metal contaminated soils: phytoremediation as potentially promising clean-up technology. *Crit Rev Environ Sci Technol*. 2009; 39:622–654.

⁷Santini TC, Kerr JL, Warren LA. Microbially-driven strategies for bioremediation of bauxite residue. *J Hazard Mater*. 2015;293:131-57.

⁸Ujaczki É, Feigl V, Molnár M, Vaszita E, Uzinger N, Erdélyi A, Gruiz K. The potential application of red mud and soil mixture as additive to the surface layer of landfill cover system. *J Environ Sci*. 2016;44:189-96.

- 377 ⁹Jones BEH, Haynes RJ, Phillips IR. Influence of organic waste and residue mud additions on
378 chemical, physical and microbial properties of bauxite residue sand. Environ Sci Pollut
379 Res. 2011;18:199-211.
- 380 ¹⁰Courtney R, Timpson J. Reclamation of fine fraction bauxite processing residue (red mud)
381 amended with coarse fraction residue and gypsum. Water Air Soil Pollut. 2005;164:91–
382 102.
- 383 ¹¹Das M, Maiti SK. Growth of *Cymbopogon citratus* and *Vetiveria zizanioides* on Cu mine
384 tailings amended with chicken manure and manure-soil mixtures: A pot scale study. Int
385 J Phytorem. 2009;11:651–663.
- 386 ¹²Israila YZ, Bola AE, Emmanuel GC, Ola IS. The effect of application of EDTA on the
387 phytoextraction of heavy metals by *Vetiveria zizanioides*, *Cymbopogon citrates* and
388 *Helianthus annuus*. Int J Environ Monit Anal. 2015;3:38-43.
- 389 ¹³Bienes R, Jimenez-Ballesta R, Ruiz-Colmenero M, Arevalo D, Alvarez A, Marques MJ.
390 Incidence of the growing of aromatics and medicinal plants on the erosion of
391 agricultural soils. Span J Rural Develop. 2010;1:19-28.
- 392 ¹⁴Singh RP, Agrawal M. Variations in heavy metal accumulation, growth and yield of rice
393 plants grown at different sewage sludge amendment rates. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf.
394 2010;73:632-41.
- 395 ¹⁵Allison FE. Soil organic matter and its role in crop production. Amsterdam (Netherlands):
396 Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company; 1973.
- 397 ¹⁶Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanabe FS, Dean LA. Estimation of Available Phosphorus in Soils
398 by Extraction with Sodium Bicarbonate. US: Circular No. 939, Department of
399 Agriculture. 1954.p.19.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

400 ¹⁷Hesse PR. A textbook of soil chemical analysis. In: Murray J, editor. A textbook of soil
401 chemical analysis. London; 1971.p.35-88.

402 ¹⁸Quevauviller P, Rauret G, Rubio R, López-Sánchez JF, Ure A, Bacon J, Muntau H.
403 Certified reference materials for the quality control of EDTA-and acetic acid-
404 extractable contents of trace elements in sewage-sludge amended soils (CRMs 483 and
405 484). Fresen J Anal Chem. 1997;357:611-618.

406 ¹⁹Gaidajis G. Ambient concentrations of total suspended particulate matter and its elemental
407 constituents at the wider area of the mining facilities of TVX Hellas in Chalkidiki,
408 Greece. J Environ Sci Heal A. 2003;38:2509-2520.

409 ²⁰Welz B, Šucmanová M. L-Cysteine as reducing and releasing agent for determination of
410 antimony and arsenic using flow injection hydride generation atomic absorption
411 spectrometry—Part 1. Optimization of analytical parameters. Analyst. 1993;118:1417-
412 23.

413 ²¹Lockwood CL, Stewart DI, Mortimer RJ, Mayes WM, Jarvis AP, Gruiz K, Burke IT.
414 Leaching of copper and nickel in soil-water systems contaminated by bauxite residue
415 (red mud) from Ajka, Hungary: importance of soil organic matter. Environ Sci Pollut
416 Res. 2015;22:10800-10.

417 ²²Jones BE, Haynes RJ, Phillips IR. Effect of amendment of bauxite processing sand with
418 organic materials on its chemical, physical and microbial properties. J Environ Manag.
419 2010;91:2281-8.

420 ²³Wang S, Shi X, Sun H, Chen Y, Pan H, Yang X, Rafiq T. Variations in metal tolerance and
421 accumulation in three hydroponically cultivated varieties of *Salix integra* treated with
422 lead. PloS one. 2014; 9:108-568.

