Review

Phytoremediation of heavy metals with several efficiency enhancer methods

Karami, Ali and Shamsuddin, Zulkifli Hj.*

Department of Land Management, Faculty of Agriculture, UPM, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia.

Accepted 5 April, 2010

It is no doubt that the contamination of water, air and soil has worsened, and this occurs as a result of the increase in population. However, the need for remediation technologies has to be seriously considered. Phytoremediation is one of the remediation techniques with a relatively slow procedure and low efficiency. This review covers some of the biological, chemical, physical, physico-chemical and genetic methods, which were applied in parallel with phytoremediation, in an attempt to help increase the efficiency in the remediation of air, soil and water. These include lowering the pH and increasing the electrode potential (Eh), as well as using chelating agents and micro-organisms (arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) and plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR)). Among the introduced methods, an appropriate application of the PGPRs is one of the most useful and environmentally friendly techniques which is currently considered as a useful process in phytoremediation. As a result of the discovering of these new methods, multi-approaches have been executed for a faster and higher removal rate of the contaminants, with a consequent increase in the efficiency of phytoremediation, as compared to single techniques.
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INTRODUCTION

Due to global industrialization and the increase in human population in the twentieth century, heavy metal contamination of soil, water and air has posed various uncompromising and fatal effects on humans and the stability of the ecosystem. Unlike organic contaminants, heavy metals are not biologically degradable, and therefore can remain in environmental bodies for a long time. The term ‘heavy metal’ has different definitions, but it is mostly used in the context of environmental pollution. Among others, Shaw et al. (2004) explained four criteria in distinguishing the groups of heavy metal: 1) Relatively abundant in the earth’s crust; 2) reasonable extraction and usage; 3) having direct contact with people; and 4) toxic to humans. Another definition describes heavy metals as the metals which have a specific gravity of more than 4 (Anonymous, 1964; Nieboer and Richardson, 1980) or more than 5 (Lapedes, 1974; Nieboer and Richardson, 1980).

Most heavy metals are categorized as toxic and accessible, based on the classification of Wood (1974), and their concentrations in soil vary between 1 to 100,000 mg/kg (Blaylock and Huang, 2000). The plant toxicity of heavy metals differs according to plant species; for flowering plants the toxicity may appear as AS(III)~Hg>Cd>Tl>Se(IV)>Pb~Sb (Fergusson, 1990). Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that many factors can influence this sequence. These include the properties of soil and the type of plants. There are generally four major soil remediation methods (Ward and Singh, 2004), namely:

1. Physical remediation: thermal desorption, cement kiln, air stripping and incineration;
2. Chemical remediation: encapsulation, solvent extraction, neutralization, oxidation-reduction and precipitation;
4. Phytoremediation: defined as the use of plants (including trees and grasses) to remove, destroy or sequester hazardous contaminants from various media such as soil, water and air (Prasad, 2003). Phytoremediation consists of the Greek word “phyto” which refers to plant, and the Latin suffix “remedium” which means curing or restoring. The main reason for the use of this technique was to collect the contaminants from the media and turn them into easily extractable form (plant tissues). Basically, the phytoremediation of contaminants is categorized under four major sub-groups (Khan, 2005; Ward and Singh, 2004), as follows:

a. Phytoextraction entails the use of plants to remove soil contaminants and transport them to above-ground plant tissues. Chaney (1983) proposed this technique as the most promising method for the remediation of contaminated soils.
b. Phytostabilization basically involves the mechanisms of plants, which immobilize or reduce the availability of soil contaminants, by plant roots or their associated bacteria.
c. Phytovolatilization requires plants to volatilize soil contaminants into the atmosphere.
d. Rhizofiltration involves the absorption of contaminants from waste water and aqueous waste streams by plant roots.

This natural and environmental friendly technology is cost-effective, aesthetically pleasant, soil organism-friendly, diversity enhancer, energy derivation from sunlight (Chaney et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2004; Susarla et al., 2002), and more importantly, it is able to retain the fertility status of the soil even after the removal of heavy metals (Kirkham, 2006). However, this relatively new technology poses some disadvantages which have limited its application. These include the necessary demands for nutritional materials and specific climatic conditions, as well as proper soil characteristics to maintain a normal plant growth. For instance, Thlaspi praecox, that is, the hyperaccumulator of cadmium (Cd), zinc (Zn) and lead (Pb), is a perennial plant which is native to Slovenia, where the roots survive during cold winters and is very sensitive to warm temperatures. In particular, one of the most important drawbacks in phytoextraction is the long time required in this method which has challenged the application of phytoremediation. Huang et al. (1997) justified that for an economical phytoextraction, plants should be able to accumulate at least 1% of the total heavy metal content present in the soil into their dry shoot biomass.

