# **Filiz Sanal**

#### Authors' addresses:

Faculty of Science, Department of Biology, Department of Molecular Biology, Trakya University, Edirne, TURKEY

#### Correspondence:

*Filiz Sanal* Faculty of Science, Department of Biology, Department of Molecular Biology, Trakya University, Edirne, TURKEY Tel.: +90 284 2352825 Fax: +90 284 2354010 e-mail: <u>fekinci3@hotmail.com</u>

#### Article info:

Received: 2019 Accepted: 2019

## Introduction

Cereal products, which play an important role in the economy of our country, have great importance in human nutrition(GÜLEÇ et al., 2010).

Cereals are used as feed in the feeding of animals and as a basic ingredient in the production of many industrial products in addition to being the raw material of bread, which is one of the essential nutrients of human beings(Singh et al., 2008).

It is also one of the most consumed nutritional sources due to its high protein content. Therefore, widespread cereal production is performed in the world to meet the nutritional needs of people (Karaoğlu & Kotancılar, 2001). Wheat, which belongs to the genus *Triticum* in the *Gramineae* family, is one of the most used and cultivated culture plants by people in the world as a basic food product. While cereal products constitute around 50% of the cultivated areas in our country, 70% of these areas constitute wheat (Yavuz, 2005). Living beings are constantly in contact with the external environment by their nature. They are exposed to stress conditions due to the lack of adaptation in case of inappropriate conditions in the environment (Büyük et al., 2012).

Stress is defined as a condition that occurs in the plant when the environmental conditions change to an extent that normal growth and development of a plant will be affected in a negative way (Büyük et al., 2012). Nowadays, especially with the development of the chemical industry, chemical substances have been diversified, and 7600 of approximately

# The Effects of Heavy Metal Stress in Wheat Plant on Certain Phenolic Compounds

#### ABSTRACT

Plants are exposed to stress conditions depending on the lack of adaptation when unfavourable conditions occur in their environment. One of these stress conditions is heavy metal pollution. Defence systems are activated in order to protect cells under stress conditions and keep the levels of reactive oxygen species (ROS) under control and to eliminate ROS. Phenolic compounds are effective compounds for eliminating and neutralizing free radicals. Therefore, this study investigates the effects of the short-term application (1 and 5 days) of arsenic, cadmium and lead ( $15\mu$ M,  $30\mu$ M and  $60\mu$ M mixtures) to a wheat species that was registered by Trakya Agricultural Research Institute in 2014 on phenolic contents.

Key words: Wheat, Phenolic compounds, Arsenic, Cadmium, Lead.

9 million chemical substances are used in daily life today. Heavy metals, which cause heavy destructions in the ecosystem, take an important place among these chemical substances.

As a result of increasing environmental pollution due to developing technology and industrialization, contamination of food sources, which are essential for people, has become a threat to human health. Some of the pollutants that are released to the environment in various ways cause accumulation in the living beings by passing to all living beings through the food chain (Nagajyoti et al., 2010).

Although some pollutants are present in small amounts in the first stages of the food chain, their intensities may increase in successive stages, and this is called biological accumulation. Plants tend to accumulate the pollutants transferred to the soil in various ways (through the atmosphere, organic fertilizers and agricultural pesticides, waste water, etc.), especially heavy metals, in the organism (MacFarlane et al., 2003).

Contrary to organic pollutants, heavy metals cause accumulation because they do not decompose in the soil, and when they reach high levels, they damage the living being as well as affecting the quality of the soil, thus causing the production amount and quality of the product to deteriorate (Wu et al., 2010). Defense systems are put into action to protect the cells under stress conditions in plants and to control the levels of Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) formed and to eliminate ROS. Phenolic compounds are compounds that are effective in eliminating and neutralizing free radicals (Šiukšta et al., 2019).

For this reason, in this study, how short-term application (1 and 5 days) of arsenic, cadmium, and lead ( $15\mu$ M,  $30\mu$ M, and  $60\mu$ M mixtures) affects phenolic substance contents was investigated on "Saban", a wheat variety registered by the Thrace Agricultural Research Institute in 2014.

