

# Accumulation of Metals on Tobacco Leaves (Primings) Grown in an Agricultural Area in Relation to Soil

E. E. Golia · A. Dimirkou · I. K. Mitsios

Received: 4 November 2006 / Accepted: 16 March 2007 / Published online: 22 May 2007  
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2007

## Introduction

Contamination of the soil-water-air-plant-animal-human system with metals has health, economic, and ecological importance (Oliver, 1997). The concentrations of metals in soils are associated with biological and geochemical cycles and are influenced by anthropogenic activities, such as agricultural practices, transport, industrial activities and waste disposal (Alloway, 1990; Kabata-Pendias and Pendias, 1992).

It is well-known that tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*) can easily accumulate certain metals and in particular cadmium in leaves (Clarke and Brennan, 1989; Tso, 1990; Gondola and Kadar, 1994). Cadmium is a non-essential, potentially toxic, largely pollutant ion, which is accumulated by tobacco plants and is transferred in tobacco smoke to humans (Bell et al., 1992; Sravrides, 2006). Phosphates fertilizers, which are used in tobacco cultivation, contain high concentrations of metals. The use of phosphate fertilizers in the fertilization of crops is one of the primary factors in the pollution of agricultural soils (He and Singh 1994a). Metal concentrations in tobacco have been found to be influenced by such factors as soil type and pH genotype, stalk position, soil and leaf residues resulting from the application of metal containing pesticides, and from soil amendments including fertilizers and municipal sludge (Adamu et al., 1989; Karaivazoglou et al., 2007).

Although, a number of investigations have been carried out on metal concentration in tobacco leaves (Murty et al., 1986; Ruso et al., 2001; McNeill et al., 2006), there are no data concerning metal content in air-cured (Burley), flue-cured (Virginia) and sun-cured (Oriental-filling) tobacco priming produced in the Thessaly region of central Greece.

The objectives of the present study were: a) To survey metal concentrations in tobacco leaves produced in different growing areas of the Thessaly region and b) to determine the most important soil factors (chemical and physical), which influence the concentration of metals in Burley, Virginia and Oriental tobacco leaves.

## Materials and Methods

A three-year survey (2002 to 2004) was conducted in the Thessaly region in order to determine the metal concentrations in soil (500 soil samples) as well as in leaves (290 leaves of Oriental, 130 of Virginia, and 80 of Burley tobacco) at the first, second and third priming. The sampling of soil as well as tobacco leaves was based on the extent of tobacco cultivation and the relative economic significance of the three types of tobacco (Burley, Virginia and Oriental) in the three prefectures of Thessaly (Karditsa, Larissa and Trikala). The Oriental, Virginia, and Burley tobacco types represents 60, 24, and 16% respectively of total Greek tobacco production.

Composite soil samples consisting of six subsamples were collected from the upper layer (0–30 cm) of each field with two replicates. The samples were air-dried and sieved through a 2-mm sieve. Soil properties such as clay content (%), organic matter (Walkley-Black method), pH (1:1) and electrical conductivity (1:1) were measured (Page et al., 1982). Plant-available fractions of metals were determined

---

I. K. Mitsios deceased.

---

E. E. Golia (✉) · A. Dimirkou · I. K. Mitsios  
Crop Production and Rural Environment Laboratory of Soil  
Science, Department of Agriculture, University of Thessaly,  
Fytokou Road, 36 446 N Ionia Magnisias, Greece  
e-mail: egol@uth.gr

by using diethylene-triamine-pentacetic acid (DTPA) buffered at pH 7.3 (Lindsay and Norvel, 1978). The total concentration of metals was determined using the *Aqua Regia* (HCl-HNO<sub>3</sub>, 3:1) extraction method (International Organization for Standardization, 1994) after digestion at 180°C for 2 h. All reagents were of analytical grade (Merck, Germany). The stock solutions of metals (1000 mg/mL) were prepared from “titrisol” Merck.

