Assessment of Soil Heavy Metal Hazards of Cultivated Soil Irrigated With Different Irrigation Water Qualities in Al-Hassa Oasis, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Mohammed M.S.[1], A. A. M. Sallam[2] and S. M. Aleid[3]

[1]Soil and Water Dept., Fac. of Agric., Al-Azhar Univ., Cairo, Egypt. Soil and Water Expert. Al- Hassa Irrigation and Drainage Authority, KSA.
[2]Agriculture Operation, Date Palm Research Center of Excellence, King Faisal University, KSA (Permanent address: College of Technology and Development, Zagazig Univ., Egypt)
[3]Food Science, Date Palm Research Center of Excellence, King Faisal University, KSA
mshahin58@yahoo.com

Abstract: Twenty four composite surface soil samples(0-30cm depth) representing cultivated soil irrigated for two seasons with different irrigation water qualities: (i-ground water (GW), ii-ground water + agricultural drainage water (DW), iii-ground water + tertiary treated wastewater (TTWW) and iv- ground water, (GW) + agricultural drainage water, (DW) + tertiary treated wastewater, (TTWW), were analyzed for their total heavy metal contents, of Cu, Mn, Fe, Zn, Co, Cd, Pb, As and Ni. The results showed that, the total contents of these metals in the soils irrigated with different irrigation water qualities, could be arranged in the following descending order: Fe > Cu > Mn > Zn > Ni > Pb > Co > As > Cd. Generally, the different irrigation water qualities can be arranged according to their effects on total heavy metal contents in the cultivated irrigated soil in the following order:(GW+DW+TTWW) > (GW+TTWW) > (GW+DW) > (GW). Based on the geo-accumulation index, the results indicated that the I_{geo} values for Mn, Fe, Co, and Cd fell into (class 0) in cultivated soil irrigated with groundwater. This indicates that the cultivated soil irrigated with groundwater is uncontaminated by these elements. On the other hand I_{geo} values for Cu, Zn, Pb, and Ni are > 0 and <1, meaning that the soil is uncontaminated to moderately contaminated with these elements. The I_{geo} value for As falls into the category of moderately to strongly contaminated ($2 < I_{geo} < 3$) in soil cultivated irrigated with groundwater. In general, I_{geo} values for the cultivated soil irrigated with (GW+ DW+TTWW) showed patterns of heavy metals contamination similar to those in the cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+TTWW) or cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+DW) but with different levels. Based on the Enrichment factor (EF) the studied soils are significantly contaminated with Cu, Ni, and Zn due to irrigation with, ground water, Cu, Ni, Pb, and Zn in cultivated soil irrigated with (GW+DW), Cu, Pb, Zn, Ni, and As in both cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+TTWW) and (GW+ DW+TTWW). The results reveal that the *EF* mean values of heavy metals in the studied cultivated soils irrigated with different irrigation water qualities, can be arranged in following descending order: (GW+ DW+TTWW) > (GW+TTWW) > (GW+DW) > (GW).

[Mohammed M.S., A. A. M. Sallam and S. M. Aleid. **Assessment of Soil Heavy Metal Hazards of Cultivated Soil Irrigated With Different Irrigation Water Qualities in Al-Hassa Oasis, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.** *World Rural Observ* 2014;6(4):12-22]. ISSN: 1944-6543 (Print); ISSN: 1944-6551 (Online). http://www.sciencepub.net/rural. 3

Key words: Irrigation water qualities. Geo-accumulation index. Enrichment factor. Heavy metals pollution and Pollution index.

1. Introduction:

Al-Hassa Oasis is located in the south of the Eastern area of Saudi Arabia about 65 km from the Arabian Gulf with an area of about 120 km with a population of more than one million person. It is bounded by the Ad- Dahna deserts**.** Al-Hassa Oasis is an important civilization and agricultural area in east of Saudi Arabia. Agriculture is the most significant sector in the Oasis and recently large agricultural enterprises were established in the Oasis with the support provided by Saudi Arabian government. There are a total of 16000 ha of cultivate land area in Al Hassa Oasis. Around three million date palms produce wide ranges of varieties of high quality dates, among the other crops rice, citrus and other fruits and alfalfa are prominent. The deficiency of water resources is the most significant problem in the Oasis. Although all these lands were planned to be irrigated by spring water, ground water resources are insufficient today. Therefore, unconventional water resources such as drainage water and treated waste water were used in irrigation practices. With all these water sources, the available amount of irrigation water is still insufficient under the prevailing irrigation practices and conditions.

The reuse of treated wastewater is a good option for increasing water supplies for agricultural use. One of its benefits is the plant's use of the water's nutrients and therefore a reduction in the pollution load that wastewater contributes to the surface water supply

(Zekri and Koo., 1994). There is considerable interest and concern in the long-term effects of reclaimed wastewater on crops intended for human consumption. Presence of heavy metals in agricultural soils above the permissible limit poses threats to public health. Concentrations of seven metals were determined in agricultural soils from Yuhang county, Zhejiang, China. Multivariate statistical approaches were used to study the variation of metals in soils during summer and winter seasons. Contamination of soils was evaluated on the basis of enrichment factor (EF), geo-accumulation index (□geo), contamination factor (□□), and degree of contamination (□deg). They found that the heavy metal concentrations were observed higher in winter as compared to summer season. Cr and Cd revealed random distribution with diverse correlations in both seasons. Principal component analysis and cluster analysis showed significant anthropogenic intrusions of Zn, Cd, Pb, Cr, and Cu in the soils. Enrichment factor revealed significant enrichment (EF > 5) of Zn, Cd, and Pb, whereas geo-accumulation index and contamination factor exhibited moderate to high contamination for Zn, Cr, Cd, and Pb. In light of the studied parameters, permissible limit to very high degree of contamination (□deg> 16) was observed in both seasons. **Naveedullah *et al.* (2013).**

Pollution of the natural environment by heavy metals is a universal problem because these metals are indestructible and most of them have toxic effects on living organisms, when permissible concentration levels are exceeded. Heavy metals frequently reported in literature with regards to potential hazards and occurrences in contaminated soils are Cd, Cr, Pb, Zn, Fe and Cu (**Akoto *et al*., 2008**). Soil samples represent an excellent media to monitor heavy metal pollution because anthropogenic heavy metals are usually deposited in top soils (**Govil et al., 2001**). Heavy metal contaminated soil affects the ecosystem when heavy metals migrate into groundwater or are taken up by flora and fauna, this results in great risk to ecosystems due to bioaccumulation **(Bhagure and Mirgane, 2010).**

Vegetables cultivated in soils polluted with toxic and heavy metals take up such metals and accumulate them in their edible and non-edible parts in quantities high enough to cause clinical problems both to animals and human beings consuming these metal-rich plants as there is no good mechanism for their elimination from the human body **(Bhuiyan *et al*., 2011)**. Heavy metals and trace elements are also a matter of concern due to their non-biodegradable nature and long biological half-lives. (Singh *et al*.; 2012) Pollution of the natural environment by heavy metal is a worldwide problem because these metals are indestructible and most of them have toxic effects on living organisms, when they exceed a certain concentration. The anthropogenic sources of heavy metals in agricultural soils include mining, smelting, waste disposal, urban effluent, vehicle exhausts, sewage sludge, pesticides, fertilizers application. (Luo *et al*. 2012). However, the authors in this study used world background reference values to determine enrichment factors ones due to unavailability of local background ones. Due to spatial variability in lithology and mineralogy, world reference has been known to be erratic when used to determine enrichment factors (Abrahim and Parker., 2008).