- 423 ²⁴Qihang W, Wang S, Thangavel P, Qingfei L, Zheng H, Jun B, Qui R. Phytostabilization of
424 *Jatropha curcas* L. in polymetallic acid mine tailings. Int J Phytorem. 2011;13: 788-
425 804.
- 426 ²⁵Gräfe M, Klauber C. Bauxite residue issues: IV. Old obstacles and new pathways for in situ
427 residue bioremediation. Hydrometallurgy. 2011;108:46-59.
- 428 ²⁶Tipping E, Smith EJ, Lawlor AJ, Hughes S, Stevens PA. Predicting the release of metals
429 from ombrotrophic peat due to drought-induced acidification. Environ Pollut
430 2003;123:239-53.
- 431 ²⁷Lacatusu R, Kiselev A, Stroe VM, Rizea N, Lungu M, Lazar R, Stanciuburileanu MM,
432 Calciu I, Popa RG, Filipescu L. Plant Growth Suitable Nutritive Red Mud Composite
433 Materials from Romanian Dry Landfilled Red Mud II. Formulation nutritive composite
434 materials and plant growth tests at laboratory and glasshouse scale. Revista De Chimie.
435 2014;65:1294-1305.
- 436 ²⁸Filcheva E, Noustorova M, Gentcheva-Kostadinova SV, Haigh MJ. Organic accumulation
437 and microbial action in surface coal-mine spoils, Pernik, Bulgaria. Ecol Eng.
438 2000;15:1-5.
- 439 ²⁹Zhu F, Xue S, Hartley W, Huang L, Wu C, Li X. Novel predictors of soil genesis following
440 natural weathering processes of bauxite residues. Environ Sci Pollut Res.
441 2016;23:2856-2863.
- 442 ³⁰Buchmann MF. NOAA Screening Quick Reference Tables, NOAA OR&R Report 08-1.
443 Seattle (WA): Office of Response and Restoration Division, National Oceanic and
444 Atmospheric Administration; 2008-34.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

³¹Santona L, Castaldi P, Melis P. Evaluation of interaction mechanisms between red muds and heavy metals. J Hazard Mater. 2006;136: 324-329.

³²Gherardi MJ, Rengel Z. Bauxite residue sand has capacity to rapidly decrease availability of added manganese. Plant and Soil. 2001;234:143-51.

³³Guan TX, He HB, Zhang XD, Bai Z. Cu fractions, mobility and bioavailability in soil–wheat system after Cu-enriched livestock manure applications. Chemosphere. 2011;82:215–222.

³⁴Hartley W, Edwards R, Lepp NW. Arsenic and heavy metal mobility in iron oxide-amended contaminated soils as evaluated by short-and long-term leaching tests. Enviro Pollut. 2004;131:495-504.

³⁵Handique GK, Handique AK. Proline accumulation in lemongrass (*Cymbopogon flexuosus* Stapf.) due to heavy metal stress. J Environ Biol. 2009;30:299-302.

³⁶Gray CW, Dunham SJ, Dennis PG, Zhao FJ, McGrath SP. Field evaluation of in situ remediation of heavy metal contaminated soil using lime and red-mud. Environ Pollut. 2006;142:530-539.

³⁷Boonyapookana B, Parkplan P, Techapinyawat S, DeLaune RD, Jugsujinda A. Phytoaccumulation of lead by sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*), and vetiver (*Vetiveria zizanioides*). J Environ Sci Health Part A-Toxic/Hazard Subst Environ Engin. 2005;40:117-137.

³⁸Alloway BJ, Ayres DC. Chemical Principles of Environmental Pollution. London (UK): Chapman and Hall; 1997.

- 466 ³⁹Domínguez-Solís JR, López-Martín MC, Ager FJ, Ynsa MD, Romero LC, Gotor C.
467 Increased cysteine availability is essential for cadmium tolerance and accumulation in
468 *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant Biotech J. 2004;2:469-476.
- 469 ⁴⁰World Health Organization. Quality Control Methods for Medicinal Plant Materials.
470 Geneva, Switzerland. 2005.
- 471 ⁴¹Sun YB, Zhou QX, Liu WT, An J, Xu ZQ, Wang L. Joint effects of arsenic and cadmium
472 on plant growth and metal bioaccumulation: potential Cd-hyperaccumulator and As-
473 excluder *Bidens pilosa* L. J Hazard Mater. 2009;165:1023-1028.
- 474 ⁴²Wood BW. Iron-induced nickel deficiency in pecan. Hort Sci. 2013;48:1145-1153.
- 475 ⁴³Zacchini M, Pietrini F, Mugnozza GS, Iori V, Pietrosanti L, Massacci A. Metal tolerance,
476 accumulation and translocation in poplar and willow clones treated with cadmium in
477 hydroponics. Water Air Soil Pollut. 2009;197: 23-34.
- 478 ⁴⁴Köhl, Löscher R. Experimental characterization of heavy metal tolerance in plants. In: Prasad
479 MNV, Hagemeyer J, editors. Heavy metal stress in plants. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer;
480 1999.p.371-389.
- 481 ⁴⁵Emamverdian A, Ding Y, Mokherdoran F, Xie Y. Heavy metal stress and some
482 mechanisms of plant defense response. The Scientific World Journal. 2015.p.26.
- 483 ⁴⁶Deng H, Ye ZH, Wong MH. Accumulation of lead, zinc, copper and cadmium by 12
484 wetland plant species thriving in metal-contaminated sites in China. Environ Pollut.
485 2004;132:29-40.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