Cadmium and lead were measured by graphite furnace atomic-absorption spectrophotometry (GFAAS). Zinc and Cu were determined by flame atomic-absorption spectrophotometry (FAAS). Deuterium background corrections were used in the analysis of Cd and Pb (Lajunen, 1992). The detection limits, based on three-times the standard deviation of the blank ( $n = 10$ ), were found to be between 0.08 µg/L (Cd - GFAAS) and 0.3 mg/L (Cu - FAAS). A certified reference material [CRM, (No 141R, calcareous loam soil)] by the Community Bureau of Reference (BCR) was also analyzed for the verification of the accuracy of trace-element determination in soils. Recovery values were calculated as the ratio of the BCR results to those of the *Aqua Regia* digestion and ranged from 95 to 103%.

Three tobacco leaves from each priming, with two replicates, were selected from plants at the same sites where soils were sampled. First priming included lower leaves and third priming upper leaves. A total of 500 tobacco leaf samples were collected at three primings each. The leaves were washed to remove any adhering soil particles and rinsed with distilled water. After that, leaf samples were placed in paper bags, dried at 75°C for 12 hours and ground using a mortar and pestle. The extraction method described by He and Singh (1994a) was followed. The samples were then analyzed for metal concentrations as previously described. Appropriate blanks were included in all extractions.

The data were statistically analyzed using correlation analysis (Pearson correlation, two-tailed). Results from two replicates were averaged prior to statistical analyses. Correlation analysis was used to establish relationships between soil characteristics and metal concentration in soil samples and in Burley, Virginia, and Oriental tobacco leaf samples.

## Results and Discussion

The soils in the region studied were silty loam (39%), sandy clay loam (33%) and clay loam (28%). In Karditsa, the soils were, according to soil taxonomy, alfisols with a mean soil pH value of 5.5. These soils have an ochric epipedon, an argillic horizon. In Trikala prefecture there were entisols with soil pH values between 6.5 and 7.5. In Larissa (Elassona) prefecture there were both alfisols as well as vertisols (pH > 7.5).

**Table 1** Concentration of extractable metals in soils (DTPA method) cultivated with tobacco

|                     | Zn<br>(mg/kg dry soil) | Cu   | Cd     | Pb   |
|---------------------|------------------------|------|--------|------|
| Burley, $n = 80$    |                        |      |        |      |
| Minimum value       | 0.2                    | 0.3  | 0.001  | 0.1  |
| Maximum value       | 2.0                    | 2.2  | 0.8    | 2.1  |
| Mean value          | 0.7                    | 0.9  | 0.2    | 0.6  |
| CV (%)              | 37.3                   | 46.7 | 78.8   | 48.4 |
| Virginia, $n = 130$ |                        |      |        |      |
| Minimum value       | 0.1                    | 0.2  | 0.0001 | 0.05 |
| Maximum value       | 3.5                    | 7.0  | 0.6    | 1.9  |
| Mean value          | 0.6                    | 1.0  | 0.14   | 0.3  |
| CV (%)              | 61.8                   | 60.2 | 87.3   | 56.3 |
| Oriental, $n = 290$ |                        |      |        |      |
| Minimum value       | 0.03                   | 0.1  | 0.0001 | 0.04 |
| Maximum value       | 5.5                    | 4.2  | 0.5    | 2.2  |
| Mean value          | 0.5                    | 0.9  | 0.1    | 0.4  |
| CV (%)              | 77.4                   | 57.3 | 85.2   | 64.4 |

Soil electrical conductivity ranged between 104.0 and 3100 µS/cm, with a mean of 441.5 µS/cm. The mean values of organic matter and clay content (%) did not differ among soils where tobacco varieties were cultivated. The mean value of organic matter of soils was 1.4%, while the mean clay value was 23%.

The concentration of DTPA extractable metals in soils where Burley, Virginia and Oriental tobacco were cultivated is presented in Table 1.

Available Cd had the highest coefficient of variance. This is due to the different amounts of fertilizers that farmers in Thessaly use for tobacco cultivation. The mean values of Zn and Cu were similar among the three tobacco varieties. Soils where Burley tobacco was cultivated had higher mean Cd and Pb values. The levels of available concentration of metals were similar to those found in previous research at the same agricultural areas (Mitsios et al., 2005).