Neugschwandtner et al. (2008) estimated that in order to obtain the Czech threshold values for Cd (1 mg kg⁻¹ soil) and Pb (220 mg kg⁻¹ soil) in contaminated soils under maximum obtained remediation factors, 260 and 300 cropping seasons, would respectively be required. Obviously, operating the huge number of cropping seasons is definitely very costly and time-consuming.

Other disadvantages of phytoextraction are the limited tolerance of the plant (particularly encountered at high concentration of contaminants), lower efficiency over other non-biological remediation techniques and the limitations when the contaminated soil layer occasionally extends to the deeper profile (Wei et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2006). Another major issue is the handling and disposal of the contaminated plant waste which could be land filled, composted or incinerated (Keller et al., 2005; Rathinasabapathi et al., 2006). However, these methods could be responsible of the transfer of the contaminants to other compartments of the ecosystem (e.g. land filling increases the risk of groundwater contamination).

Generally, two approaches have been proposed to be employed in using plants to extract heavy metals from contaminated soils. First is the use of plants with extraordinary ability to accumulate the contaminants known as “hyperaccumulators”, and second is the use of tolerant plants (Peer et al., 2005) with a relatively higher accumulation ability as compared to most other plants (but with lower ability as compared to hyperaccumulators) and high biomass such as corn, rice, peas and Indian mustard. These are normally accompanied by other enhancement methods (e.g. using chelating agents) to increase the concentration of heavy metals in plant tissues (Do Nascimento and Xing, 2006). In total, there are 45 families and 400 species of introduced hyperaccumulator vascular plants (Reeves and Baker, 2000). The number of species with a high accumulation capacity and high biomass are rather rare because hyperaccumulators have a small above-ground biomass, slow growth and a long maturity phase (Zhou and Song, 2004). The term “hyperaccumulator” was first explained by Brooks et al. (1977) who related it to plants which could accumulate nickel (Ni) at a concentration of more than 1000 mg/kg dry weight in their leaves. This was followed by Baker and Brooks (1989) who defined this term by including the concentration of other heavy metals in shoots of hyperaccumulator plants as 100 mg/kg dry weight for Cd; 1,000 mg/kg dry weight for Ni, copper (Cu), cobalt (Co), Pb; 10,000 mg/kg dry weight for Zn and manganese (Mn) and 1 mg/kg dry weight for gold (Au). There are three other important characteristics (Wei et al., 2008; Wei et al., 2004) used in defining a plant as a hyperaccumulator. The first characteristic is the translocation factor (TF) which refers to the concentration of heavy metal in shoots divided by that in roots, and it should be higher than 1 (the concentration of contaminants in shoots should be higher than in roots). This particular criterion is especially important in phytoextraction since harvesting of the shoots is the main purpose. The second characteristic is the accumulation factor (AF), that is, the
concentration of heavy metal in roots divided by that in soil which should be higher than 1. Tolerance is the third criterion, which is manifested by insignificant or no reduction in the shoot biomass of plants grown in contaminated sites. Although finding out the species which carry all the mentioned criteria is rather difficult, hyperaccumulators usually have a weak point in at least one of them.

**INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF PHYTOREMEDIATION**

Increasing the bioavailability of heavy metals

One of the most critical points of phytoremediation is the phytoavailability of heavy metals in soil (Lombi et al., 2001). Based on the uptake by plants, heavy metals in soil could be classified into three groups which include “available” fractions (easily absorbable forms including free ions and chelating ions), “exchangeable” fractions (bound to organic matter, carbonates or Fe-Mn oxides) and “unavailable” fractions (residual forms which are most difficult to be absorbed) (Wei et al., 2008; Zhou and Song, 2004). Nevertheless, there are other techniques which can be used to increase the bioavailability of heavy metals such as decreasing pH by adding sulfuric acid or organic fertilizers (Roy and Singh, 2006; Warton and Matthiessen, 2005) or using chelating re-agents. Sappin-Didier et al. (2005) showed an increase in the accumulation of Cd in transgenic tobacco as pH decreased, whereas Singer et al. (2007) proved an increase in the Ni concentration of Alyssum lesbiacum which was paralleled with the increase in pH. The latter case showed a different impact strategy of pH under different situations on the accumulation of metal.