486 ⁴⁷Yanqun Z, Yuan L, Jianjun C, Haiyan C, Li Q, Schwartz C. Hyperaccumulation of Pb, Zn
487 and Cd in herbaceous grown on lead–zinc mining area in Yunnan, China. Environ Int.
488 2005; 31:755-762.

489 ⁴⁸Yoon J, Cao X, Zhou Q, Ma LQ. Accumulation of Pb, Cu, and Zn in native plants growing
490 on contaminated Florida site. Sci Total. 2006;368: 456-46.

491 ⁴⁹Baker AJM, McGrath SP, Sidoli CMD, Reeves RD. The possibility of in situ heavy metal
492 decontamination of polluted soils using crops of metal-accumulating plants. Resour
493 Conserv Recy. 1994;11:41-49.

494 ⁵⁰Clemens S, Palmgren MG, Krämer U. A long way ahead: understanding and engineering
495 plant metal accumulation. Trends in Plant Sci. 2002;7:309-315.




Fig. 1 Root, shoot and total plant biomass of lemongrass grown under different RM treatments in soil amended with CD or SS. Values are mean \pm SE. Different letters indicate significant differences at $p < 0.05$ according to Duncan's test. RM: red mud; C: control; CD_{RM0}: soil with CD; CD_{RM5}: 5 % RM in CD_{RM0}; CD_{RM10}: 10 % RM in CD_{RM0}; CD_{RM15}: 15 % RM in CD_{RM0}, SS_{RM0}: soil with SS; SS_{RM5}: 5 % RM in SS_{RM0}; SS_{RM10}: 10 % RM in SS_{RM0} and SS_{RM15}: 15 % RM in SS_{RM0}.

Table 1 Selected physico-chemical properties, total and phytoavailable metal contents in control and RM treatments in soil amended with CD or SS (Mean ± SE)