### Materials and methods

All seeds used in the study were subjected to surface sterilization in a 1.5% sodium hypochlorite solution for 10 minutes before being allowed to germinate in the Petri dishes. Surface-sterilized seeds were washed several times with distilled water(Peksen & Sanal, 2018).

In the same way, the Petri dishes to be seeded were sterilized in a Pasteur oven at 120 °C for 1 hour. The Petri dishes were prepared in such a way that each one contained 25 seeds.

Sterilized wheat seeds were placed between blotting papers, with each Petri dish containing 25 seeds, and photoperiod was applied at 20 °C, and then the plant was allowed to germinate in the growth chamber. For the experimental groups, 15  $\mu$ M, 30  $\mu$ M and 60  $\mu$ M concentrations of freshly prepared (As, Pb, Cd) metal mixture solutions were used. Distilled water was used as irrigation water for the control group.

#### The phenolic substance analysis

For the phenolic substance analysis, plant samples were homogenized in a mixture of isopropyl alcohol methanol (50%;50%). 0.5 gr stem was placed in Eppendorf tubes. Then, it was powdered with the help of liquid nitrogen, ball, and homogenizer. To these samples, 100  $\mu$ l hydrochloric acid was added first, which was followed by 400  $\mu$ l methanol/propanol/ultrapure water (1:1:1) mixture, and then homogenized for 1 minute using a vortex.

Afterwards, the samples were incubated in the mixing block for 30 min at 25 °C and for 10 min at 70 °C. After centrifugation at 10,000 rpm for 15 minutes, the supernatant was filtered with a PTFE filter with a pore diameter of 0.22  $\mu$ m and transferred to amber vials. Phenolic substance analyses were made with LC/QTOF and LC/MS/MS.

The results obtained were qualitatively controlled, and the results were then added to the calibration graphs in the Mass Hunter QQQ Quantitative Analysis program in order to calculate the quantitative analysis results based on the areas of the peaks.

In the analysis, a Raptor Biphenyl 5 µm (50 x 2.1 mm) column was used, and the column oven temperature was set at 40 °C. The mobile phase A was created with ultrapure water, 2% formic acid, and the mobile phase B was created with methanol, 2 mM ammonium acetate, 1 mM ammonium formate mixture. The flow rate is 0.7 ml/min, method time is 10 min, gradient profile (min/A%) is (0/100), (1.5/100), (3/10), (4/2), (7/2), (8/100), (10/100) and the injection volume is 5.0 µl. The gas temperature was set at 325 °C, nebulizer gas pressure was set at 45 psi, capillary voltage was set at 3000 V, sheath gas temperature was set at 400 °C, sheath gas flow was set at 11 L/min, and Collision gas Nitrogen  $(N^2)$  and pressure was set at 1.12 m Torr. The MRM (Multiple reaction monitoring) mode was studied as positive and negative. Collision energy, fragmentor voltage, fragmentation ions among MS parameters were optimized using the Optimizer Program.

Statistical analyzes were performed according to Student's t-test. Each group was compared with its own control group.

## Results

Reduced glutathione levels increased at 15  $\mu$ M and 60  $\mu$ M doses on day 1 and day 5 compared to the control group, while a decrease was observed at 30  $\mu$ M dose on the 1st day. However, on day 5, it is still higher compared to the control group (Table 1). It was observed that gallic acid levels increased on day 1 due to the dose, and on day 5, the increase was only at 30 and 60  $\mu$ M doses (Table 2).

Upon examining the benzoic acid levels, it was observed that the levels at all doses decreased on day 1, and while there was a decrease at 15  $\mu$ M dose, there was an increase again at 30  $\mu$ M dose and a decrease at 60  $\mu$ M dose by 85% compared to the control on day 5 (Table 3). An increase of 98% was determined only at 30  $\mu$ M dose on day 5, while there was a decrease at all doses on day 1 and day 5 in Protocatechuic acid levels (Table 4). On day 1 and day 5, while the catechin values were unchanged at 15  $\mu$ M doses, there was an increase at 30 and 60  $\mu$ M doses (Table 5).

On day 1, Trans Caffeic Acid levels were a decrease at all doses compared to the control group due to the dose, and a rapid drop at 15  $\mu$ M dose on day 5 was followed by a rapid rise with a dose increase (Table 6). While there was no change in the 15  $\mu$ M dose application on day 1, a slight decrease was observed with a dose increase.