The geo-accumulation index (I_{geo}) has been used since the late 1960 and has been widely employed in European trace studies. Originally used for bottom sediments (Muller, 1969), and has been successfully applied to the measurement of soil contamination (Loska *et al.,* 2003). The I_{geo} enables the assessment of contamination by comparing current and pre-industrial concentrations, although it is not always easy to reach pre-industrial sediment layers. Enrichment factor (EF) has been employed for the assessment of contamination in various environmental media by several researchers (Lue et al., 2009). Its version adapted to assess the contamination of various environmental media. Enrichment Factor (EF) of an element in the studied samples is based on the standardization of a measured element against a reference element. A reference element is often the one characterized by low occurrence variability. It is used to differentiate heavy metals sources. To assess the extent of contamination of heavy metals in soil and also provide a measure of the degree of overall contamination along a particular soil, pollution index has been applied (Hakanson*.,* 1980).

The pollution index reflects the metal enrichment in the soil. The geochemical background values in continental crust averages of the trace metals under consideration reported by (Taylor and Mclennan 1985) was used as back ground values for the metal.

The objectives of the present study were to: (1) assess heavy metal contamination of agricultural soil irrigated with different irrigation water qualities in Al-Hassa Oasis, Saudi Arabia using three approaches, namely; the geo accumulation index (I_{geo}), Enrichment Facto (EF) and Pollution Index (PI).

Materials and Methods:

Soil Sample Collection and Analysis:

Twenty four composite surface soil samples (0-30cm depth) were collected from farms representing cultivated soils irrigated with different irrigation water qualities over two seasons. The collected soil samples were air-dried, gently crushed, sieved through a 2 mm sieve and stored in plastic bags for chemical and physical analyses. Soil pH and EC values were determined in soil paste extract according to **Sparks,**

et al. (1996). Particle size distribution was carried out according to Gee and Bauder, (1996). Organic matter was determined according to the method described by Nelson and Sommers, (1982). The concentrations of soluble cations and anions (Ca^{2+}, Mg^{2+}, Na^{+}, K^{+}, CO_3^{-2}, HCO_3^{-}, Cl^{-} and SO_4^{-2}) were determined according to the method described by Loeppert and Suarez, 1996). Soil samples were digested in preparation for total metal analysis using a concentrated acid mixture H_2SO_4, HF and $HClO_4$ according to Hossner, (1996). The filtrated digests were analyzed for the total contents of Cu, Mn, Fe, Zn, Co Cd, Pb, As and Ni using Shimadzu (AAS 6300) Atomic Absorption spectrophotometer.

Moreover, the contamination assessment of the study soils was calculated**.** The assessment of soil or sediment enrichment with metal ions was carried out by the index of geo- accumulation I_{geo} and enrichment EF factor (Lue *et al*., 2009); beside of the Pollution Index (PI).

Geo-accumulation Index (I_{geo}):

In this study, the I_{geo} for cultivated soil irrigated with different irrigation water qualities was calculated using the following equation:

$$I_{geo} = \log_2 (C_n/1.5\,B_n) \qquad (1)$$

Where, C_n is the measured concentration of the element in the tested sediment (soil) and B_n is the geochemical background value of the element in fossil argillaceous sediment (average shale). The constant 1.5 is introduced to minimize the effect of possible variation in the background values which may be attributed to lithological variations in the sediment. Lue *et al.* (2009) gave the following interpretation for the geo-accumulation of seven classes of accumulation (I_{geo}) index for contamination levels in soil (Teng *et al*., 2002 and Ji *et al*. 2008):-

Enrichment factor (EF): This is determined by the relation:

$$EF = [\, C_x/C_{ref} \,]_{sample} \,/\, [\, B_x/B_{ref} \,]_{Background} \qquad (2)$$

where;

C_x = content of the examined element in the examined environment.

C_{ref} = content of the examined element in the reference environment.

B_x = content of the reference element in the examined environment and

B_{ref} = content of the reference element in the reference environment.

I_{geo}	Class I_{geo}	Contamination Level
0	Igeo ≤ 0	Uncontaminated
1	0 < Igeo < 1	Uncontaminated/moderately contaminated
2	1 < Igeo < 2	Moderately contaminated
3	2 < Igeo < 3	Moderately/strongly contaminated
4	3 < Igeo < 4	Strongly contaminated
5	4 < Igeo < 5	Strongly/extremely contaminated
6	5 < Igeo	Extremely contaminated

An element is regarded as a reference element if it is of low occurrence variability. It is also possible to apply an element of geochemical nature whose substantial amounts occur in the environment but has no characteristic effects i.e. synergism or antagonism towards an examined element. Five contamination categories are recognized on the basis of the enrichment factor:

EF categories	EF value	Contamination Level
1	EF < 2	Deficiency to minimal enrichment
2	EF = 2 - 5	Moderate enrichment
3	EF = 5 - 20	Significant enrichment
4	EF = 20 - 40	Very high enrichment
5	EF > 40	Extremely high enrichment

The enrichment factor, due to its universal formula, is relatively simple and easy tool for assessing enrichment degree and comparing the contamination of different environments. (Reimann and De-Caritat, 2000).

Pollution index (PI):

The pollution index (PI) parameter is expressed as:

$$PI = C_{metal} / C_{background} \qquad (3)$$

Where, PI is the pollution index, C metal is the concentration of pollutant in soil,

C background is the background value for the metal. The pollution index (PI) was classified into four groups (Mmolawa *et al*., 2011 and Al Omran et al. 2011), as follow:

PI ≤ 1 refers to low contamination;

1 ≤ PI < 3 means moderate contamination;

3 ≥ PI < 6 indicates considerable contamination and

PI > 6 indicates very high contamination.