Parameters	C	CD _{RM0}	CD _{RM5}	CD _{RM10}	CD _{RM15}	SS _{RM0}	SS _{RM5}	SS _{RM10}	SS _{RM15}
pH	7.87±0.05 ^{cd}	7.33±0.01 ^f	7.82 ±0.02 ^d	8.09 ±0.02 ^b	8.27 ±0.01 ^a	7.71±0.04 ^e	7.82 ±0.01 ^d	7.94±0.01 ^c	8.21±0.04 ^a
EC (mS cm ⁻¹)	0.18 ±0.01 ⁱ	0.50±0.00 ^e	0.54±0.00 ^d	0.56±0.00 ^c	0.86±0.01 ^b	0.32±0.00 ^h	0.43±0.00 ^g	0.47±0.00 ^f	1.15 ±0.00 ^a
TOC (%)	0.56 ±0.10 ^d	4.19±0.06 ^c	4.23±0.28 ^c	4.56 ±0.07 ^{bc}	4.40±0.10 ^{bc}	4.77±0.21 ^{ab}	5.15±0.06 ^a	5.18±0.11 ^a	5.09±0.06 ^a
TN (%)	0.12±0.01 ^f	0.54±0.02 ^a	0.48±0.02 ^{abc}	0.30±0.01 ^d	0.21±0.01 ^e	0.53±0.001 ^{ab}	0.50±0.03 ^{abc}	0.46±0.03 ^{bc}	0.45±0.04 ^c
AP (mg kg ⁻¹)	31.83±1.64 ^g	443.04±37.98 ^{cd}	416.49±14.97 ^{de}	393.78±6.31 ^{ef}	377.26±12.17 ^f	566.64±18.93 ^a	520.32±5.04 ^{ab}	485.22±4.54 ^{bc}	463.39±5.74 ^{cd}
CEC (meq100 g ⁻¹)	4.16±0.11 ^{bc}	3.76±0.06 ^c	3.78±0.03 ^c	3.99±0.37 ^c	4.14±0.02 ^{bc}	4.50±0.06 ^{ab}	4.57±0.05 ^{ab}	4.65±0.03 ^a	4.71±0.02 ^a
Total metal contents (mg kg⁻¹)									
Al*	0.08±0.00 ^g	0.37±0.01 ^g	8.58±0.21 ^e	19.05±0.22 ^c	24.31±0.19 ^b	3.14±0.24 ^f	16.62±0.13 ^d	24.70±0.20 ^b	32.95±0.23 ^a
Fe*	2.57±0.03 ^h	3.38±0.22 ^h	16.26±0.11 ^g	31.84±0.48 ^e	48.65±0.56 ^c	21.81±0.23 ^f	35.80±1.12 ^d	51.91±1.06 ^b	67.39±1.38 ^a
Mn	260.67±1.76 ^e	285.43±1.57 ^d	286.68±0.89 ^d	291.42±4.57 ^d	303.42±2.02 ^c	308.39±2.19 ^{bc}	310.27±4.53 ^{abc}	314.97±1.49 ^{ab}	318.16±1.35 ^a
Zn	134.49±7.49 ^e	146.07±2.16 ^c	147.54±3.21 ^{de}	163.14±2.60 ^{cd}	170.61±4.75 ^c	540.94±7.01 ^b	536.03±5.28 ^b	550.94±7.01 ^{ab}	560.32±5.31 ^a
Cu	70.55±0.79 ^f	76.20±1.38 ^e	79.92±2.08 ^e	88.57±1.93 ^d	116.28±2.07 ^c	177.57±2.27 ^b	179.63±2.55 ^{ab}	181.79±1.30 ^{ab}	184.24±0.62 ^a
Pb	18.27±0.48 ⁱ	18.79±0.72 ^h	25.53±0.46 ^g	43.26±0.75 ^e	45.94±0.43 ^d	36.49±0.23 ^f	49.03±0.08 ^e	61.80±0.11 ^b	73.31±0.21 ^a
Cd	1.46±0.05 ^h	2.14±0.02 ^h	12.75±0.06 ^g	33.50±0.11 ^f	40.25±0.17 ^e	50.98±0.83 ^d	73.30±1.65 ^c	93.08±2.89 ^b	116.58±3.51 ^a
Ni	11.69±0.81 ^f	12.48±0.34 ^f	13.22±0.25 ^f	16.79±0.38 ^e	18.78±0.75 ^e	26.55±0.25 ^d	35.27±1.24 ^c	39.68±1.04 ^b	49.75±0.27 ^a
Cr	16.94±0.75 ^g	17.97±0.39 ^g	68.31±0.96 ^f	84.07±1.42 ^{ef}	112.12±3.79 ^c	310.05±5.03 ^d	351.06±3.89 ^c	410.96±0.43 ^b	476.42±37.34 ^a
As	0.13±0.01 ^g	0.59±0.01 ^{fg}	0.99±0.06 ^{ef}	1.37±0.06 ^e	1.88±0.06 ^d	3.47±0.24 ^c	3.80±0.20 ^c	4.80±0.35 ^b	5.73±0.07 ^a
Phytoavailable metal contents (mg kg⁻¹)									
Al	57.86±0.79 ^c	58.21±0.83 ^c	47.00±2.52 ^c	42.33±1.45 ^f	36.00±1.00 ^g	78.51±1.87 ^a	63.67±0.88 ^b	57.89±0.48 ^c	52.36±1.06 ^d
Fe	86.43±0.86 ^{cd}	103.30±3.43 ^b	82.16±0.90 ^{de}	72.44±1.27 ^{ef}	66.67±0.33 ^f	135.96±3.59 ^a	111.67±4.41 ^b	92.88±1.28 ^c	81.98±0.56 ^{de}
Mn	35.71±1.17 ^b	35.69±0.24 ^b	32.70±0.36 ^{cd}	31.34±0.47 ^{de}	28.33±0.88 ^f	41.69±0.24 ^a	37.44±0.08 ^b	34.67±1.02 ^{bc}	29.63±1.93 ^{ef}
Zn	5.07±0.20 ^g	11.19±0.01 ^d	9.98±0.11 ^e	8.44±0.03 ^f	8.22±0.40 ^f	18.47±0.21 ^a	16.42±0.24 ^b	15.90±0.34 ^b	14.56±0.73 ^c
Cu	4.24±0.20 ^{ef}	6.97±0.12 ^d	4.61±0.29 ^e	3.64±0.25 ^f	2.77±0.08 ^g	12.65±0.03 ^a	10.67±0.15 ^b	9.80±0.45 ^c	9.49±0.26 ^c
Pb	0.03±0.00 ^f	0.04±0.00 ^{bc}	0.03±0.00 ^{de}	0.03±0.00 ^{ef}	0.03±0.00 ^g	0.05±0.00 ^a	0.04±0.00 ^b	0.04±0.00 ^{bc}	0.03±0.00 ^{cd}
Cd	0.27±0.01 ^e	0.35±0.00 ^b	0.32±0.00 ^d	0.27±0.00 ^e	0.25±0.00 ^f	0.47±0.00 ^a	0.35±0.00 ^b	0.33±0.00 ^c	0.32±0.00 ^d
Ni	2.14±0.06 ^{de}	2.34±0.02 ^c	2.16±0.01 ^{de}	2.07±0.01 ^e	1.83±0.04 ^f	2.84±0.01 ^a	2.43±0.01 ^b	2.23±0.01 ^d	2.17±0.02 ^d
Cr	4.27±0.13 ^d	2.68±0.24 ^e	2.41±0.15 ^{ef}	1.89±0.15 ^f	1.07±0.05 ^g	6.97±0.15 ^a	6.57±0.28 ^{ab}	5.96±0.06 ^b	5.23±0.03 ^c
As	0.01±0.001 ^f	0.08±0.004 ^c	0.07±0.002 ^{cd}	0.06±0.004 ^d	0.03±0.001 ^e	0.13±0.01 ^a	0.10±0.001 ^b	0.07±0.003 ^c	0.04±0.002 ^e