Chelating agents have been widely used by many researchers (Blaylock et al., 1997; Chiu et al., 2005; Marques et al., 2008b; Pastor et al., 2007). Synthetic chelating agents are shown to have the potential to increase the bioavailability of unavailable and exchangeable heavy metal fractions (Komarek et al., 2007; Sun et al., 2001). The most important application of the chelating reagent is related to phytoremediation of less bioavailable heavy metals such as lead (as only 0.1% of soil Pb is bioavailable) (Peer et al., 2005). The use of non-biodegradable or the least biodegradable chelating agents, such as ethylene-diaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA), can leach metals into the ground water (Santos et al., 2006) and create a new source of pollution by this residual chelating reagent (Wei et al., 2008). (S,S)-N,N’-ethylenediamine disuccinic acid (EDDS) is the biodegradable form of EDTA (Schowanek et al., 1997; Vandevivere et al., 2001) with 90% biodegradability within 20 days (Dixon, 2004) and is a good substitute of EDTA (Tandy et al., 2006). Luo et al. (2006) showed that the application of hot EDDS (90°C) was much more efficient than the normal chelate solutions (25°C) in improving the uptake of heavy metals by plants. These authors also hypothesized that when hot water pre-treatment was used, the uptake of metal-EDTA was enhanced through physiological damage to the roots. However, the applicability of this experiment in big expanse of contaminated land is still being questioned, since spreading near boiling EDDS on soil surface can seriously injure plant shoots and further disrupt phytoremediation process, unless long tubes are used to directly transfer hot solution to soil surface. Nevertheless, this method has its own economical and operational restrictions.

Another method is to increase the electrode potential (Eh) which can enhance the bioavailability of metals in soil solution (Zhou and Song, 2004). The adjustment of Eh is usually executed using farming techniques such as solar drying, balancing of organic materials or irrigation arrangement; however, the adjustment of Eh is generally complicated (Wei et al., 2008; Yang, 1998).

### The increase of plant growth

As the biomass of plants (especially the biomass of shoot) has a critical role in the total metal removal, any physical (such as light and temperature adjustment), chemical (such as the use of fertilizers) or physico-chemical (such as adjustment of soil pH) methods could improve the efficiency of phytoremediation. Appropriate application of fertilizers (N, P, K) and irrigation also have beneficial effects (Wei et al., 2008); for instance, Jankong et al. (2007) found an increase in the biomass and accumulation of arsenic in silverback ferns (Pityrogramma calomelanos) fertilized with phosphorus. Meanwhile, Barrutia et al. (2009) observed an increase in the mean plant biomass and tolerance when treated with fertilizers in Pb, Cd and Zn contaminated soils. Hamlin and Barker (2006) discovered that nitrate fertilizers could be used to enhance the biomass of shoot and stimulate the accumulation of Zn. In spite of the presence of positive effects of fertilizers on metal accumulation, Marques et al. (2008a) showed a reduction in the accumulation of Zn in Solanum nigrum when amended with manure.

### Decreased phytoremediation period

Another suggested approach is to accelerate the growth of plants, which consequently decreases phytoremediation cycle, by providing specific demands of respective plant species (e.g. adjusting light, temperature and CO₂) (Wu et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2008). This could also be achieved by transferring the seedling to the field so as to decrease the duration of phytoremediation (as the accumulation of heavy metal in plant shoots at flowering stage is high) (Wei et al., 2008); however, this technique also has its own ambiguous applicability because of the...
restrictions in the sowing of individual seedlings in a vast area of contaminated land.

**Biological methods**

Hiltner (1904) was the first to describe the term ‘rhizosphere’. This microbial community is effective in tracing metal phytoavailability using different mechanisms, including the release of chelators, acidification and redox changes (Abou-Shanab et al., 2003). Generally, beneficial rhizospheric micro-organisms include free-living as well as symbiotic rhizobacteria and mycorrhizal fungi.

**Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF)**

The term “mycorrhiza” was first used by Frank in 1885 and it was related to the modified root structure of forest trees. More than 80% of terrestrial plant diversity has a symbiotic association with mycorrhizae fungi (Sylvia, 2005). The principal role of mycorrhizal fungi is to improve the uptake of phosphorus and mineral nutrients for plants (Chen et al., 2006) and enhance the number and length of root branch (Padilla and Encina, 2005). However, the alleviation mechanisms of AMF on the phytoremediation of metal is not clear (Jankong and Visoottiviseth, 2008). Some researchers did not find any change in the concentration of heavy metals with the presence of AMF (e.g. Vogel-Mikus et al., 2006), while others found an increase in some metal concentrations in plant tissues (e.g. Marques et al., 2008a; Whitfield et al., 2003) and some others observed a decrease (e.g. Xu et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2009).

**Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR)**

Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) have initially been used in agriculture and forestry to increase plant yield, as well as growth and tolerance to diseases. In addition, they have recently been used in environmental remediation, particularly to overcome plant stress under flooded, high temperature and acidic conditions (Lucy et al., 2004). This group of microbes can be divided into two main groups, based on their relationships, namely free living (ePGPR) which live outside the plant cells and symbiotic (iPGPR) which live inside the plant cells and produce nodules (Gray and Smith, 2005). PGPR can promote the growth of plants using direct and indirect mechanisms. Direct mechanisms include lowering the production levels of ethylene through synthesis of 1-aminoacyclopropane-1-carboxylate (ACC) deaminase in plants (Reed and Glick, 2005; Safronova et al., 2006; Saleem et al., 2007), providing bioavailable phosphorus for plant uptake and atmospheric nitrogen fixation for plant use, sequestering trace elements like iron using siderophores (Glick et al., 1995) and production of plant hormones like gibberellins, cytokinins and auxins (Glick et al., 1999). Indirect impact of PGPR is usually achieved by increasing the plant tolerance to diseases (Guo et al., 2004). It is crucial to highlight that because the efficient use of PGPR is limited to slight and moderately contaminated sites (Wu et al., 2006), the most important limiting factor for the application of PGPR is their tolerance to the concentration of heavy metal. Based on the amount and the type of the organic compounds, which are mostly exuded from plant roots (Myers et al., 2001) as well as the amount and the type of heavy metals (Sandaa et al., 1999), the PGPR population between plants could be different among the same species in the contaminated soils, or even between the different growing stages of an individual plant. Wu et al. (2006) explained the increasing population of PGPR on the rhizosphere of *Brassica juncea* grown in Pb-Zn mine tailing by seedling stage > flowering stage > tillering stage.

PGPR in terrestrial plants: The alteration of rhizospheric microbial complex in the uptake of essential elements, such as Mn$^{2+}$ and Fe$^{3+}$ (Barber and Lee, 1974), and the efficiency of phytoremediation (O’Connell et al., 1996) have been well documented. Hasnain and Sabri (1997) showed an improvement in the growth of *Triticum aestivum* seedling in different Pb concentrations when their seeds were inoculated with two *Pseudomonas* strains as compared to the uninoculated control. The safety of their usage is one of the most important considerations which should be taken into account before deciding on whether to use PGPR for phytoremediation purposes. For example, *Burkholderia cepacia* is a multi-drug resistant PGPR with health risk potentials (Lee et al., 2008), but at the same time, it has been shown to have special abilities in increasing the efficiency of phytoremediation (Table 1). A number of new researches carried out in relation to the effects of PGPRs on the growth of plants and/or heavy metal concentrations in contaminated soils are summarized in Table 1.

PGPR in aquatic plants: Aquatic plants are relatively new approved organisms for remediation purposes; these include rhizofiltration, phytofiltration, and constructed wetlands (Abou-Shanab et al., 2007; Bennicelli et al., 2004; Zurayk et al., 2001). These aspects of phytoremediation have attracted more attention because of the increase in water pollution. Due to the new approach, most of the current research still focuses on the wetland hyperaccumulator species. Nonetheless, the availability of information on the effects of rhizospheric or rhizoplanic bacteria on the uptake of metal by plants rooted in aquatic systems is rather scarce. So et al. (2003) demonstrated that bacterial species resistant to Cu$^{2+}$ or Zn$^{2+}$, isolated from water hyacinths (*Eichhornia crassipes*), had led to an increase in the Cu$^{2+}$ removal
Table 1. Some recent researches in relation to the effects of PGPRs on plants in heavy metal contaminated soils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGPR</th>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Heavy metal</th>
<th>Effect(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bradyrhizobium</em> sp., <em>Pseudomonas</em> sp., <em>Ochrobactrum cyli</em></td>
<td><em>Lupinus luteus</em></td>
<td>Pb, Cu, Cd,</td>
<td>Decreased the metals accumulation. However, plant biomass was increased.</td>
<td>Dary et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bacillus subtilis, Bacillus cereus, Flavobacterium sp., Pseudomonas aeruginosa</em></td>
<td><em>Orychophragmus violaceus</em></td>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>Increased shoot biomass and Zn accumulation.</td>
<td>He et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ralstonia metalidurans</em></td>
<td><em>Maize</em></td>
<td>Cr, Pb</td>
<td>Increased the uptake by shoots by a factor of 5.4 and 3.8, respectively.</td>
<td>Braud et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Achromobacter xylosidans strain Ax10</em></td>
<td><em>Brassica juncea</em></td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Increased the length of roots and shoots, fresh and dry weight significantly and extensively improved the Cu uptake of <em>B. juncea</em> plants as compared to the control.</td>
<td>Ma et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brevibacterium Halotolerans</em></td>
<td><em>Zea mays</em></td>
<td>Pb, Zn, Cu</td>
<td>Demonstrated the highest concentrations of Pb, Zn, Cu with the PGPR strain.</td>
<td>Abou-shanab et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bacillus subtilis, Bacillus pumilus</em></td>
<td><em>Brassica napus</em></td>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>The Cd content per plant was increased; but the growth of roots was increased by 83% and shoots by 94%. The Cd content per plant was increased to 72% and the growth of the roots and shoots was by 56% and 64% respectively.</td>
<td>Dell’Amico et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas tolaasii ACC23</em></td>
<td><em>Black gram plants</em></td>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>Lessened the accumulation of cadmium in plants; showed extensive rooting and enhanced plant growth.</td>
<td>Ganesan (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Burkholderia sp. J62</em></td>
<td><em>Maize and tomato</em></td>
<td>Cd, Pb</td>
<td>Increased the biomass of maize and tomato plants significantly; the increased Pb and Cd contents in tissues varied from 38% to 192% and from 5% to 191%, respectively.</td>
<td>Jiang et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas fluorescens G10, Microbacterium sp. G16</em></td>
<td><em>Rape</em></td>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Increased root elongation of inoculated rape seedlings and total Pb accumulation as compared to the control plants.</td>
<td>Sheng et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</em></td>
<td><em>Mustard and pumpkin</em></td>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>Demonstrated improved growth and branched rooting expansively, reduced cadmium uptake of pumpkin by 59.22% in roots and 47.40% in shoots; reduction in the uptake of Cd by 52.44% and 36.89% in roots and shoots of mustard, respectively.</td>
<td>Sinha and Mukherjee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Burkholderia cepacia</em></td>
<td><em>Sedum alfredii</em></td>
<td>Cd, Zn</td>
<td>Increased plant growth with Zn treatment up to 110%; increased Cd and Zn uptakes up to 243% and 96.3%, respectively.</td>
<td>Li et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bradyrhizobium sp. RM8</th>
<th>Green gram var K851</th>
<th>Ni, Zn</th>
<th>Increased plant growth and decreased uptake of heavy metals by plant.</th>
<th>Wani, et al. (2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudomonas sp. RJ10</td>
<td>Brassica napus</td>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>Increased uptake of Cd by plant, and significantly enhanced shoot and root dry weight.</td>
<td>Sheng et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacillus sp. RJ16</td>
<td>Brassica juncea</td>
<td>Pb, Zn, Cu</td>
<td>Increased the removal of Pb, Zn, Cu by 92%, 38% and 36%, respectively.</td>
<td>Wu et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azotobacter chroococcum HKN-5</td>
<td>Indian mustard</td>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>Increased the length of roots significantly (specially strain 5C-2).</td>
<td>Belimov et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacillus megaterium HKP-1</td>
<td>Barley cultivar Tselinnyi-5</td>
<td>Pb, Cd</td>
<td>Increased growth of plants and uptake of nutrients; prevented the accumulation of Pb and Cd.</td>
<td>Belimov et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacillus mucilaginosus HKK-1</td>
<td>Barley cultivar Tselinnyi-5</td>
<td>Pb, Cd</td>
<td>Increased growth of plants and uptake of nutrients; prevented the accumulation of Pb and Cd.</td>
<td>Belimov et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. paradoxus 2C-1, 2P-1, 2P-4, 3C-2, 3C-3, 3C-5, 3P-3, 5C-2, 5P-3</td>
<td>Barley cultivar Tselinnyi-5</td>
<td>Pb, Cd</td>
<td>Increased growth of plants and uptake of nutrients; prevented the accumulation of Pb and Cd.</td>
<td>Belimov et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

capacity of this plant species. Xiong et al. (2008), who worked on Sedum alfredii Hance (a terrestrial plant), in an aqueous medium with rhizospheric bacteria, suggested that rhizospheric bacteria appeared to protect the roots against heavy metal toxicity. The number of bacteria on the root surface of terrestrial plants is approximately 10^7 cell/cm² (Kennedy et al., 1998), but this was found to decrease to 10^6 cell/cm² in aquatic plants (Fry and Humphrey, 1978). The difference in the population of bacteria could be attributed to several factors, such as the variability of oxygen flux around the roots of aquatic plants, which might change the equations of phytoremediation in the different media.