Table 2 shows the metal concentration extracted by *Aqua Regia* in soils cultivated with Burley, Virginia and Oriental tobacco.

Total Cu and Cd concentrations were similar in soils where the three tobacco varieties were grown. However, total concentrations of Zn and Mn appeared to be higher in soils cultivated with air-cured (Burley) tobacco.

The availability of metals was calculated as the ratio of available concentration to the total concentration for each metal ( $C_{\text{dtpa}}/C_{\text{aqua regia}} \times 100$ ). That percentage (%) in soils where Burley tobacco was cultivated was: Zn: 1.8, Cu: 4.0, Cd: 25 and Pb: 10.9, in soils where Virginia tobacco was cultivated was: Zn: 1.9, Cu: 4.4, Cd: 23.3 and Pb: 5.9, and in soils where Oriental tobacco was cultivated was: Zn: 1.8,

**Table 2** Concentration of extractable metals in soils (*Aqua Regia* method) cultivated with tobacco

|                          | Zn<br>(mg/kg dry soil) | Cu   | Cd   | Pb   |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------|------|------|
| Burley, <i>n</i> = 80    |                        |      |      |      |
| Minimum value            | 16.6                   | 8.1  | 0.06 | 2.5  |
| Maximum value            | 69.9                   | 40.5 | 1.3  | 9.4  |
| Mean value               | 39.2                   | 22.3 | 0.8  | 5.5  |
| CV (%)                   | 32.0                   | 36.1 | 32.0 | 30.2 |
| Virginia, <i>n</i> = 130 |                        |      |      |      |
| Minimum value            | 11.9                   | 9.0  | 0.03 | 1.9  |
| Maximum value            | 72.8                   | 52.9 | 1.1  | 8.4  |
| Mean value               | 32.0                   | 22.7 | 0.6  | 5.1  |
| CV (%)                   | 27.7                   | 40.6 | 48.8 | 35.4 |
| Oriental, <i>n</i> = 290 |                        |      |      |      |
| Minimum value            | 7.0                    | 5.6  | 0.06 | 2.0  |
| Maximum value            | 131.3                  | 60.9 | 0.9  | 7.9  |
| Mean value               | 28.4                   | 20.6 | 0.5  | 3.9  |
| CV (%)                   | 39.3                   | 45.1 | 89.6 | 57.8 |

Cu: 4.4, Cd: 20 and Pb: 10.3. Therefore the element of primary concern regarding soil pollution, Cd, had the highest availability as related to DTPA extractability. This result agrees with other investigations (Adamu et al., 1989; Mitsios et al., 2005).

Table 3 shows the concentration of metals in three tobacco types, averaged over the period studied. Correlation coefficients among soil parameters and the concentration of

metals in Oriental tobacco are shown in Table 4. Correlation coefficients in Virginia and Burley tobacco were lower and in some cases not significant at either the 0.05 or 0.01 level (Pearson correlation, 2- tailed), so they are not presented.

In Burley, Virginia, and Oriental tobacco leaves the mean concentrations of Zn, Cu, Cd and Pb (as they are presented in Table 3) had the higher values at first priming and the lowest values at third priming. This finding is probably be explained by tendency for low metal mobilities through tobacco plants (Tso, 1990). Lower leaves seem to accumulate high amounts of metals, but in all cases the concentrations were lower than those reported by other investigators (Murty et al., 1986; Clarke and Brennan, 1989; Bell et al., 1992; Gondola and Kadar, 1994; Ruso et al., 2001; McNeill et al., 2006).

During the three years (2002–2004) of this research the concentrations of metals (Zn, Cu, Cd, Pb) were higher in Burley tobacco leaves. The levels of metals studied followed the order: Burley > Virginia > Oriental. Differences in metal concentration in the tobacco leaves examined seem to imply that different types of tobacco have different responses to metal accumulation. Also, it should be noted that Burley cultivation acquires higher amounts of both phosphate and nitrogen fertilizers than Virginia or Oriental tobacco. The use of fertilizers in crops is one of the primary factors in the pollution of agricultural soils as well as of tobacco plants (He and Singh, 1994a; Karaivazoglou et al., 2007).