*g kg⁻¹; EC: electrical conductivity; TOC: total organic carbon; TN: total nitrogen; AP: available phosphorous; CEC: cation exchange capacity; RM: red mud; CD: cowdung manure; SS: sewage sludge; C: control; CD_{RM0}: soil with CD; CD_{RM5}: 5 % RM in CD_{RM0}; CD_{RM10}: 10 % RM in CD_{RM0}; CD_{RM15}: 15 % RM in CD_{RM0}; SS_{RM0}: soil with SS; SS_{RM5}: 5% RM in SS_{RM0}; SS_{RM10}:10 % RM in SS_{RM0} and SS_{RM15}:15 % RM in SS_{RM0}. Numbers with different letters in same row differ significantly at p < 0.05 as per the Duncan's test.

Table 2 Metal contents (mg kg⁻¹) in lemongrass grown under control and RM treatments in soil amended with CD or SS (Mean ± SE).

Metals	C	CD _{RM0}	CD _{RM5}	CD _{RM10}	CD _{RM15}	SS _{RM0}	SS _{RM5}	SS _{RM10}	SS _{RM15}
Al	0.01±0.00 ⁱ	0.19±0.00 ^h	1.66±0.02 ^f	2.83±0.05 ^d	3.55±0.06 ^b	0.45±0.02 ^g	2.37±0.02 ^c	3.27±0.05 ^c	3.85±0.13 ^a
Fe	0.63±0.02 ^f	0.65±0.01 ^f	2.54±0.07 ^e	3.18±0.01 ^c	3.58±0.03 ^b	2.76±0.03 ^d	3.12±0.10 ^c	3.49±0.06 ^b	4.06±0.11 ^a
Mn	52.03±2.46 ^e	51.23±2.77 ^e	62.54±2.95 ^d	75.28±0.26 ^c	84.64±1.77 ^b	74.58±0.96 ^c	88.87±2.36 ^b	97.54±3.11 ^a	102.39±0.23 ^a
Zn	25.35±1.30 ^g	29.03±0.67 ^{fg}	29.59±1.88 ^f	31.45±0.67 ^f	37.70±0.83 ^e	139.87±1.79 ^d	143.67±1.54 ^c	154.58±0.91 ^b	161.09±1.06 ^a
Cu	41.84±2.77 ^f	45.21±1.49 ^{ef}	47.14±0.66 ^{ef}	51.40±2.01 ^e	58.87±0.21 ^d	69.60±0.50 ^c	77.85±3.96 ^b	81.68±1.25 ^{ab}	85.98±2.98 ^a
Pb	2.16 ± 0.01 ^h	6.00±0.38 ^g	10.18±0.18 ^f	21.96±0.27 ^d	25.27±0.43 ^c	16.52±1.47 ^c	29.69±0.10 ^c	43.35±1.87 ^b	52.47±1.22 ^a
Cd	1.32±0.04 ^g	1.89±0.03 ^g	10.33±0.52 ^f	23.93±0.74 ^c	26.99±1.1 ^e	38.16±0.54 ^d	53.82±3.32 ^c	68.12±2.45 ^b	79.43±0.48 ^a
Ni	3.78±0.02 ^g	5.95±0.09 ^f	6.44±0.07 ^f	7.69±0.20 ^e	8.18±0.16 ^{de}	8.69±0.17 ^d	13.31±0.48 ^c	17.59±0.05 ^b	22.56±0.06 ^a
Cr	8.38±0.08 ^f	9.34±0.03 ^e	9.68±0.29 ^e	10.64±0.19 ^d	10.74±0.11 ^d	37.07±0.02 ^c	38.82±0.61 ^b	40.32±0.02 ^a	41.03±0.16 ^a
As	0.10±0.01 ^f	0.74±0.04 ^e	0.86±0.03 ^{de}	0.94±0.03 ^d	0.98±0.02 ^d	2.15±0.01 ^c	2.49±0.11 ^b	2.53±0.01 ^b	2.72±0.01 ^a