Quality control and data analyses:

Before analysis, the devices were rinsed with acidified water (10% HNO3) and weighted to dissolve metals. Also, all the equipment's and containers were soaked in 10% NHO3 for 24 h then rinsed thoroughly in de-ionized water before use. Moreover, quality control was assured by performing duplicate analysis on all samples and by using reagent blanks and standards. Also values of the studying metals below the detection limits of the Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (AAS) Model AA-6300 Shimadzu Corporation, Japan, were refused according to Mapanda et al. (2005). Finally, descriptive statistics (maximum, minimum, average and LSD, etc….) were calculated. Statistical analysis was performed using analysis of variance technique (ANOVA) by means of the computer program and statistical analysis systems (SAS, 2001).

3. Results and Discussion:

The basic physiochemical properties of the collected soil samples are statistically summarized in Table (1). The texture class of soil generally, ranged from sandy loam, to loamy sand. In the surface soil samples (0 –30 cm depth) irrigated with different irrigation water qualities: (GW), (GW+DW), (GW+TTWW) and (GW+DW+TTWW); the average percentages of sand were 81.18, 80.15, 78.35 and 78.56, respectively. The respective average percentages of silt were 7.74, 8.62, 9.10 and 9.52. The corresponding clay percentages reached 11.08, 11.23, 12.55 and 11.91, respectively. The EC values were 2.81, 5.04, 3.15 and 4.21 dS.m^{-1} for the study soil irrigated with (GW), (GW+DW), (GW+TTWW) and (GW+DW+TTWW) respectively. The corresponding pH values were 7.63, 7.67, 7.61 and 7.70, respectively; while the organic matter contents (O.M %) were 0.65, 0.67, 0.88 and 0.64 for the cultivated soil irrigated with (GW), (GW+DW), (GW+TTWW) and (GW+DW+TTWW), respectively. These results show that long term wastewater irrigation altered the quantity of the soil organic matter. The added organic matter can be mineralized easier and there are more dissolved organic carbon compounds in the soils. Similar results were obtained by **Vazquezmontiel et al. (1996);** who found increase in the soil organic matter content due to irrigation with (TTWW), This finding with stenos in agreement with those of **Rattan et al.(2001).** The Ca++ and Na+ ions were the most dominant cations, meanwhile the Cl$^-$and SO4^{--} ions were the most dominant anions. Also, the exchange sodium percentage values reached 11.80, 10.27, 6.21 and 5.70 in soils irrigated with (GW+DW), (GW+ DW + TTWW), (GW+TTWW) and (GW), respectively. These results are in harmony with those obtained by Abdel- Nasser et al. (2000), who reported that increasing salinity of irrigation water lead to an increase in the exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP %) on soil complex.

Table (1): Major physical and chemical properties of the study soil irrigated with different irrigation water qualities (over two seasons).

Parameters	**Irrigation Water Quality**				
	GW	**GW+DW**	**GW+TTWW**	**GW+DW+TTWW**	**LSD at 5%**
	Average	Average	Average	Average	
Sand %	81.18 a	80.15 b	78.35 d	78.56 c	**0.002**
Silt %	7.74 d	8.62 c	9.10 b	9.52 a	**0.002**
Clay %	11.08 d	11.23 c	12.55 a	11.92 b	**0.002**
Soil Texture	Sandy Loam	Loamy Sand	Sandy Loam	Sandy Loam	**--**
pH	7.63 c	7.67 b	7.61 d	7.70 a	**0.002**
O.M. g kg-^{1}	0.54 d	0.57 b	0.73 a	0.64 c	**0.002**
Ec (dS/m^{-1})	2.74 b	3.16 ab	2.57 b	3.52 a	**0.582**
Ca^{++} (m mole.L^{-1})	9.02 c	11.14 b	8.70 d	11.76 a	**0.004**
Mg^{++} (m mole.L-1)	1.34 c	3.22 a	1.60 b	1.72 c	**0.004**
Na^{+} (m mole.L-1)	16.46 c	22.24 a	15.12 d	21.02 b	**0.004**
K^{+} (m mole.L-1)	0.54 d	0.74 a	0.58 c	0.70 a	**0.004**
HCO$_3^-$ (m mole.L-1)	7.72 d	12.52 a	8.64 c	10.40 b	**0.004**
Cl$^-$ (m mole.L-1)	10.42 d	23.18 b	13.54 c	23.46 a	**0.004**
SO$_4^{--}$ (m mole.L-1)	9.24 a	1.70 c	3.74 b	1.46 d	**0.004**
ESP	5.70 d	11.80 a	6.21 c	10.27 b	**0.089**

Means in each row followed by the same letter(s) did not differ at < 0.05 according to Duncan's multiple-range test. The value of each property is the average of 6 soil samples collected over two successive seasons (2010,2011).

Data presented in Table (2) show the average chemical composition of different water qualities used for irrigation. Apparently, the values of EC were (2.81, 5.04, 3.15, and 4.21 dS m^{-1} for (GW), (GW+ DW), (GW + TTWW), and (GW+DW+TTWW) water samples, respectively, whereas the corresponding values of TDS were 1798.4, 3225.6, 2016.0 and 2694.4 mg/L, respectively. The data illustrate that the highest value of EC was recorded for (GW+DW) followed by (GW+DW+TTWW) and (GW + TTWW) while the lowest value of EC was recorded for (GW). The values of pH were 7.63, 7.80, 7.55 and 7.77, for (GW), (GW+ DW), (GW + TTWW), and (GW+DW+TTWW) water samples, respectively.

With Respect to heavy metals content of the different irrigation water qualities, data show that (GW+DW+TTWW) followed by (GW + TTWW) contained higher concentration of Cu, Mn, Fe, Zn, B, Ni, Pb, Cd, As and Co compared to (GW+ DW) or (GW) irrigation water. The concentrations of these metals in all irrigation water qualities were within the permissible limits for irrigation purposes. In this respect, Pescod (1992) showed that the threshold values of heavy metals in irrigation water leading to crop damage are 2000 µg L^{-1} for Cu, 200 µg L^{-1} for Mn, 5000µg$L^{-1}$for Fe, 2000 µg$L^{-1}$for Zn,200 µgL^{-1} for Ni, 5000 µg$L^{-1}$for Pb and 10 µgL^{-1} for Cd.

Heavy metals total content (mg/kg^{-1} soil) in the cultivated soils:

Total concentrations of heavy metals in cultivated soil under study i.e. iron [Fe], manganese [Mn], zinc [Zn], copper [Cu], lead [Pb], cadmium [Cd], Arsenic [As], Cobalt [Co], and Nickel [Ni] and their background values are listed in Table 3.

Table (2): Chemical composition and biological content of the different irrigation water qualities used for irrigation of Al-Hassa Irrigation and Drainage Authority areas (over two seasons).