**Table 3** Concentration of metals at first, second and third priming of air-cured (Burley), flue-cured (Virginia) and sun-cured (Oriental-filling) tobacco leaves averaged over the years 2002–2004

|                          | Zn               |                 |                 | Cu              |                 |                 | Cd              |                 |                 | Pb              |                 |                 |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                          | 1 <sup>st</sup>  | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
|                          | mg/kg dry matter |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Burley, <i>n</i> = 80    |                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Minimum value            | 6.8              | 8.9             | 12.4            | 4.6             | 3.1             | 1.1             | 0.1             | 0.1             | 0.04            | 0.2             | 0.1             | 0.04            |
| Maximum value            | 161.6            | 133.6           | 125.5           | 54.5            | 37.3            | 27.6            | 3.7             | 2.9             | 3.6             | 9.1             | 3.3             | 1.3             |
| Mean value               | 76.7             | 67.5            | 55.5            | 22.2            | 18.6            | 12.0            | 0.9             | 0.7             | 0.6             | 1.2             | 0.9             | 0.6             |
| CV (%)                   | 56.8             | 48.1            | 48.2            | 53.1            | 51.1            | 53.8            | 79.3            | 82.3            | 96.6            | 68.6            | 54.1            | 48.0            |
| Virginia, <i>n</i> = 130 |                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Minimum value            | 9.2              | 7.4             | 4.8             | 1.9             | 1.1             | 1.7             | 0.02            | 0.01            | 0.01            | 0.04            | 0.1             | 0.01            |
| Maximum value            | 135.6            | 118.8           | 99.7            | 42.8            | 33.2            | 26.0            | 3.0             | 2.4             | 1.3             | 10.2            | 8.0             | 4.8             |
| Mean value               | 55.4             | 39.5            | 28.8            | 18.8            | 15.4            | 11.5            | 0.7             | 0.4             | 0.2             | 0.9             | 0.8             | 0.6             |
| CV (%)                   | 45.7             | 48.8            | 45.2            | 66.3            | 67.9            | 48.3            | 112.2           | 106.8           | 96.8            | 97.7            | 94.0            | 96.3            |
| Oriental, <i>n</i> = 290 |                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Minimum value            | 2.1              | 10.0            | 8.2             | 0.3             | 0.6             | 0.2             | 0.01            | 0.01            | 0.01            | 0.02            | 0.01            | 0.02            |
| Maximum value            | 114.4            | 109.4           | 95.6            | 37.8            | 30.8            | 25.3            | 2.5             | 2.6             | 1.9             | 14.4            | 7.2             | 7.7             |
| Mean value               | 48.1             | 42.9            | 37.0            | 15.5            | 10.6            | 9.9             | 0.6             | 0.5             | 0.3             | 0.8             | 0.5             | 0.2             |
| CV (%)                   | 52.6             | 76.6            | 48.3            | 44.1            | 50.7            | 71.6            | 81.4            | 87.2            | 87.8            | 78.9            | 80.5            | 93.9            |