RM: red mud; CD: cowdung manure; SS: sewage-sludge; C: control; CD_{RM0}: soil with CD; CD_{RM5}: 5 % RM in CD_{RM0}; CD_{RM10}: 10 % RM in CD_{RM0}; CD_{RM15}: 15 % RM in CD_{RM0}; SS_{RM0}: soil with SS; SS_{RM5}: 5% RM in SS_{RM0}; SS_{RM10}: 10 % RM in SS_{RM0} and SS_{RM15}: 15 % RM in SS_{RM0}. Numbers with different letters in same row differ significantly at p < 0.05 as per the Duncan's test.

Table S1-1 Details of different treatments

Treatment	Description
C	Unamended soil (Control)
CD _{RM0}	Unamended soil and cowdung manure (2:1 w/w)
CD _{RM5}	5% red mud + 95% CD _{RM0}
CD _{RM10}	10% red mud + 90 % CD _{RM0}
CD _{RM15}	15% red mud + 85% CD _{RM0}
SS _{RM0}	Unamended soil and sewage-sludge (2:1 w/w)
SS _{RM5}	5% red mud + 95% SS _{RM0}
SS _{RM10}	10% red mud + 90 % SS _{RM0}
SS _{RM15}	15% red mud + 85% SS _{RM0}

Table S1-2 Physico-chemical properties, total and phytoavailable metal contents in red mud, sewage-sludge and cowdung manure

Physicochemical properties	Red mud	Sewage-sludge	Cowdung manure
pH	9.21±0.01	7.72±0.02	7.77±0.01
EC (mS cm ⁻¹)	2.96±0.02	1.95±0.01	0.943±0.01
TOC (%)	0.30 ±0.24	6.58±0.02	5.44±0.02
TN (%)	nd	1.05±0.03	1.09±0.11
AP (mg kg ⁻¹)	6.46±0.02	638.32 ±8.22	572.24±3.08
CEC (meq 100 ⁻¹ g)	4.39±0.01	6.10±0.06	5.49±0.06
Total metals (mg kg⁻¹)			
Al*	187.7±4.79	2.42±0.04	0.01±0.00
Fe*	335.60±13.84	22.85±0.84	0.35±0.03
Mn	215.29±6.14	382.28±10.48	355.44±2.99
Zn	179.80±4.69	1087.66±54.44	204.87±7.71
Cu	122.61±2.95	325.01±8.79	188.63±4.34
Pb	162.86±5.93	66.26±3.64	6.91±0.51
Cd	252.18±4.24	169.76 ±7.56	0.64 ±0.05
Ni	58.51±0.96	56.90±2.61	4.72±0.16
Cr	418.75±8.32	315.42±8.42	8.04±0.23
As	18.07±1.15	10.67±0.36	0.04±0.002
Phytoavailable metals (mg kg⁻¹)			
Al	187.7±4.79	2.42±0.04	0.01±0.0001
Fe	83.41±0.52	283.64±5.90	220.12±4.04
Mn	21.91±2.15	54.91±0.11	42.79±0.12
Zn	5.07±0.32	64.81±0.22	16.42±0.02
Cu	4.62±0.12	42.74±1.04	28.74±1.55
Pb	0.03±0.001	0.07±0.001	0.04±0.001
Cd	0.27±0.02	0.71±0.02	0.44 ±0.01
Ni	1.45±0.04	3.62±0.07	3.24±0.05
Cr	1.04±0.08	5.12±0.48	2.75±0.16
As	0.05±0.002	1.24±0.05	0.02±0.001