 Table 1. Reduced glutathione levels.

# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Reduced glutathion (pp	b) 1st Day		
Control	15 mM	30 mM	60 mM
19.8397	21.2894	18.6556	21.0639
5 th Da	•		
11.1770	21.2894	18.6556	21.0639
Values are the mean of the t	riplicated experiments.		
Table 2. Gallic acid level	ls.		
Gallic acid (ppb)	1st Day		
Control	15 mM	30 mM	60 mM
0.3798	0.9062	0.7671	3.9295
<b>5 th D</b> 0.6563	ay 0.5799	0.8186	0.7810
Values are the mean of the t		0.0100	0.7010
Table 3. Benzoic acid lev			
2,5-Dihydroxybenzoic A			
Control	<b>15 mM</b>	<b>30 n</b>	
15.6006	8.6304	8.30	.95 8.9763
4.6694	5 th Day 3.7970	6.51	14 0.6851
Values are the mean of the t		0.31	0.0851
Table 4. Protocatechuic	acid levels.		
	· ·		
	b) 1st Day 15 mM	30 mM	60 mM
Control		<b>30 mM</b> 18.3241	<b>60 mM</b> 14.5460
Control 19.0870 5 th D	15 mM 16.9218 ay	18.3241	14.5460
<b>Control</b> 19.0870 5 <b>th D</b> 7.4231	<b>15 mM</b> 16.9218 <b>ay</b> 6.1166		
<b>Control</b> 19.0870 5 <b>th D</b> 7.4231	<b>15 mM</b> 16.9218 <b>ay</b> 6.1166	18.3241	14.5460
<b>Control</b> 19.0870 5 <b>th D</b> 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t	<b>15 mM</b> 16.9218 <b>ay</b> 6.1166 riplicated experiments.	18.3241	14.5460
<b>Control</b> 19.0870 <b>5 th D</b> 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t	<b>15 mM</b> 16.9218 <b>ay</b> 6.1166 riplicated experiments.	18.3241 12.5035	14.5460
7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels	<b>15 mM</b> 16.9218 <b>ay</b> 6.1166 riplicated experiments.	18.3241	14.5460
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control	15 mM 16.9218 ay 6.1166 riplicated experiments.	18.3241 12.5035 30 mM	14.5460 6.1063 60 mM
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control	<b>15 mM</b> 16.9218 <b>ay</b> 6.1166 riplicated experiments. <b>1st Day</b> <b>15 mM</b> 32.5184	18.3241 12.5035	14.5460 6.1063
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control 32.2121 5 th D 15.5381	15 mM 16.9218 ay 6.1166 riplicated experiments.	18.3241 12.5035 30 mM	14.5460 6.1063 60 mM
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control 32.2121 5 th D 15.5381	15 mM 16.9218 ay 6.1166 riplicated experiments.	18.3241 12.5035 <b>30 mM</b> 35.3295	14.5460 6.1063 60 mM 35.4816
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control 32.2121 5 th D 15.5381 Values are the mean of the t Table 6. Trans Caffeic A	15 mM 16.9218 ay 6.1166 riplicated experiments. 1st Day 15 mM 32.5184 ay 15.8393 riplicated experiments. cid levels.	18.3241 12.5035 <b>30 mM</b> 35.3295	14.5460 6.1063 60 mM 35.4816
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control 32.2121 5 th D 15.5381 Values are the mean of the t Table 6. Trans Caffeic A	15 mM 16.9218 ay 6.1166 riplicated experiments. 1st Day 15 mM 32.5184 ay 15.8393 riplicated experiments. cid levels.	18.3241 12.5035 <b>30 mM</b> 35.3295	14.5460 6.1063 60 mM 35.4816
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control 32.2121 5 th D 15.5381 Values are the mean of the t Table 6. Trans Caffeic Acid (Trans Caffeic Acid) (p) Control	15 mM         16.9218         ay         6.1166         riplicated experiments.         .         1st Day         15 mM         32.5184         ay         15.8393         riplicated experiments.         cid levels.         pb)       1st Day         15 mM	18.3241 12.5035 30 mM 35.3295 19.2603 30 mM	14.5460 6.1063 60 mM 35.4816 16.9540 60 mM
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control 32.2121 5 th D 15.5381 Values are the mean of the t Table 6. Trans Caffeic Acid (Trans Caffeic Acid) (p) Control 1215.5744	15 mM         16.9218         ay         6.1166         riplicated experiments.         .         1st Day         15 mM         32.5184         ay         15.8393         riplicated experiments.         cid levels.         pb)       1st Day         15 mM         1178.8307	18.3241 12.5035 <b>30 mM</b> 35.3295 19.2603	14.5460 6.1063 <b>60 mM</b> 35.4816 16.9540
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control 32.2121 5 th D 15.5381 Values are the mean of the t Table 6. Trans Caffeic Acid (Trans Caffeic Acid) (p) Control 1215.5744 5 th D	15 mM         16.9218         ay         6.1166         riplicated experiments.         .         1st Day         15 mM         32.5184         ay         15.8393         riplicated experiments.         cid levels.         pb)       1st Day         15 mM         1178.8307         ay	18.3241 12.5035 30 mM 35.3295 19.2603 30 mM 917.6194	14.5460 6.1063 60 mM 35.4816 16.9540 60 mM 1009.6944
Control 19.0870 5 th D 7.4231 Values are the mean of the t Table 5. Catechin Levels (Catechin) (ppb) Control 32.2121 5 th D 15.5381 Values are the mean of the t Table 6. Trans Caffeic Acid (Trans Caffeic Acid) (p) Control 1215.5744	15 mM         16.9218         ay         6.1166         riplicated experiments.         .         1st Day         15 mM         32.5184         ay         15.8393         riplicated experiments.         cid levels.         pb)       1st Day         15 mM         1178.8307         ay         61.7350	18.3241 12.5035 30 mM 35.3295 19.2603 30 mM	14.5460 6.1063 60 mM 35.4816 16.9540 60 mM