**Table 4** Correlation among soil parameters and the concentration of metals in Oriental tobacco leaves ( $n = 290$ )

|                    | Zn 1 <sup>st</sup> | Zn 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Zn 3 <sup>rd</sup> | Cu 1 <sup>st</sup> | Cu 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Cu 3 <sup>rd</sup> | Cd 1 <sup>st</sup> | Cd 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Cd 3 <sup>rd</sup> | Pb 1 <sup>st</sup> | Pb 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Pb 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| pH                 | -0.827**           | -0.855**           | -0.648**           | -0.815*            | -0.748*            | -0.741*            | -0.746**           | -0.671**           | -0.640**           | -0.762*            | -0.582*            | -0.581*            |
| EC                 | -0.623**           | -0.503**           | -0.512**           | -0.655**           | -0.518**           | -0.415**           | -0.447*            | -0.444*            | -0.398*            | -0.547*            | -0.547*            | -0.417*            |
| OM %               | 0.655**            | 0.635**            | 0.747**            | 0.525**            | 0.517*             | 0.411*             | 0.222**            | 0.236*             | 0.247*             | 0.355*             | 0.342*             | 0.232*             |
| Clay %             | 0.425**            | 0.452**            | 0.347              | 0.423**            | 0.445**            | 0.458*             | 0.447*             | 0.435**            | 0.447*             | 0.351*             | 0.323*             | 0.311*             |
| Zn Aqua            | 0.585*             | 0.559*             | 0.532*             | 0.333*             | 0.339*             | 0.337*             | 0.314*             | 0.348*             | 0.316*             | -0.041             | 0.143              | -0.015             |
| Zn DTPA            | 0.699**            | 0.681**            | 0.666**            | 0.440**            | 0.525*             | 0.598**            | 0.491*             | 0.487*             | 0.348*             | 0.011              | -0.048             | -0.006             |
| Zn 1 <sup>st</sup> |                    | 0.845**            | 0.890**            | 0.645*             | 0.522*             | 0.586*             | 0.258**            | 0.238*             | 0.270*             | 0.190              | 0.193              | 0.213*             |
| Zn 2 <sup>nd</sup> |                    |                    | 0.865**            | 0.435*             | 0.335*             | 0.439*             | 0.361*             | 0.319*             | 0.320*             | 0.151              | 0.054              | 0.086              |
| Zn 3 <sup>rd</sup> |                    |                    |                    | -0.040             | 0.277**            | 0.277*             | -0.012             | -0.012             | 0.255**            | 0.423**            | 0.445**            | 0.418**            |
| Cu Aqua            |                    |                    |                    | 0.323*             | 0.326*             | 0.333*             | 0.237*             | 0.027              | 0.041              | -0.189             | -0.177             | -0.144             |
| Cu DTPA            |                    |                    |                    | 0.876**            | 0.701**            | 0.739**            | 0.416**            | 0.284**            | 0.106**            | 0.083              | 0.058              | 0.061              |
| Cu 1 <sup>st</sup> |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.745**            | 0.745*             | 0.355**            | 0.455**            | 0.325*             | 0.212*             | 0.219              | 0.259*             |
| Cu 2 <sup>nd</sup> |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.756*             | 0.323*             | 0.412**            | 0.323*             | 0.123              | 0.214*             | 0.215*             |
| Cu 3 <sup>rd</sup> |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.147              | 0.123              | 0.255*             | 0.147              | -0.012             | 0.122              |
| Cd Aqua            |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.368*             | 0.260*             | 0.394*             | 0.195              | 0.136              | -0.207             |
| Cd DTPA            |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.786**            | 0.749**            | 0.728**            | 0.220*             | 0.343*             | 0.214*             |
| Cd 1 <sup>st</sup> |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.655**            | 0.625**            | 0.523*             | 0.258*             | 0.213*             |
| Cd 2 <sup>nd</sup> |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.633**            | 0.250*             | 0.123              | 0.145              |
| Cd 3 <sup>rd</sup> |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.256              | 0.223              | 0.256*             |
| Pb Aqua            |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.0236*            | 0.328*             | 0.323*             |
| Pb DTPA            |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.420*             | 0.484*             | 0.466              |
| Pb 1 <sup>st</sup> |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.512**            | 0.522**            |
| Pb 2 <sup>nd</sup> |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    | 0.555**            |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Correlation coefficients among metal concentrations in tobacco and soil parameters (Table 4), show that there is a strong relationship among the concentrations of each tobacco priming (first, second and third) for every metal studied. Strong correlation was also recorded among the available concentrations of metals and their respective concentrations in all tobacco primings. This suggests that the concentrations of metals in the soil measured by the DTPA method can be used as a predictor of metal concentration in tobacco leaves. As there is also a relationship among available (DTPA method) and total (*Aqua Regia* method) concentration, the total concentration may possibly be calculated from the available concentration. This may be advantageous, as the *Aqua Regia* extraction method is very laborious and more expensive than the DTPA method.