Characteristic	Irrigation Water Quality				LSD at 5%
	GW	GW+DW	GW+TTWW	GW+DW+TTWW	
EC (dS/m)	2.81 d	5.04 a	3.15 c	4.21 b	**0.002**
TDS (mg/L)	1798.4 d	3225.6 a	2016.0 c	2694.4 b	**3.700**
pH	7.63 c	7.80 a	7.55 d	7.77 b	**0.002**
Soluble Cations, m mole L^{-1}					
Ca^{2+}	7.94 d	13.26 a	9.40 c	10.44 b	**0.004**
Mg^{2+}	4.36 d	7.58 a	4.90 c	6.90 b	**0.004**
Na^{+}	14.9 d	28.42 a	16.26 c	23.92 b	**0.004**
K^{+}	0.90 c	1.14 a	0.94 b	0.84 d	**0.004**
Soluble Anions, m mole L^{-1}					
CO_3^{2-}	-	-	-	-	**-**
HCO_3^{-}	4.46 c	8.84 a	3.62 d	5.70 b	**0.004**
Cl^{-}	10.00 d	17.34 c	20.32 b	22.34 a	**0.120**
SO_4^{2-}	13.64 c	24.22 a	7.56 d	14.06 b	**0.004**
NO^{-}_3, mg/L	5.23 d	10.21 c	11.34 b	13.53 a	**0.240**
Micronutrients, m mole L^{-1}					
Cu	0.012 b	0.016 ab	0.019 c	0.026 a	**0.060**
Mn	0.017 d	0.022 b	0.027 c	0.032a	**0.002**
Fe	0.072 d	0.085 c	0.095 b	0.099 a	**0.002**
Zn	0.045 d	0.076 c	0.085 b	0.090 a	**0.110**
B	0. 35 b	0. 48 a	0. 26 b	0. 57 a	**0.110**
Heavy metals, m mole L^{-1}					
Ni	0.005 d	0.008 b	0.013c	0.015 a	**0.002**
Pb	0.009 d	0.019 b	0.014 c	0.017 a	**0.002**
Cd	0.002 a	0.006 c	0.015 d	0.019 b	**0.002**
As	0.003 b	0.008 d	0.009a	0.011 c	**0.002**
Co	0.004 a	0.009 c	0.012 d	0.016 b	**0.002**
Biological Content					
Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	9.84 a	7.09 d	7.95 b	7.46 c	**0.002**
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD_5) mg L^{-1}	2.04 d	3.53 c	4.28 a	3.88 b	**0.110**
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) mg L^{-1}	4.05 d	12.48 c	14.64 b	16.78 a	**0.089**

The value of each property is the average of 24 water samples for each irrigation water quality during two successive seasons (2010,2011**).**

The results showed that (GW+ DW+TTWW), (GW+TTWW) and (GW+DW) increased total heavy metal contents of Fe, Mn, Cu, Zn, Co, Cd, Pb, As and Ni in the cultivated soils irrigated with these water qualities as compared to the cultivated soil irrigated with ground water. Results also showed that, the total soil content of these metals could be arranged in the following descending order: Fe > Cu > Mn > Zn > Pb > Co > As > Cd> Ni. The concentration of iron [Fe] ranged from 1820.0 to 2525.67, 2089.0 to3711.50, 2367.17 to 4701.33 and from 2724.67 to 5038.67 mg/kg at depth of (0-30) cm for cultivated soils irrigated with (GW), (GW+ DW), (GW+TTWW) and (GW+ DW +TTWW), respectively. The concentration range of Cu was 26.61 to 57.33 with an average of 41.97 mg/kg for soil irrigated with (GW), the mean concentration of Cu is higher than the average value of common range in cultivated agricultural soil. The concentration of Mn ranged from 31.93 to 46.74 mg/kg with an average 39.34 mg/kg for soil irrigated with (GW) while the corresponding range for soil irrigated with (GW+ DW +TTWW) was 77.31 to 106.18 with an average 91.46 mg/kg soil. The mean concentrations of Zn were 27.77, 37.26, 50.48 and 58.47 for soils irrigated with (GW), (GW+ DW), (GW+TTWW) and (GW+ DW +TTWW), respectively. The mean concentrations of Cd were 0.06, 0.12, 0.16 and 0.21 mg/kg for cultivated soils irrigated with (GW), (GW+ DW), (GW+TTWW) and (GW+ DW +TTWW), respectively.

Generally the data showed that the effects of different irrigation water qualities on total heavy metals content in soil are in the following order:

(GW+ DW+TTWW) > (GW+TTWW) > (GW+DW) > (GW). These results are in agreement with those obtained by **Hussein (1991),** who found that treated wastewater and agricultural drainage water significantly increased Fe, Mn, Cu and Zn in sandy clay loam soil, sandy soil and calcareous soil. These results are in harmony also with those obtained by **Shahin and Hussein (2005),** who reported that the (GW+ DW +TTWW) resulted in the highest effect on Cd content of soil followed by (GW+TTWW), (GW+ DW) and then (GW).

The Geo-Accumulation Index (I_{geo}) for studied soils:

The I_{geo} values for the nine heavy elements in the cultivated soils irrigated with different irrigation water qualities are listed in (Table 4). Applying the classification system devised by (Teng et al., 2002 and Ji et al., 2008); the elements identified in the irrigated soils may be divided into three categories. The I_{geo} values, of the cultivated soils irrigated with groundwater, for Mn, Fe, Co, and Cd fell into (class 0). This indicates that the cultivated soil irrigated with groundwater is uncontaminated with these elements. On the other I_{geo} values for Cu, Zn, Pb, and Ni are > 0and < 1 where they ranged from 0.51to 0.96, 0.02 to 0.55, 0.11 to 0.30, and 0.21 to 0.69 for Cu, Zn, Pb, and Ni, respectively (Table 4). This indicates that the cultivated soil irrigated with groundwater is uncontaminated to moderately contaminated with these elements. The I_{geo} value for As falls into the category of Moderately/strongly contaminated ($2 < I_{geo} < 3$) I_{geo} values for As in cultivated soil irrigated with ground water varied the most ranging from -1.06 to 2.17 (Table 4), with an average value of - 0.80, which falls into the category of "practically uncontaminated," while the maximum geo-accumulation index value of 2.17 suggests the existence of moderately/strongly contaminated soils. Elevated Arsenic concentrations are largely owing to the moving engine parts, fungicide, insecticides and phosphate fertilizers, (Sutherland, *et al.*, 2000 and Ji *et al.*, 2008) hence, concentrations of As have been significantly influenced by anthropogenesis activities.

The I_{geo} values for cultivated soil irrigated with groundwater mixed with agricultural drainage water, indicate a contamination with the same elements and contaminating the cultivated soil irrigated with groundwater but with different levels. I_{geo} values are > 1 < 2, for Cu, Pb, and Ni, where they ranged from 0.69 to 1.47, 0.79 to 1.01, and 0.54 to1.02 for Cu, Pb and Ni, respectively. This indicates that the cultivated soil irrigated with (GW+ DW) are classified according to the level of contamination (classes) into the category of moderately contaminated and this indicates that these contaminating elements are due to anthropogenic activities.

The I_{geo} values for Mn, Fe, Co, and Cd are classified as class 0. This indicates that the soil irrigated with (GW+ DW) is uncontaminated with these elements. On the other hand the I_{geo} values for Zn and As are in the range 0.45 to 0.98 and -0.07 to 0.29, respectively. Such soils are classified as uncontaminated to moderately contaminated (class1).

The calculated results of I_{geo} of heavy metals for the cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+TTWW) are presented in Table (4). The results show that the I_{geo} values for Mn, Fe and Co indicate that the soils uncontaminated with these elements. Cd and As gave I_{geo} values in the range of - 0.17 to 0.22 and 0.09 to 0.42, respectively. This indicates that the soil irrigated with (GW+TTWW) was uncontaminated to moderately contaminated with these elements (class 1). The I_{geo} values for soil irrigated with ground water mixed with tertiary treated wastewater are presented in Table (4). Their I_{geo} values are > 1 and < 2, for Cu, Zn, Pb, and Ni, with values ranging from 1.33 to 1.74, 0.88 to 1.32, 1.25 to 1.55 and 0.93 to1.32 for Cu, Zn, Pb and Ni, respectively. This indicates that the cultivated soil irrigated with groundwater mixed with tertiary treated wastewater are classified according to the level of contamination by these elements as moderately contaminated (class2), indicating that this contamination is due to anthropogenic activities.

The I_{geo} values (Table 4), of cultivated soil irrigated by (GW+ DW + TTWW) for Mn, Fe, and Co, are mostly negative, falling into (class 0); i.e. uncontaminated soils,. While the I_{geo} values for the elements Cu, Zn, Pb, and Ni are 1.67 to 1.95, 1.10 to 1.54, 1.49 to 1.77, and 1.32 to 1.66, respectively. This indicates that the soils irrigated with (GW+DW+TTWW) are classified as moderately contaminated with Cu, Zn, Pb, and Ni (class2); and there is a moderate contribution of The anthropogenic sources. The most likely source of these elements may be due to the agricultural materials added to the cultivated soil irrigated with (DW) or (TTWW) as irrigation water sources (Lue *et al.*, 2009). I_{geo} values for Cd in cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+DW+TTWW)) ranged from -0.36 to 0.53 indicating that these soils can be classified as uncontaminated to moderately contaminated with Cd element. I_{geo} values for As in cultivated soils irrigated with (GW +DW+TTWW) ranged from negative up to 4.65, and hence these soils are classified as strongly/ extreme contaminated (class5), with As.

In general, I_{geo} values for the irrigated soil irrigated with (GW+DW+TTWW) showed patterns of heavy metals contamination similar to those in the cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+TTWW) showed patterns or soils irrigated by (GW+DW).

On average, levels of Mn and Fe found in this study were below concentrations which are deemed pollutants, Mn and Fe may be chosen as reference elements for research on agricultural cultivated soils. Clear signs of pollution are present for Cu, Zn, Pb, As, and Ni, with maximum values of I_{geo} close to 4.65 for As in cultivated soil irrigated with (GW +DW+TTWW). It should be also noted that the I_{geo} mean values of metals in the studied cultivated soil irrigated with different irrigation water qualities could be arranged in the following descending order: (GW +DW+TTWW) > (GW +TTWW) > (GW +DW) > (GW).

The Enrichment Factor (EF) for studied soils:

For a better estimation of anthropogenic inputs, EF was calculated for each metal by dividing its ratio to a normalized element by the same ratio found in a baseline. The use of EF for identification of anomalous metal concentration requires geochemical normalization of the heavy metal data to a conservative element such as Al or Fe (Ghrefat and Yusuf, 2006). Several authors have successfully used Fe or suggested the use of Fe to normalize metal contamination (Bhuiyan *et al*. 2011). The current study had also employed Fe as a conservative tracer to differentiate natural from anthropogenic source of metal contamination in the cultivated soils irrigated with different irrigation water qualities. In order to estimate quantitatively the anthropogenic trace metals in the cultivated soils; their background concentration must be known. Previous researchers often used an average lactogenic background value an average concentration in shale (Ghrefat and Yusuf, 2006; Bhuiyan *et al*., 2011) or an average value of measured concentration before industrialization (Hakanson, 1980) to assess trace metal concentration in sediment. In this study the background value was taken from average of cultivated soils (Turekian and Wedepohl, 2011; Al- Omran *et al*.,2011).

The average levels of the sampling representing the cultivated soils irrigated with different irrigation water qualities for EF are displayed in Table (4). The EF values for cultivated soil irrigated with groundwater reveal that EF values for studied metals could be arranged in the following descending order: Cu > Ni > Zn > Pb > As > Cd > Mn > Fe > Co. The highest values for Cu, Ni and Zn are 7.4, 6.18 and 5.59, respectively indicating significant enrichment, while the EF values for Pb and As are 4.69 and 2.49, respectively indicating moderate enrichment. The EF values are 1.69, 1.38, 0.88 and 0.77 for Cd, Mn, Fe and Co, respectively indicating deficiency to minimal enrichment.

The calculated results of EF values for heavy metals in the cultivated soils irrigated with (GW +DW) are shown in Table (4). The results show that Cu, Ni, Pb and Zn have significant enrichment with highest values reaching: 10.58, 7.73, 7.66 and 7.52 respectively, indicating severe enrichment; while the As and Cd have EF values of 4.65 and 3.38, respectively therefore this soil is moderately enriched with As and Cd. Meanwhile, the EF for Mn, Fe and Co falls within the range 1.17 to 1.78, which reveals that the cultivated soils irrigated with (GW + DW) are depleted in these minerals (deficient category).

In general, EF values for the cultivated soils irrigated with (GW +TTWW) or for cultivated soils irrigated with (GW +DW+TTWW) are similar to those of the cultivated soils irrigated with (GW +DW), where the EF values for Cu, Pb, Zn, Ni, and As are 12.76, 11.15, 9.52, 9.50 and 5.05, respectively for the cultivated soils irrigated with (GW + TTWW).

While the EF values for these metals in cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+DW+TTWW) are 14.66, 12.95, 9.52, 12.02 and 6.55, respectively. The EF values for these elements which are greater than 5, (i.e. EF value = 5 to 20) indicate significant enrichment. This suggests that the sources of contamination with these are anthropogenic due to previous agricultural activities such as fungicides, algaecides, pesticides, wood preservatives, antifouling paint and nutritional supplements in animal feed (Edwards, 1976). Heavy metal accumulations in plant and soil from natural and artificial sources represent important environmental pollution problems. Food safety issues and potential adverse health risks make this one of the most serious environmental concerns (Cui *et al*., 2004). Fe and Co are the two deficient to minimal enrichment metals and therefore contamination may be traced to a natural source. The differences in the EF values may be due to the difference in the magnitude of input for each metal in the soil and/or differences in the removal rate of each metal from the soil (Akoto, *et al*., 2008).

It should be also noted that the *EF* mean values of metals in the studied cultivated soils irrigated with different irrigation water qualities, when compared to the EF severe enrichment level adopted in many studies (Ghrefat and Yusuf, 2006; Abrahim and Parker, 2008; Akoto *et al*.,2008; Olubunmi and Olorunsola, 2010).

which is (5 to 20), can be arranged in following descending order: (GW +DW+TTWW) with 66% of metals falling within the EF severe enrichment level; > (GW+TTWW) with 55% of metals falling within EF severe enrichment level; > (GW +DW) with 44% of metals falling within EF severe enrichment level > (GW) with 33% of metals falling within EF severe enrichment level.

Pollution index (PI) for studied soils:

Based on the result of the calculated pollution index shown in Table (4), it is observed that the lowest PI value was shown for cultivated soil irrigated with (GW), while the highest PI values are shown for cultivated soil irrigated with (GW +DW+TTWW). Based on PI values for the studied soils, PI for the different heavy metals fall into three categories. The first category with PI value ≤ 1 indicating low contamination or unpolluted cultivated soils with the metals: Mn, Fe, Co, Cd, and As in the cultivated soil irrigated with (GW), Mn, Fe, and Co in cultivated soils irrigated with (GW +DW), (GW + TTWW) and (GW+DW+TTWW).

The second category, with PI value from1 to 3 indicating moderate contamination by the heavy metals: Cu, Zn, Pb, and Ni in cultivated soil irrigated with (GW), Zn, Cd, and As in cultivated soil irrigated with (GW +DW), Cd, and As in both cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+ TTWW) and (GW+DW+TTWW). More detailed study and monitoring are required to monitor the source of pollution.

The third category, with PI value = 3 to 6 indicating considerable soil heavy metal contamination which require intervention to ameliorate the pollution. The soils falling in this category also require regular monitoring and the investigation of the major source of pollution. The current results indicated that the third category does not include cultivated soils irrigated with ground water, while the cultivated soil irrigated with (GW +DW) show Cu, and Ni pollution with IP values falling within the third category. Both cultivated soils irrigated with (GW+TTWW) and (GW +DW+TTWW) show Cu, Zn, Pb and Ni severe pollution with PI values falling within the third category, reaching: 5.03, 3.75, 4.39 and 3.74, respectively for the first, and: 5.78, 4.35, 5.10 and 4.74, respectively for the second.

Pearson's correlation coefficients of heavy metal:

Pearson correlation analysis (Edwards,1976) was performed between all the variables. The level of significance ($p \leq 0.01$) of multi-element correlation for soil samples was determined and the results are given in Table (5). From the result, it is observed that the listed r values indicated high positive correlation coefficient between various pairs of metals, reflecting their simultaneous source from different irrigation water qualities and agricultural activates on soil contamination with studied heavy metals. The inter-metallic correlation coefficients in the soil samples with $p < 0.01$ were: Fe-Pb, As-Ni, Cu-Mn, Cu-Co, Cu-Ni, Cu-Pb, and Cu-As in the cultivated soil irrigated with different irrigation water qualities with different correlation coefficients. Significant correlations indicate that they may have originated from common sources, possibly with anthropogenic influence due to agricultural activities such as fungicides, algaecides, and pesticides. The strong association of Cu, Zn, Pb, As and Ni indicates common sources, and these metals may have been derived from anthropogenic sources, especially the agricultural activities.

Table (3): Total content of heavy metals (mg/kg^{-1} soil) in the soils (farms) irrigated with different irrigation water qualities (at 0-30 cm depth) over two seasons compared to common ranges in soil of AL- Hassa oasis.

Metal (mg.kg^{-1} soil)	GW			GW + DW			GW+TTWW			GW+DW+TTWW			Common range in soil* (mg/kg^{-1}soil)		
	Max.	Min	Ave.	Max.	Min	Ave.	Max.	Min	Ave.	Max.	Min	Ave.	Max.	Min	Ave.
Cu	57.33	26.61	41.97	81.97	32.39	57.19	98.80	49.86	74.30	113.56	74.97	93.74	100.0	2.00	30.0
Mn	46.74	31.93	39.34	63.09	55.13	59.11	81.50	58.05	74.56	106.18	77.31	91.46	4180	182	1476
Fe	2525.67	1820.00	2172.50	3711.50	2089.00	2900.50	4701.33	2367.17	3534.33	5038.67	2724.67	3881.50	55000.0	7000.0	38000.0
Zn	40.16	15.45	27.77	54.04	20.46	37.26	68.39	32.58	50.48	79.27	48.31	58.47	300.00	10.00	50.00
Co	4.14	2.46	3.30	6.28	3.91	5.09	7.92	5.27	6.35	9.85	6.40	8.13	40.00	1.00	8.00
Cd	0.08	0.04	0.06	0.16	0.08	0.12	0.21	0.10	0.16	0.26	0.14	0.21	0.7	0.01	0.06
Pb	4.14	2.77	3.62	6.76	4.81	5.79	9.84	6.11	7.97	11.43	7.50	9.47	200.00	2.00	10.00
As	2.08	1.53	1.81	3.88	2.14	3.02	4.24	2.53	3.39	5.22	3.08	3.88	50.00	1.00	5.00
Ni	10.14	4.32	7.23	12.73	5.56	9.14	15.65	8.25	11.95	19.80	11.44	15.62	500.00	5.00	40.00

Gw= (ground water); GW+DW= (ground water + agricultural drainage water); GW+TTWW= (ground water + tertiary treated wastewater); GW+DW+TTWW= (ground water + agricultural drainage water + tertiary treated wastewater).

*Common range of element concentrations in soils reported by Lindsay (1979), Kabata and Pendias (1992), Marschner (1995), Adriano (2001), and AL-Omran *et al.*(2011). Cobalt rangeis after Bowen (1999) {c.f. Cataldo and Vaughan,. (1999)}

Table (4): Average values of Geo-accumulation indexes (I_{geo}), Enrichment Factor (EF) and Pollution index (PI) for soils (farms at 0 - 30 cm depth) irrigated with different irrigation water qualities in Al- Hassa Oasis.