Genetically-engineered approaches

As a result of the development in biological science, genetic modification methods have attracted the attention of many scientists. Higher efficiency in the remediation by plants is achieved mostly by an increase in the tolerance and/or accumulation capacity of transgenic plants. The earliest research by Misra and Gedamu (1989) showed an increase in cadmium tolerance of transgenic tobacco plants (Nicotiana tabacum) expressing a yeast metallothionein gene. In addition, Hsieh et al. (2009) found an increase in mercury (Hg) accumulation and tolerance of Arabidopsis thaliana when mercuric ion binding protein (MerP), originated from transposon TnMERI1 of transposon TnMERI1 Bacillus megaterium strain MB1, was expressed in the transgenic plants. Transgenic plants usually contain some beneficial enzymes like ACC deaminase (Grckho et al., 2000; Nie et al., 2002) and gamma-glutamylcysteine synthetase (Han et al., 2000), which in turn improve the tolerance of plants to stress and increase the ratio between plant growth and shoot/root. Transgenic plants, with selected genes, have also been shown to have higher abilities to biodegrade organic contaminants in their tissues (Doty et al., 2000; Kawahigashi et al., 2003). Along with genetically engineered plants, the
the role of transgenic PGPR is considerable. The transgenic PGPRs usually have a higher ability to degrade organic contaminants (Barac et al., 2004; Monti et al., 2005) and exude heavy metal binding components, such as metallothioneins (MTs) and phytochelatines (PCs), which are useful in phytoremediation and bioremediation of contaminants (Wu et al., 2006).

Since all the research mentioned in the earlier section were merely confined to laboratory studies and field applications of transgenic organisms were also highly restricted, the use of this approach is therefore restricted in most countries; thus, they could not be considered as possible tools in phytoremediation of contaminated lands in the near future.

**Multi-functional methods to improve phytoremediation**

As each described method has its own advantages and disadvantages, new approaches have been focusing on multi-improvement methods. Lin et al. (2009) found a better efficiency of the low dose EDTA with a medium soil nutrient level on the accumulation of Pb in sunflower. Vaxevanidou et al. (2008) showed a 10% increase in the extraction of Pb with bacteria (Desulfitomomomas palmitatis) and EDTA, as compared to the amendment of EDTA alone. However, in the same study, a 30% reduction was observed for the extraction of Zn, with the presence of bacteria and EDTA, as compared to only EDTA. Similarly, Di Gregorio et al. (2006) showed a 56% increase in the efficiency of the EDTA-led phytoextraction by *B. juncea*, which was combined with an application of Triton X-100 and Sinorhizobium sp. Pb002 inoculums. More processes for the multi-function removal of contaminants are currently being used in removing organic compounds such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). For instance, a multi-process which includes physical (volatilization), photochemical (photoxidation) and microbial remediation (contaminant degrading bacteria, PGPRs) processes was employed by Huang et al. (2004). In their study, the average efficiency for the removal of 16 priority PAHs, using the multi-process remediation system, was found to be 100% more than land-farming, 50% more than using bacteria alone and 45% more than phytoremediation alone.

**CONCLUSION**

The increase of heavy metal pollution in the environment has led many researchers to focus on developing fast, economical and more efficient remediation technologies. It is no doubt that phytoremediation is an environmentally friendly technique, but the removal process is rather slow with lower efficiency as compared to many other techniques. Thus, some other remediation techniques, which are paralleled to or in sequence with phytoremediation, have been suggested to increase the potential for remediation. This review has highlighted some phytoremediation efficiency enhancer methods, including the recent studies which showed higher abilities when multiple techniques were used to increase the concentration and speed of pollution removal. At the same time, it is important to note that plants have a focal role in this system, and that the entire accompanying techniques are for higher and faster bioaccumulation of contaminants in plant tissues.
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