*g kg⁻¹; nd: not detected; EC: electrical conductivity; TOC: total organic carbon; TN: total nitrogen; AP: available phosphorous; CEC: cation exchange capacity

Table S1-3 Pearson’s correlation coefficient between metal contents in soil and plant biomass under control and different red mud treatments in soil amended with both cowdung manure and sewage-sludge

Metals	R-values	
	Cowdung manure	Sewage-sludge
Al	0.994***	0.991***
Fe	0.935***	0.930***
Mn	0.749***	0.909***
Zn	0.681**	0.991***
Cu	0.911***	0.925***
Pb	0.967***	0.994***
Cd	0.992***	0.994***
Ni	0.870***	0.980***
Cr	0.865***	0.955***
As	0.849***	0.945***

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ns: insignificant,

Table S1-4 Classification of plant based on metal tolerance index

No.	MTI (%)	Classification of plant
1	$0 \leq 25$	Highly sensitive
2	$25 \leq 50$	Sensitive
3	$50 \leq 75$	Moderate
4	$75 \leq 100$	Tolerant
5	≥ 100	Highly tolerant

Table S1-5 Translocation (TF) and bioconcentration (BCF_{plant}) factors for studied metals in lemongrass grown under control and RM treatments in soil amended with CD or SS (Mean ± SE).