Soil pH appeared to be the most important of the factors measured which influenced the concentration of Cd, Pb, Zn and Cu at three primings of air-cured (Burley), flue-cured (Virginia) and sun-cured (Oriental-filling) tobacco produced in the Thessaly region of central Greece. This generally agrees with other investigations in other agricultural

soils (Adamu et al., 1989; Gondola and Kadar, 1994; Karavazoglou et al., 2007).

In conclusion, the metal concentrations found in air-cured (Burley), flue-cured (Virginia) and sun-cured (Oriental-filling) tobacco priming produced in the Thessaly region are lower than those reported by other investigators. Therefore, tobacco plants grown in the area studied can be used for cigarettes without health risks depending on metal accumulation. Respective soils from the areas of central Greece studied were also less polluted, as most of the metals were present at concentrations lower than the critical limits (Alloway, 1990; Kabata-Pendias and Pendias, 1992).

## References

- Adamu CA, Mulchi CL, Bell PF (1989) Relationships between soil pH, clay, organic matter and CEC and heavy metal concentrations in soils and tobacco. *Tob Sci* 33:96–100
- Alloway B (1990) Heavy metals in soils. Blackie, Glasgow, UK
- Bell PF, Mulchi CL, Chaney RL (1992) Microelement concentrations in Maryland air-cured tobacco. *Commun Soil Sci Plant* 23:1617–1628

- Clarke BB, Brennan E (1989) Differential cadmium accumulation and phytotoxicity in sixteen tobacco cultivars. *JAPCA J Air Waste Ma* 39:1319–1322
- Gondola I, Kadar I (1994) Heavy metal content of flue-cured tobacco leaf in different growing regions of Hungary. *Acta Agron Hung* 43:243–251
- He QB, Singh BR (1994a) Crop uptake of cadmium from phosphorus fertilizers: I. Yield and cadmium content. *Water Air Soil Poll* 74:251–265
- International Organization for Standardization (1994) ISO/DIS 11466. In: *Environment Soil Quality, ISO Standards Compendium*. International Organization for Standardization, Switzerland
- Kabata-Pendias A, Pendias AK (1992) *Trace elements in soils and plants*, 2nd edn. Chemical Rubber Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
- Karaivazoglou NA, Tsotsolis NC, Tsadilas CD (2007) Influence of liming and form of nitrogen fertilizer on nutrient uptake, grown, yield, and quality of Virginia (flue-cured) tobacco. *Field Crops Sci* 100:52–60
- Lajunen LHG (1992) *Spectrochemical analysis by atomic absorption and emission*. The Royal Society of Chemistry, Cambridge, England
- Lindsay WL, Norvell WA (1978) Development of a DTPA test for zinc, iron, manganese and copper. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* 42:421–428
- McNeill A, Beri R, Islam S, Alkhatib MN, West R (2006) Levels of toxins in oral tobacco products in the UK. *Tob Control* 15:64–71
- Mitsios IK, Golia EE, Tsadilas CD (2005) Heavy metal concentration in soils and irrigation water in Thessaly area, Central Greece. *Commun Soil Sci Plant* 36:487–501
- Murty KSN, Tjell JC, Gopalachari NC (1986) Lead and cadmium content of Indian flue-cured tobacco. *Plant Soil* 95:281–284
- Oliver MA (1997) *Soil and Human Health: A Review*. *Eur J Soil Sci* 48:573–592
- Page AL, Miller HR, Keeney RD (1982) *Methods of Soil Analysis Part II - Chemical and Microbiological Properties*. Soil Science of America, Madison, Wisconsin, USA
- Ruso J, Japata J, Hernadez M, Ojeda MA, Benlloch M, Prats-Perez E, Tena M, Lopez R, Jorin J (2001) Toxic metals accumulation and total soluble phenolics in sunflower and tobacco plants. *Minerva Biotechnol* 13:93–95
- Sravrides JC (2006) Lung carcinogenesis: Pivotal role of metals in tobacco smoke. *Free Radical Bio Med* 41:1017–1030
- Tso TC (1990) *Physiology and Biochemistry of tobacco plants*. Ideals, Maryland, USA