J. BioSci. Biotech.

doses on day 1 and day 5 depending on the dose (Table 9).

The highest increase on both days was observed at 15  $\mu$ M

dose, and at 30 and 60 µM doses, the indole 3 acetic acid

levels decreased and came close to the control group values.

On the 1st day of the application, salicilic acid levels

increased depending on the dose, but no significant change

However, they are still higher than the control (Table 10).

# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Sanal F.

On day 5, a decrease in chlorogenic acid levels was observed at 15 and 30 µM doses, while values in the control group were reached in the 60 µM dose application (Table 7). On day 1, there was a decrease in the 15 µM dose application and an increase at 30  $\mu M$  dose and a decrease at 60  $\mu M$  dose, and on day 5, the amounts of transcumaric acid decreased considerably in the 15 µM dose application. They were determined to be higher at 30  $\mu$ M and 60  $\mu$ M doses than the control values (Table 8). Transferrulic acid increased at all

2.6144

0.4903

was observed on day 5 (Table 11). 
 Table 7. Chlorogenic acid levels.
 (Chlorogenic Acid) (ppb) **1st Day** Control 15 mM 30 mM 60 mM 27.7689 27.4493 25.3519 26.9363 5 th Day 13.0062 10.9606 12.7073 13.5643 Values are the mean of the triplicated experiments. Table 8. Transcumaric acid levels. (Transcumaric acid) (ppb) 1st Day 30 mM Control 15 mM 60 mM 134.9263 100.8294 153.2374 123.1339 5 th Dav 70.0894 13.8836 93.3819 78.9054 Values are the mean of the triplicated experiments. Table 9. Trans Ferrulic acid levels. (Trans Ferrulic acid) (ppb) 1st Day Control 15 mM 30 mM 60 mM 77983.1400 79409.0945 7981.8761 87603.53 5 th Day 639.3858 754.2079 686.5870 826.2434 Values are the mean of the triplicated experiments. 
 Table 10. Indol-3-acetic acid levels.
 (Indol-3-acetic acid) (ppb) 1st Day <u>30 mM</u> Control 15 mM 60 mM 2.5641 2.9816 3.2257 5 th Day 4.7499 1.3993 0.8811 Values are the mean of the triplicated experiments. 
 Table 11. Salicilic acid levels.
 (Salicilic acid) (ppb) 1st Day 15 mM 30 mM Control 60 mM 35.4820 38.9806 40.4517 41.9764 5 th Day 19.8853 19.8510 19.1756 19.1214 Values are the mean of the triplicated experiments.