Metals	Average values of Geo-accumulation(Index (I_{geo})					Average values of Enrichment Factor (EF)					Average values of Pollution index (PI)				
	Back Ground * (mg.kg^{-1} soil)	Irrigation water qualities				Back Ground * (mg.kg^{-1} soil)	Irrigation water qualities				Back Ground * (mg.kg^{-1} soil)	Irrigation water qualities			
		GW	GW+DW	GW+TTWW	GW+DW+TTWW		GW	GW+DW	GW+TTWW	GW+DW+TTWW		GW	GW+DW	GW+TTWW	GW+DW+TTWW
Cu	19.66	0.51	0.96	1.33	1.67	19.66	5.42	7.38	9.59	12.10	19.66	2.92	2.91	3.78	4.77
Mn	688	-4.71	-4.13	-3.79	-3.50	688	1.29	1.63	1.63	2.00	688	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.13
Fe	43193	-4.90	-4.48	-4.20	-4.06	43193	0.76	1.01	1.23	1.35	43193	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.09
Zn	18.23	0.02	0.45	0.88	1.10	18.23	3.87	5.19	7.03	7.03	18.23	2.20	2.04	2.77	3.21
Co	15.90	-2.85	-2.23	-1.91	-1.55	15.90	0.62	0.95	1.19	1.52	15.90	0.26	0.32	0.40	0.51
Cd	0.12	-1.58	-0.58	-0.17	0.22	0.12	1.17	2.54	3.38	4.44	0.12	0.67	1.00	1.33	1.75
Pb	2.24	0.11	0.79	1.25	1.49	2.24	4.10	6.56	9.03	10.73	2.24	1.85	2.58	3.56	4.23
As	2.12	-0.81	-0.07	0.09	0.29	2.12	2.17	3.62	4.06	4.65	2.12	0.98	1.42	1.60	1.83
Ni	4.18	0.21	0.54	0.93	1.32	4.18	4.39	5.55	7.26	9.49	4.18	2.43	2.19	2.86	3.74

Gw= (ground water); GW+DW= (ground water + agricultural drainage water); GW+TTWW= (ground water + tertiary treated wastewater); GW+DW+TTWW= (ground water + agricultural drainage water + tertiary treated wastewater).
(*) The background values were obtained according AL-Omran *et al*.(2011).

Table (5):Pearson correlation coefficient for the metals in cultivated soil irrigated with different irrigation water qualities.

	Cu	Mn	Fe	Zn	Co	Cd	Pb	As	Ni
Mn	0.10	1.00							
Fe	0.98**	0.15	1.00						
Zn	0.88**	0.12	0.88**	1.00					
Co	0.99**	0.10	0.98**	0.88**	1.00				
Cd	0.98**	0.14	0.98**	0.88**	0.99**	1.00			
Pb	0.99**	0.13	0.99**	0.89**	0.99**	0.98**	1.00		
As	0.95**	0.11	0.98**	0.85**	0.97**	0.97**	0.97**	1.00	
Ni	0.99**	0.08	0.96**	0.88**	0.99**	0.97**	0.98**	0.92**	1.00

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Conclusion:

The present study represents a useful tool for the evaluation heavy metal hazards of cultivated soil, in relation to different irrigation water qualities and how it's may effect on the soil heavy metal contents. The methods used, including geo-accumulation index, enrichment factor, pollution index and correlation analysis provide an important tools for better understanding of the pollutants among the cultivated soil sampling in relation to the environmental matrices employed for the study. The relatively different concentrations of the studied heavy metals clearly indicate that the main source of pollution may come from the agricultural activities. The use of geo-accumulation index, enrichment factor, and pollution index has provided essential information for the assessment of pollution level in the cultivated soils. Enrichment Factor (EF) has shown a significant enrichment with elements such as Cu, Zn, Pb, and Ni. The possible source of pollution was expected to be originating from land base agricultural activities and the different irrigation water qualities used for soils irrigation.

Acknowledgement:

The authors would like to express their appreciation to the Date Palm Research Center (Center of Excellence) King Faisal University for their financial funding of this study under grant #AG-3.

References:

1. Abdel-Nasser, G., M. M. Harhash and S. M. EL-Shazly (2000).Response of some olive cultivars grown in Siwa Oasis to well water quality. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 25(5):2877-2896.
2. Abrahim G. M, Parker R. J. (2008). Assessment of heavy metal enrichment factors and the degree of contamination in marine sediments from Tamaki Estuary, Aukland, New Zealand. Envron.Monit. Assess. 136: 227–238.
3. Adriano, D.C.(2001). Trace elements in terrestrial environments, (2nd edition), Spring-Verlag, New York.
4. Akoto O, Ephraim JH, Darko G. (2008). Heavy metal pollution in surface soils in the vicinity of abundant raiway servicing workshop in Kumasi, Ghana. Int. J. Environ. Res. 2(4): 359–364.
5. ALOmran, A.M., EL- Maghraby., S.E., Nadeem, M.E.A., EL- Eter, A.M. and EL-Qahtani, S.M.I. (2011). Impact of Cement Dust on Some Soil Properties Around the Cement Factory in Al-Hasa Oasis Saudi Arabia. American- Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci., 11(6):840-846, 2011.
6. Bhagure, G.R., and S.R. Mirgane. (2010). Heavy metal concentrations in groundwaters and soils of Thane Region of Maharashtra, India. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment DOI 10.1007/ s10661-010-1412-9.
7. Bhuiyan, M.A.H.; Suruvi, N.I.; Dampare, S.B.; Islam, M.A.; Quraishi, S.B.; Ganyaglo, S.; Suzuki, S.(2011). Investigation of the possible sources of heavy metal contamination in lagoon and canal water in the tannery industrial area in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Environ. Monit. Assess.*, *175*, 633–649.
8. Bowen, H. J. M. (1999). Trace Elements in Biochemistry, AcademicPress, New York, 1999.
9. Cataldo, D. A., and Vaughan, B. E.(1999). Retention, absorptionand translocation of foliar contaminants. In: Transuranics inNatural Environments, M. G. White and P. B. Dunaway,Eds., NVO-178, NTIS.
10. Cui, Y.J., Y.G. Zhu, R.H. Zhai, D.Y. Chen, Y.Z. Huang, Y. Qui, and J.Z. Liang. (2004). Transfer of metals from near a smelter in Nanning, China. Environment International 30: 785–91.
11. Edwards, A.L. (1976). The Correlation Coefficient. In *Introduction to Linear Regression and Correlation*; W. H. Freeman and Company: San Francisco, CA, USA, Chapter 4,pp. 33-46.
12. Gee, G.W. and J.W. Bauder, 1996. Particle Size Analysis. In: Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 1, 3rd Edition. Physical and Mineralogical Methods. Edited by Sparks, D. L. et. al. Am. Soc. Agron. and Soil Sci. Soc. Am., Madison, WI., pp: 377-382.
13. Ghrefat, H. and N. Yusuf (2006). "Assessing Mn, Fe, Cu, Znand Cd pollution in bottom sediments of wadi Al-Arab Dam, Jordan". Chemosphere; 1-8.
14. Govil, P.K., G.L.N. Reddy, and A.K. Krishna.2001. Contamination of soil due to heavy metals in Patancheru industrial developmentarea, Andhra Pradesh, India. Environmental Geology 41: 461–9.
15. Hakanson, L., (1980). An Ecological risk index for aquatic pollution control: A sedimentological approach. Water Res., 14: 975-1001.
16. Hossner, L.R., 1996. Dissolution for Total Elemental Analysis. In: Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 3, 3rd Edition. Chemical Methods. Edited by D.L. Sparks, *et al*., Soil Sci. Soc. Am. and Am. Soc. Agron., Madison, WI., pp: 46-64.
17. Hussein, A.H. A. (1991). Use of saline water for irrigation of some crops and its effect on soil properties and plant growth in relation to the addition of soil amendments. M.Sc thesis, Fac. of Agric. Saba Bacha, Alex. Univ.
18. Ji, Y.Q., Y.C. Feng, J.H. Wu, T. Zhu, Z.P. Bai and C.Q. Duan(2008). Using geo-accumulation index to study source profiles of soil dust in China, J. Environ. Sci., 20: 571-578.
19. Kabata-Pendias, A., and H. Pendias(1992). Trace elements in soils and plants. 3rd ed. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
20. Lindsay, W., (1979). Chemical Equilibrium in Soils.1 Edition. A Wiley Inter. Sci. Pub.. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
21. Loeppert, R.H. and D.L. Suarez, 1996. Carbonate and Gypsum: Manometer Method. In Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 3: Chemical Methods. 3rd Edition. Soil Sci. Soc. Am., Madison, WI., pp: 437-474.
22. Loska K, Wiechula D, Barska B, Cebula E andChojnecka A (2003). Assessment of Arsenic enrichment of cultivated soils inSouthern Poland. Polish Journal of Environmental Studies2: 187–192.

23. Lue, X; L.Wang, K. Lei, J. Huang, Y. Zhai, (2009) Contamination assessment of copper, lead, zinc, manganese and nickel in street dust of Baoji,NW China, Journal of Hazardous Materials 161 (2008) 1058–1062.
24. Luo, X.; Yu, S.; Zhu, Y. and Li, X. (2012). Trace metal contamination in urban soils of China. *Sci. Total Environ.*, *441–442*, 17–30.
25. Mapanda, F.; Mangwayana, E.N.; Nyamangara, J. andGiller, K.E (2005). The effect of long-term irrigation using wastewater on heavy metal contents of soils under vegetables in Harare, Zimbabwe. Agric. Ecosys. Environ., 107, 151–165.
26. Marschner, H. (1995). Mineral Nutrition of Higber Plants (2ndedition), Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
27. Mmolawa, K. B., A. S. Likuku and G. K. Gaboutleeloe (2011).Assessment of heavy metal pollution in soils along majorroadside areas in Botswana. African J. EnvironmentalScience and Technology, 5(3): 186-196.
28. Muller G (1969). Index of geo-accumulation in sediments of the Rhine River. Geo Journal 2: 108-118.
29. Naveedullah, M Z, Chunna YU, Hui S, Dechao D, Chaofeng S, Liping Land Yingxu C(2013). Risk Assessment of Heavy Metals Pollution in Agricultural Soils of Siling Reservoir Watershed in Zhejiang Province, China. BioMed Research International Volume 2013, Page 1-10.
30. Nelson, D.W. and L.E. Sommers, 1982. Total Carbon, Organic Carbon and Organic Matter, pp: 539-579. In: A.L. Page *et al*., (eds.) In: Methods of Soil Analysis, Argon. Monograph 9, Part 2, 2nd Edition,Am. Soc. Agron. Inc., Madison, WI, USA.
31. Olubunmi FE andOlorunsola OE (2010). Evaluation of the status of heavy metal pollution of sediment of Agbabu bitumen deposits area, Nigeria. Eur. J. Sci. Res. 41(3):373–382.
32. Pescod, M. 1992. Wastewater treatment and use in agriculture. Bull. FAO #47 (125) (Rome).
33. Ratttan, R.K., Datta, S.P., Singh, A.K., Chhonkar, P.K., Suribabu, K. 2001. Effects of long-term application of sewage effluents on available nutrient and available water status in soils under Keshopur Effluent Irrigation Scheme in Delhi. J. Water Manage.
34. Reimann, C. and P. De-Caritat, 2000. Intrinsic flaws of element Enrichment Factors (EFs) in environmental geochemistry. Environ. Sci. Technol., 34: 5084.
35. SAS Institute (2001). SAS for Windows, SAS user's guide: Statistics. Version 8.0 e. SAS Inst., Inc., Cary, North Carolina.
36. Shahin, M. M. and A. H. A. Hussein. 2005. Effect of irrigation water quality on cadmium content in some soils and plant grown in the Al-Hassa Oasis, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Al-Azhar J. Agric. Res., 42: 61-74.
37. Singh, K.P.; Mohan, D.; Sinha, S.; Dalwani, R.(2012). Impact assessment of treated/untreated wastewater toxicants discharged by sewage treatment plants on health, agricultural, and environmental quality in the wastewater disposal area. *Appl. Sci.*, *2* 600.
38. Sparks, D.L., A.L. Page, R.H. Miller and D.R. Keeney, Eds., 1996. Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 3. Chemical Methods. 3rd Edition. Am. Soc. Agron. and and Soil Soil Sci. Soc. Am., Madison, WI.
39. Sutherland RA, Tolosa CA, Tack FMG andVerloo MG (2000).Characterization of selected element concentration and enrichment ratios in background and anthropogenically impacted roadside areas. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 38: 428–438.
40. Taylor, S. R. and S. M. Mclennan (1985). The continental crustpublications, Oxford.: Its composition and Evaluation Black well scientific.
41. Teng Y G, Tuo X G, Zhang C J, 2002. Applying geoaccumulationindex to assess heavy metal pollution in sediment: Influenceof different geochmical background. Environmental Scienceand Technology (in Chinese), 2: 7–9, 48.
42. Turekian, and K.L. Wedepohl, (2011). Distribution of the elements in some major units of the earth's crust. Goel. Soc. Am. Bull., 72: 172-192.
43. Vazquezmontiel, N.J. Horan and D.D. Mara, (1996). Management of domestic wastewater for reuse in irrigation, Water Sci. Technol., 33 (10–11) (1996) 355–362.
44. Zekri M., R. and C.J.Koo (1994). "Treated municipal wastewater for citrus irrigation". Journal of Plant Physiology.

10/12/2014