Metals	Parameters	C	CD _{RM0}	CD _{RM5}	CD _{RM10}	CD _{RM15}	SS _{RM0}	SS _{RM5}	SS _{RM10}	SS _{RM15}
Al	TF	1.48±0.12 ^d	2.26±0.08 ^a	2.09±0.00 ^{ab}	2.08±0.07 ^{ab}	2.08±0.00 ^{ab}	2.10±0.15 ^{ab}	1.88±0.07 ^{bc}	1.85±0.07 ^{bc}	1.77±0.09 ^c
	BCF _{plant}	0.08±0.00 ^e	0.52±0.01 ^a	0.19±0.00 ^b	0.15±0.01 ^c	0.15±0.00 ^c	0.15±0.01 ^c	0.14±0.00 ^c	0.13±0.01 ^{cd}	0.12±0.00 ^d
Fe	TF	0.16±0.00 ^d	0.17±0.00 ^{cd}	0.17±0.01 ^{cd}	0.19±0.01 ^{bc}	0.23±0.00 ^a	0.12±0.00 ^e	0.15±0.01 ^d	0.17±0.00 ^d	0.21±0.00 ^b
	BCF _{plant}	0.25±0.01 ^a	0.19±0.03 ^b	0.16±0.01 ^c	0.10±0.00 ^c	0.07±0.00 ^g	0.13±0.00 ^d	0.09±0.00 ^f	0.07±0.00 ^{gh}	0.06±0.00 ^h
Mn	TF	0.47±0.01 ^d	0.56±0.06 ^{cd}	0.75±0.08 ^{ab}	0.80±0.04 ^{ab}	0.81±0.03 ^a	0.48±0.04 ^d	0.66±0.04 ^{bc}	0.79±0.05 ^{ab}	0.77±0.03 ^{ab}
	BCF _{plant}	0.20±0.01 ^{de}	0.18±0.01 ^e	0.22±0.01 ^d	0.25±0.00 ^c	0.28±0.01 ^b	0.24±0.01 ^c	0.29±0.00 ^b	0.31±0.01 ^a	0.32±0.01 ^a
Zn	TF	2.61±0.12 ^d	1.74±0.07 ^{de}	1.56±0.59 ^{ef}	1.16±0.09 ^{ef}	1.04±0.04 ^f	1.52±0.06 ^a	1.41±0.07 ^{ab}	1.32±0.09 ^b	1.30±0.05 ^c
	BCF _{plant}	0.22±0.02 ^{cd}	0.17±0.01 ^e	0.20±0.01 ^{cd}	0.19±0.00 ^{de}	0.22±0.00 ^c	0.26±0.01 ^b	0.27±0.01 ^{ab}	0.28±0.01 ^{ab}	0.29±0.00 ^a
Cu	TF	0.56±0.03 ^a	0.63±0.01 ^a	0.66±0.01 ^a	0.66±0.04 ^a	0.68±0.05 ^a	0.66±0.00 ^a	0.68±0.00 ^a	0.69±0.00 ^a	0.74±0.14 ^a
	BCF _{plant}	0.59±0.04 ^a	0.59±0.01 ^a	0.59±0.02 ^a	0.58±0.02 ^a	0.51±0.01 ^b	0.39±0.00 ^d	0.43±0.03 ^{cd}	0.45±0.01 ^{bcd}	0.47±0.02 ^{bc}
Pb	TF	2.24 ± 0.05 ^b	2.34 ± 0.14 ^b	1.80 ± 0.08 ^c	1.17±0.04 ^{de}	1.04±0.05 ^c	2.81±0.27 ^a	1.80±0.00 ^c	1.42±0.05 ^d	1.34±0.03 ^{de}
	BCF _{plant}	0.12 ± 0.00 ^f	0.33 ± 0.02 ^c	0.40 ± 0.01 ^d	0.51 ± 0.01 ^c	0.59 ± 0.02 ^b	0.45 ± 0.04 ^{cd}	0.61 ± 0.00 ^b	0.70 ± 0.03 ^a	0.72± 0.02 ^a
Cd	TF	1.64±0.16 ^a	1.60±0.05 ^a	1.53±0.14 ^{ab}	1.43±0.05 ^{ab}	1.29±0.02 ^b	1.59±0.01 ^a	1.51±0.11 ^{ab}	1.40±0.03 ^{ab}	1.46±0.09 ^{ab}
	BCF _{plant}	0.90±0.03 ^a	0.89±0.02 ^a	0.81±0.04 ^b	0.71±0.02 ^c	0.63±0.01 ^d	0.75±0.02 ^{bc}	0.73±0.03 ^c	0.73±0.03 ^c	0.68±0.02 ^{cd}
Ni	TF	2.03±0.05 ^a	2.00±0.12 ^a	1.77±0.24 ^{ab}	1.70±0.18 ^{ab}	1.68±0.03 ^{ab}	1.60±0.13 ^b	1.45±0.09 ^b	1.39±0.04 ^b	1.40±0.03 ^b
	BCF _{plant}	0.33 ± 0.02 ^d	0.48 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	0.49 ± 0.01 ^a	0.46 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	0.44 ± 0.02 ^b	0.33 ± 0.00 ^d	0.38 ± 0.02 ^c	0.44 ± 0.01 ^b	0.45± 0.00 ^{ab}
Cr	TF	1.21±0.00 ^a	1.21±0.00 ^a	1.13±0.00 ^b	1.08±0.00 ^d	1.04±0.00 ^g	1.08±0.00 ^c	1.05±0.00 ^c	1.04±0.00 ^f	1.03±0.00 ^h
	BCF _{plant}	0.50±0.02 ^a	0.52±0.01 ^a	0.14±0.01 ^b	0.13±0.00 ^{bc}	0.10±0.00 ^{de}	0.12±0.00 ^{bcd}	0.11±0.00 ^{cde}	0.10±0.00 ^{cde}	0.09±0.01 ^e
As	TF	1.18±0.01 ^{ab}	1.06±0.00 ^c	1.05±0.00 ^c	1.04±0.00 ^c	1.04±0.00 ^c	1.20±0.00 ^a	1.19±0.01 ^{ab}	1.17±0.04 ^{ab}	1.13±0.03 ^b
	BCF _{plant}	0.78±0.09 ^{bc}	1.26±0.10 ^a	0.88±0.06 ^b	0.69±0.04 ^{cd}	0.52±0.01 ^{de}	0.63±0.05 ^{cde}	0.66±0.06 ^{cde}	0.53±0.04 ^{de}	0.47±0.01 ^e

RM: red mud; CD: cowdung manure; SS: sewage-sludge; C: control; CD_{RM0}: soil with CD; CD_{RM5}: 5 % RM in CD_{RM0}; CD_{RM10}: 10 % RM in CD_{RM0}; CD_{RM15}: 15 % RM in CD_{RM0}; SS_{RM0}: soil with SS; SS_{RM5}: 5% RM in SS_{RM0}; SS_{RM10}:10 % RM in SS_{RM0} and SS_{RM15}:15 % RM in SS_{RM0}. Numbers with different letters in same row differ significantly at p < 0.05 as per the Duncan's test.




Fig. S1-1 Linear regression between metal content in soil (independent variable) and entire plant biomass (dependent variable) under control and red mud treatments soil amended with cowdung manure or sewage-sludge (n=3). Levels of significance are indicated: ns, not significant; *, $p < 0.05$; **, $p < 0.01$; ***, $p < 0.001$.




Fig. S1-2 Linear regression between metal content in soil (independent variable) and entire plant biomass (dependent variable) under control and red mud treatments soil amended with cowdung manure or sewage-sludge ($n=3$). Levels of significance are indicated: ns, not significant; *, $p < 0.05$; **, $p < 0.01$; ***, $p < 0.001$.