ISSN 1314-6246	Sanal F.	J. BioSci. Biotech.	2019, 8(1): 45-50
	RESEAR	CH ARTICLE	

Trans-sinapic acid decreased on day 1 at all doses, while regression was observed in the 30  $\mu$ M and 60  $\mu$ M dose application on day 5, still being higher than the control group (Table 12). While there was no significant change in absisic acid levels on day 1, a dose-dependent decrease was observed at all doses on day 5 (Table 13). Compared with the control group, a slight increase was observed at all doses on day 1 in the Luteolin levels, whereas there was a decrease at all doses

on day 5 (Table 14). Following a slight increase at 15  $\mu$ M dose on day 1, the levels of jasmonic acid decreased by half at 30 and 60  $\mu$ M doses. On day 5, no change was observed at 15  $\mu$ M dose, while the levels decreased significantly at 30 and 60  $\mu$ M doses (Table 15). Naringin increased at all doses on day 1, and there was no change at 15  $\mu$ M dose on day 5, while a dose-dependent increase was observed at 30 and 60  $\mu$ M doses (Table 16).

#### Table 12. Trans-sinapic acid levels.

(Trans-sinapic acid) (ppb)	1st Day		
Control	15 mM	30 mM	60 mM
544.5512	444.3694	386.6642	488.1015
5 th Day			
106.4077	590.4320	726.0999	225.7222
Values are the mean of the triplic	cated experiments.		
<b>Fable 13</b> . Absisic acid levels.			
(Absisic acid) (ppb)	1st Day		
Control	15 mM	30 mM	60 mM
19.5324	18.7744	20.2904	17.7986
5 th Day			
10.8545	9.5573	8.3953	8.1648
Values are the mean of the triplic	cated experiments.		
Table 14. Luteolin levels.			
(Luteolin) (ppb)	1st Day		
Control	15 mM	30 mM	60 mM
8.1871	8.5849	8.7324	8.6156
5 th Day	2 7000	2 2021	2 12 5 1
5.2829 Values are the mean of the tripli	3.7899	3.3821	3.4254
Values are the mean of the triplic	cated experiments.		
<b>Fable 15.</b> Jasmonic acid leve			
(Jasmonic acid) (ppb)	1st Day		
Control	15 mM	30 mM	60 mM
43.2784	45.0399	24.1307	20.3251
5 th Day			
12.1273	12.4054	7.7830	4.9449
Values are the mean of the triplic	cated experiments.		
Table 16. Naringin levels.			
(Naringin) (ppb)	1st Day		
Control	15 mM	30 mM	60 mM
3.5327	4.7435	4.5935	3.8392
5 th Day			
2.8894	2.8335	3.4609	4.4749
Values are the mean of the triplic	cated experiments.		

#### Discussion

Phenolic compounds have various functions in plants. Changes may be observed in the amounts of these compounds under different environmental conditions and stress conditions. Isoflavones and some other flavonoids are stimulated when plants are injured or infected, while stress conditions such as low temperature, low nutrients or heavy metal exposure (Michalak, 2006).

Biosynthesis of phenolic compounds has been reported to be stimulated with the effect of nickel toxicity in the wheat plant, aluminium in the corn plant, and cadmium in the bean plant. The changes in the metabolism of phenolic compounds are thought to occur as a result of hydrolysis of conjugates under heavy metal stress. It is stated that the increase in soluble phenolic compounds is necessary for the formation of a physical barrier which prevents the entry of heavy metals into the cell by increasing the cell wall resistance (Bubna et al., 2011).

Furthermore, many studies have shown that phenolic compounds respond to heavy metal stress as a secondary metabolite. Boron toxicity in the tomato plant (Cervilla et al., 2012; Elguera et al., 2013) resulted in an increase in the amount of phenolic compounds, while it has been reported that cadmium treatment in Erica andevalensis leaves affects the total amount of phenolic compounds and it increases in the corn plant depending on the dose (K1sa et al., 2016).

In our study, it was observed that there were significant changes in the amount of phenolic acids due to heavy metal stress in order to adapt to the environment and this effect was more significant in long-term treatment with high dose. Similarly, Elguera et al. (2013) reported that cadmium treatment in *L. sativum* reduced the amounts of chlorogenic acid, ferulic acid, and caffeic acid (Elguera et al., 2013).

On the other hand, in vitro studies have shown that phenolic compounds can directly clean reactive oxygen species formed by heavy metals göstermiştir(Michalak, 2006). This suggests that they are part of the natural defense system of the plant. In our study, significant changes in phenolic compounds as a result of increased dose and duration of heavy metal exposure are an important proof of this. In conclusion, phenolic compounds, which are part of the plant's defense system, were significantly affected by heavy metal pollution.

#### References

Bubna GA, Lima RB, Zanardo DYL, Dos Santos WD, Ferrarese MDLL, Ferrarese-Filho O. 2011. Exogenous caffeic acid inhibits the growth and enhances the lignification of the roots of soybean (Glycine max). J.Plant Physiol., 168: 1627-1633.

- Büyük İ, Soydam-Aydin S, Aras S. 2012. Bitkilerin stres koşullarına verdiği moleküler cevaplar. *Turkish Bulletin of Hygiene & Experimental Biology*, 69.
- Cervilla LM, Blasco B, Rios JJ, Rosales MA, Sánchez-Rodríguez E, Rubio-Wilhelmi MM, Romero L, Ruiz JM. 2012. Parameters symptomatic for boron toxicity in leaves of tomato plants. J. Bot.
- Elguera JCT, Barrientos EY, Wrobel K, Wrobel K. 2013. Effect of cadmium (Cd (II)), selenium (Se (IV)) and their mixtures on phenolic compounds and antioxidant capacity in *Lepidium sativum*. Acta Physiol. Plant., **35**: 431-441.
- GÜLEÇ TE, Sönmezoglu ÖA, Yıldırım A. 2010. Makarnalık Bugdaylarda Kalite ve Kaliteyi Etkileyen Faktörler. Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi.
- Karaoğlu MM, Kotancılar HG. 2001. Tahıl Ürünlerinin Sağlığımız Açısında Önemi. Atatürk Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi, 32: 101-108.
- Kısa D, Elmastaş M, Öztürk L, Kayır Ö. 2016. Responses of the phenolic compounds of *Zea mays* under heavy metal stress. Appl. Biol. Chem., 59: 813-820.
- MacFarlane G, Pulkownik A, Burchett M. 2003. Accumulation and distribution of heavy metals in the grey mangrove, *Avicennia marina* (Forsk.) Vierh.: biological indication potential. Environ. Pollut., 123: 139-151.
- Michalak A. 2006. Phenolic compounds and their antioxidant activity in plants growing under heavy metal stress. Pol. J. Environ. Stud., 15(4): 523-530.
- Nagajyoti P, Lee K, Sreekanth T. 2010. Heavy metals, occurrence and toxicity for plants: a review. *Environmental Chem. Lett.*, 8: 199-216.
- Peksen S, Sanal F. 2018. Arsenic Effects on Lipid Peroxidation and Antioxidative Enzyme Activities in Barley Cultivars Roots. Fresen. Environ. Bull., 27: 5871-5881.
- Singh P, Kumar R, Sabapathy S, Bawa A. 2008. Functional and edible uses of soy protein products. *Compr. Rev. Food Sci. F.*, 7: 14-28.
- Šiukšta R, Bondzinskaitė S, Kleizaitė V, Žvingila D, Taraškevičius R, Mockeliūnas L, Stapulionytė A, Mak K, Čėsnienė T. 2019. Response of Tradescantia plants to oxidative stress induced by heavy metal pollution of soils from industrial areas. Environ. Sci. Pollut. R., 26: 44-61.
- Wu G, Kang H, Zhang X, Shao H, Chu L, Ruan C. 2010. A critical review on the bio-removal of hazardous heavy metals from contaminated soils: issues, progress, eco-environmental concerns and opportunities. J. Hazard.Mater., 174: 1-8.
- Yavuz F. 2005. Türkiye'de tarım. Tarım ve Köyişleri Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara.