The effect of vegetation on soil polluted with galligu: phytostabilisation and novel approaches to evaluate soil galligu concentration

Lucherini, Andrea; Gonzalez-Ollauri, Alejandro; Mickovski, Slobodan B.

Published in:
Environmental Geotechnics

DOI:
[10.1680/jenge.19.00031](https://doi.org/10.1680/jenge.19.00031)

Publication date:
2020

Document Version
Author accepted manuscript

[Link to publication in ResearchOnline](#)

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Lucherini, A, Gonzalez-Ollauri, A & Mickovski, SB 2020, 'The effect of vegetation on soil polluted with galligu: phytostabilisation and novel approaches to evaluate soil galligu concentration', *Environmental Geotechnics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1680/jenge.19.00031>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please view our takedown policy at <https://edshare.gcu.ac.uk/id/eprint/5179> for details of how to contact us.

The effect of vegetation on soil polluted with galligu: phytostabilisation and novel approaches to evaluate soil galligu concentration

Andrea Lucherini¹, Alejandro Gonzalez-Ollauri^{1,2,3}, Slobodan B. Mickovski^{1, 2}

¹School of Computing, Engineering and Built Environment, Glasgow Caledonian University, G4 0BA Glasgow, UK

²The BEAM Research Centre, Glasgow Caledonian University, G4 0BA Glasgow, UK

³ Corresponding author: alejandro.ollauri@gcu.ac.uk

Abstract

The Sighthill area, situated north of river Clyde in Glasgow, is polluted with the waste product galligu as a consequence of past activities associated with the alkali industry. As this area is planned for re-development, it is necessary to explore feasible ways of polluted soil decontamination. An experimental laboratory survey was conducted to assess whether phytostabilisation could be a suitable strategy to limit the mobilisation of galligu within contaminated soil. For this purpose, two different types of vegetation were tested - i.e. a male dwarf fern (*Dryopteris Affinis* (Lowe) Fraser-Jenk) and alfalfa (*Medicago Sativa* L.). Laboratory experiments were conducted using readily available materials to study both the axial and vertical movement of galligu in the soil as a result of heavy rainfall events. In addition to this research, original and simple methods were tested to assess whether it was possible to estimate galligu content within a soil volume. The results showed that sediment loss was reduced by 84% and 94% under fern and alfalfa covers, respectively, compared to fallow soil. The concentration of galligu in the sediments from fern and grass treated soil was 59% and 62% lower, respectively, than under fallow soil conditions. Furthermore, alfalfa was observed to be more effective in containing galligu, since the fern root systems may have allowed the contaminant to percolate towards the bottom of the soil. Turbidity and colour-based analyses were able to give an estimation of the concentration of galligu in the soil effectively. The results of this research are directly applicable to phytoremediation actions on polluted soils and to the assessment of synthetic soil pollutants using simple and inexpensive methods.

Keywords

Geoenvironment; Land contamination; Pollution

1. Introduction

Galligu is an industrial, toxic, solid waste mainly comprising calcium sulphide (CaS), and often found in soils polluted by heavy metals and other hazardous elements. Galligu is generated by the Leblanc process, which is employed to produce soda ash (i.e. sodium carbonate) (Aftalion,1991). The Leblanc process is based on two separated stages: (i) production of sodium sulphate (Na₂SO₄) or “salt cake” through the (NaCl) and sulphuric acid (H₂SO₄) – i.e. $2\text{NaCl} + \text{H}_2\text{SO}_4 \rightarrow \text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4 + 2\text{HCl}$; and (ii) production of CaS and sodium carbonate (Na₂CO₃) through the reaction between the resulting Na₂SO₄ from Step 1 and calcium carbonate (CaCO₃) -i.e. $\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4 + 2\text{C} + \text{CaCO}_3 \rightarrow \text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3 + \text{CaS}$. The Leblanc process was widely used in soda production plants throughout the 19th Century in France and Great Britain, with Great Britain once producing

10 over 200,000 tons of soda per year. For each ton of Na_2CO_3 generated, 2 tons of galligu were produced (for
11 review see Aftalion, 1991). Since galligu had no economic value, it was dumped and spread on open fields
12 near the processing factories. Although galligu production and tipping do not exist anymore (the Leblanc
13 process was replaced by the Solvay process in the late 19th Century; Kiefer, 2002), the galligu remaining at
14 brownfield sites still poses a serious environmental threat, jeopardising the quality of soil and water.

15

16 To date, the most common treatment method used to control galligu pollution *in situ* is
17 stabilisation/solidification using cement – i.e. encapsulation (Halton Borough Council, 2013). The
18 encapsulation of contaminants through solidification is widely used for controlling soil heavy metals
19 (Bocanegra, et al., 2017; Li & Poon, 2017), pesticides (Shukla, et al., 1992) and organic waste
20 (Vipulanandan & Krishnan, 1990), too. An alternative, chemically-based technique to encapsulation is known
21 as ACT (Accelerate Carbon Technology), in which cement is mixed with gaseous carbon dioxide to seal the
22 polluted soil under treatment (Bertos, 2004). However, the two techniques mentioned above are not
23 environmentally friendly, as they are based on the injection of synthetic materials into the environment and
24 the release of contaminants back into the environment is possible after encapsulation (Moore et. Al, 2003).
25 Alternative green techniques or nature-based solutions, such as phytoremediation, have not been explored
26 before for the reclamation of land polluted with galligu.

27 Phytoremediation comprises the use of vegetation and associated microbes to reduce the concentration and
28 toxic effects of pollutants in contaminated environments (Greipsson, 2011). It is a cost effective eco-friendly,
29 and socially accepted approach that has been used to tackle soil and water pollution problems over the last
30 300 years (e.g. McCutcheon and Rock, 2001). Phytoremediation has been implemented successfully in the
31 clean-up of soils polluted with heavy metals (Muthusaravanan, 2018), or in the removal of nitrogen from the
32 water using treatment wetlands (Kinidi & Saleh, 2017). The cost of phytoremediation of one cubic meter of
33 soil can be between 1000 and 100000 times lower than conventional soil remediation (Ghosh, 2005).
34 Multiple physiological processes undertaken by different plant species can be considered for reducing the
35 concentration of pollutants in the environment or promote their immobilisation – e.g. phytoextraction,
36 phytostabilisation, phytovolatilisation, phytotransformation, and phytofiltration (for review see Rahman,
37 2011). The specific phytoremediation process will depend on the soil pollutant and on the chosen plant

38 species – i.e. not all species are able to withstand, uptake, or accumulate any or specific pollutants
39 (Malayeri, 2008). In the case of galligu, phytostabilisation could be a potential viable alternative to
40 conventional remediation methods like encapsulation.

41 Sites polluted with galligu are usually co-contaminated by other toxic materials, such as heavy metals
42 (Gomes, 2016). This issue should be taken into account upon selecting plant species – a key step to
43 succeed with a given phytoremediation action. Some members of the *Dryopteridaceae* fern family are able to
44 tolerate and accumulate heavy metals (i.e. hyperaccumulators) and their phytoremediation potential has
45 been tested before (e.g. Raquel, 2012; Ruiz-Chancho, 2008; Tremlovà, 2016). However, *Dryopteris affinis*
46 (Lowe Fraser-Jenk), a dwarf fern native to Scotland, has never been tested for phytoremediation purposes.
47 This is an important aspect for future applications, as the use of native species for remediation actions
48 should be more ecologically sound (Pimentel, 2005). Alternatively, other fast-growing species may be
49 considered for phytoremediation purposes (Wang, et al., 2008), e.g. alfalfa (*Medicago Sativa* L.) - a
50 leguminous, perennial, cosmopolite, and fast-growing herb (Bonfranceschi, et al., 2009). Alfalfa has shown
51 stabilising potential on acidic copper mine tailings (Chen, et al., 2015) as well as on pyrene (Wang, et al.,
52 2012), stabilising heavy metals and hydrocarbons (Agnello, et al., 2016). In addition, alfalfa has a fibrous root
53 system able to trap contaminants effectively, reduce erosion, and stabilise soil materials (Hao, et al., 2004;
54 Gonzalez-Ollauri and Mickovski, 2017a).

55 The aim of this paper is to investigate whether phytostabilisation can be considered a viable solution to
56 immobilize or limit the movement of galligu in polluted soil. By using male dwarf ferns and alfalfa under
57 laboratory conditions, the observations will focus on the ability of vegetation to reduce the axial and vertical
58 transport of galligu after simulating heavy rainfall events. To complement the assessment of the
59 effectiveness of phytostabilisation against galligu-polluted soil, this paper also strives to explore potential,
60 simple, cost-effective, novel approaches for quantifying the concentration of galligu in polluted soil and runoff
61 under resource-limited situations. For this objective, the viability of two different analytical approaches will be
62 elaborated: (i) turbidity; and (ii) image analysis.

63 **2. Materials and methods**

64 **2.1. Soil and galligu characterisation**

Galligu samples were retrieved from Sighthill, Glasgow, Scotland (Longitude: -4.231040, Latitude: 55.871420) together with a bulk sample of uncontaminated soil. A mass of 1.5 kg of galligu was collected with a shovel from each one of 20 different sampling points separated 2 m apart from each other. A mass of 20 kg of soil not contaminated with galligu was also excavated from the same site. The retrieved samples were placed in sealable PVC bags and stored in a cold, dry, and well-ventilated room to prevent any potential spreading of fumes. Particle size distribution and specific gravity tests (BSI, 2013) were undertaken for both galligu and soil materials. In addition, pH measurements using the slurry method (ASTM, 1995) were conducted on both pure galligu and soil-galligu mixtures using a pH electrode (Fisher Scientific ACCUMET BASIC AB15; previously calibrated at pH 4.0 and 9.0) in order to scope more information about the physicochemical properties of the samples.

2.2. Substrate preparation

Galligu and soil materials were dried in an air-assisted oven at 80°C for 24 hours until constant mass was achieved. The materials were then broken manually – first with a hammer and then with pestle and mortar. Soil and galligu were sieved separately through a 2 mm diameter sieve (BS ISO 11277:2009; ISO/TC 190, 2009). Then, a 50:50 mass mixture of galligu and uncontaminated soil was prepared from the dried and sieved samples and was used as substrate for plant growth.

2.3 Axial transport of galligu

2.3.1 Axial soil column preparation

Six axial soil columns were prepared at the Hydraulics Laboratory, Glasgow Caledonian University to test the axial transport of galligu following runoff simulation tests. The axial soil columns were prepared using PVC pipes with dimensions of 500mm x 100mm x 50 mm, cut in half, and tilted 20 degrees from the horizontal to foster runoff (Fig. 1). Each half pipe was filled with plant growth substrate with a bulk density of 1.26 g cm⁻³ up to 2/3 of its length. The remaining third was used as a buffer zone and was filled with uncontaminated soil (Fig. 1) in order to evaluate the potential movement of galligu following the runoff simulations. Ferns and alfalfa were grown only on the soil-galligu mix substrate, and no vegetation was established within the buffer zone (Figure 1). Two replicates of three different ground covers (6 test beds in total) were established on the columns – i.e. fern, alfalfa, and fallow soil. At the column ends, small openings were cut to allow the flow of

92 water and solids. Additionally, small plastic trays were placed at the column ends to collect water and
93 sediment transported with the runoff (Fig. 1).

94

95 **Figure 1. Axial soil columns used for runoff simulations. The contaminated area is labelled in green, while the buffer zone in red.**
96 **See online version for colours.**

97

98 To establish a vegetated ground cover with ferns on the model soil columns, twenty-five individuals of
99 *Dryopteris affinis* (Lowe Fraser-Jenk) were sourced from Shady Plants Fern Nursery (Clashmore, Rep.
100 Ireland). The fern individuals were stored in the laboratory for a period of seven days to enable adaption to
101 the new environmental conditions. During this period, the fern individuals were stored at 24°C under a 36 W
102 BIOLUX® fluorescent lamp placed 300 mm above the ferns. The plants were watered every two days with 25
103 mL of tap water. After this period, the plants were carefully removed from their pots and the root systems
104 were cleaned carefully from the remaining soil using a water jet. After air drying each root system, the plants
105 were transplanted into the prepared substrate (Section 2.2) after adding a small amount of compost into
106 planting holes to provide a dose of nutrients and lower the transplantation shock (Espiritu, 2016). Three
107 planting holes were created in each axial column (a total of 6 ferns; Figure 2), spaced 50 mm from the
108 column edges and between individuals. Once the fern ground covers were established on each axial soil
109 column, these were placed under a fluorescent lamp for a week and the soil was covered with PVC

110 membrane to retain moisture and promote mulching. Each column was watered daily with 100 mL of tap
111 water.

112

113 **Figure 2 Preparation and transplantation of ferns into an axial soil column.**

114 To establish an herbaceous ground cover on the model soil columns, 10 g of alfalfa seeds were evenly
115 spread on the surface of the columns, watered and placed under a fluorescent lamp. The seeded columns
116 were kept under a black PVC membrane for 2 days to retain moisture and promote mulching until
117 germination. After germination, the membrane was removed and the columns were placed under a
118 fluorescent lamp for 4 weeks. After 1 week from germination, 20 mL of fertiliser solution (15mL of Miracle-
119 Gro® Water Soluble All Purpose Plant Food fertilizer diluted in 4.5 L of water) were added manually every 5
120 days.

121 **2.3.2 Runoff simulation tests**

122 To generate runoff on the axial soil columns, rainfall was simulated by using a 20 L backpack sprayer. The
123 nozzle was kept at 100 mm above the soil surface and moved manually to sprinkle water evenly over the
124 portion of the axial soil column containing polluted soil (Fig. 1). Rainfall intensity was pre-monitored and
125 maintained at a rate of 36 mm hour^{-1} , mimicking a heavy rainfall event (MET Office, 2007). This resulted in
126 the application of 200 mL of water for 15.5 seconds for each simulation run. In total, 12 simulation runs were
127 implemented (i.e. 6 events in one hour) over two days, separated by 24 hours without further water additions
128 to allow the soil to dry. The first simulation run was undertaken when the soil in the axial columns was fully
129 saturated with the aim of fostering runoff.

130 **2.3.3 Solid Materials Transport**

131 The solid materials transported with the runoff generated from the rainfall simulation events were collected in
132 plastic trays placed at the end of the axial soil columns (Fig. 1). The total runoff volume was measured with a
133 volumetric cylinder. Subsequently, the collected suspension – i.e. water plus soil solids – was placed in
134 aluminium trays that were then placed in an oven at 80°C for 24 hours to eliminate the liquid portion and
135 quantify the proportion of solids transported in the runoff. The sediment load resulting from each rainfall
136 event was calculated by dividing the mass of solids carried in the runoff by the corresponding mass of water
137 carried in the runoff. In addition, the hydraulic flux through the axial soil columns was estimated by dividing
138 the volume of water collected after each rainfall simulation event by the duration of these events. With this,
139 we strived to investigate whether the presence of vegetation could affect the amount of water infiltrating into
140 the soil. Eventually, three core soil samples were collected with an apple corer from the buffer zone (Fig. 1)
141 of each axial column (i.e. 18 samples in total). To do so, a random sampling approach was followed to
142 collect soil cores from the top, middle, and bottom part of the buffer zone. The soil core samples were oven-
143 dried at 80°C for 24 hours and stored until further analysis.

144 **2.4 Vertical transport of Galligu**

145 *2.4.1 Vertical soil columns preparation*

146 Eight vertical soil columns were built using transparent PVC cylinders of 200 mm height and 60 mm
147 diameter. Each cylinder was filled with uncontaminated dry, sieved soil (Section 2.2) up to a 150mm height
148 from the bottom. The remaining cylinder volume was filled with a 50:50 galligu-soil mixture (Section 2.2). At
149 the bottom of each column, a nylon mesh with 0.2 mm apertures was installed to sustain the soil, and
150 capped with perforated plastic lids to allow water flow through the column (Figure 3). We replicated the same
151 treatments (i.e. ground covers) in the vertical columns as for the axial soil columns (Section 2.3) – i.e. 3
152 vegetated with ferns, 3 with alfalfa, and 2 under fallow cover as control. Ferns were prepared for
153 transplantation following the same steps indicated in Section 2.3 and then inserted in the soil column with
154 their root tips in contact with the uncontaminated soil horizon – i.e. 50 mm below the ground level (b.g.l).
155 With this, we intended to encourage the fern roots to grow towards the bottom through the uncontaminated
156 soil. For the columns with an herbaceous cover, 2 g of alfalfa seeds were evenly spread on the column
157 surface. The surface of all eight prepared soil columns was covered with black PVC membrane to allow
158 mulching and germination of the seeds, and to keep the roots moist. After germination, the columns were
159 placed under a 60 W incandescent lamp placed 300 mm above the soil columns. The columns were water

160 saturated from the bottom to prevent vertical deposition of galligu before simulating rainfall. A plastic cone
161 was installed at the top of the columns to prevent water overflow during the simulation runs.

162

163 **Figure 3** Vertical soil column preparation (diameter 60mm). (a-c) The nylon mesh is placed at the bottom of the column and
164 covered with a plastic cap and fixed with dark tape (d) seeds spread on the top of the vertical soil column. The black mark shows
165 the limit between pure and contaminated soil

166 **2.4.2 Percolation tests and evaluation of the vertical transport of galligu**

167 To assess the vertical transport of galligu in the soil, we conducted a series of percolation tests on fully
168 saturated vertical soil columns by simulating a series of rainfall events. Each rainfall simulation run consisted
169 in the application of 17 mL of water manually with a Pasteur pipette over 5 seconds, maintaining the same
170 rainfall intensity of 36 mm hour⁻¹ as for the axial tests (Section 2.3.2). Rainfall simulations were carried out
171 six times over a period of 12 days, leaving one day between simulation runs. The time necessary for the
172 water to fully infiltrate in the soil columns after each rainfall simulation event was recorded with a stopwatch.
173 During the simulations, the columns were placed on plastic trays to collect the drained leachate. The
174 leachate volume was measured with a volumetric cylinder after full infiltration was observed. At the end of
175 the series of rainfall simulations, the soil columns were extracted from the cylinders. Then, the vertical
176 movement of galligu through the column was assessed visually. For this, we measured the displacement of
177 the boundary between polluted and unpolluted soil with a ruler. Subsequently, three soil samples were taken
178 from three different locations (i.e. top, middle, bottom) within the polluted soil column zone (i.e. top third). The
179 soil samples were oven-dried at 80 C for 24 h and stored for further analysis.

180 **2.5 Galligu concentration in the soil**

181

182 ***2.5.1. Determination of Galligu concentration through turbidity analysis***

183 We attempted to quantify the concentration of galligu in the soil by conducting a series of turbidity tests using
184 a UV-VIS spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific® GENESYS 105 UV-VIS). Firstly, we built a calibration curve
185 as a reference for determining the concentration of galligu in suspensions with known galligu concentration.
186 To do so, we made mixtures containing 2 g of soil and a varying concentration of galligu – i.e. 0 wt%, 25 wt%,
187 50 wt%, 75 wt%, and 100 wt%. The mixtures were introduced into 50 mL centrifuge test tubes and topped up
188 with distilled water. Subsequently, the suspensions were shaken with a rotatory mechanical shaker for 10
189 minutes. Then, 5 mL of the turbid suspension were retrieved with a Pasteur pipette and analysed with a
190 spectrophotometer at a wavelength of 400 nm (Orion Method AQ4500, AMI Turbiwell, EPA method 180.1).
191 The absorbance of the suspensions was measured at 4 different time intervals (i.e. 2 min, 10 min, 15 min, and
192 20 min) to reduce the possible bias produced by the sedimentation of galligu particles over time. Once the
193 calibration curve was built, the galligu concentration in the samples taken from both axial and vertical
194 transport tests was quantified in relation to the benchmark concentrations established by the calibration
195 process. To this end, suspensions were created with 2 g of sample and distilled water in 50 mL centrifuge
196 tubes. Then, we followed the same steps described above for the calibration process. The concentration of
197 galligu (wt%) in a sample was averaged between the concentrations measured at four different time intervals
198 (i.e. 2 min, 10 min, 15 min, and 20 min).

199 ***2.5.2 Determination of Galligu concentration through digital image analysis***

200 We also attempted to determine the concentration of galligu in the soil through the analysis of digital images
201 taken from galligu-soil mixtures and from the samples collected after the axial and vertical transport tests
202 (see Sections 2.3.3 and 2.4.2). To this end, a calibration process was undertaken first, in which three
203 concentrations of galligu were considered – i.e. 0 wt%, 50 wt%, 100 wt%. Galligu and soil mixture
204 suspensions were made as described in Section 2.2. With regard to the samples collected after the axial and
205 vertical tests, the solids were let to sediment completely and the liquid fraction was removed by drying under
206 a 60 W incandescent lamp for 24h. The solid fraction was then spread into a thin, flat layer, ensuring that

207 ridges or scars that could cast shadows on the digital images were not visible. The same steps were
208 followed for the samples retrieved from the axial and vertical tests (Sections 2.3 and 2.4).

209 Digital photographs of the solid fraction layers were taken from a vertical distance of 500 mm using a 14
210 Megapixel Fujifilm® Finepix S3200 camera. To do so, the layers were illuminated under a 36 W BIOLUX®
211 fluorescence lamp. Digital image analysis was undertaken using ImageJ v.1.51n software (Schneider, et al.,
212 2012). To proceed with the image analysis, a colour frequency histogram was generated from the images to
213 determine the pixel value belonging to soil and galligu particles, respectively. Through trial and error, it was
214 observed that the optimal conditions for capturing digital images of soil-galligu mixture occurred when solid
215 materials were slightly moist. These conditions increased the colour contrast between galligu and soil and,
216 thus, made it easier to distinguish soil and galligu particles. Hence, dry mixtures of soil and galligu needed to
217 be wetted prior to being photographed

218 Cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) were built from the image histograms and compared through
219 Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests (Kolmogorov, 1933). The CDFs from each sample were compared against 3
220 benchmark CDFs from the samples with known galligu concentration described above. The latter step was
221 used to determine the concentration of galligu in the samples retrieved after conducting the axial and vertical
222 transport tests. The obtained results were then compared against the galligu concentrations obtained from
223 the turbidity analyses to assess whether the two tests were in agreement with each other.

224 **2.6 Statistical analysis**

225

226 Statistical tests were carried out to evaluate statistically significant differences between the three ground
227 covers - i.e. ferns, alfalfa, and fallow soil – established on the axial and vertical soil columns following rainfall
228 simulations. Normality tests were undertaken first by inspecting visually the density function plot for each of
229 the studied variables (i.e. sediment loss, runoff discharge, galligu content, percolation time). Statistically
230 significant differences between the three ground covers were assessed through one-way ANOVA analysis
231 (Marvin & Bishop, 1993) and with Kruskal-Wallis tests (Kruskal & Wallis, 1952) when data were and were not
232 normally distributed, respectively. For axial soil transport, the analyses were conducted on 6 different
233 samples (i.e 2 with ferns, 2 with alfalfa, 2 unvegetated), with 12 observations on the amount of solids loss
234 each, for a total of 72 observations. The same number of samples were analysed for inspecting runoff
235 discharge. For galligu content on axial runoff sediments, 5 observations were made on each sample, for a

236 total of 30 observations. On vertical transportation tests, when measuring the percolation time, the number of
237 observations were 36 per sample. For this test, 3 samples were prepared with ferns, 3 with alfalfa and 2
238 unvegetated, so the total amount of observations were 288. In vertical samples, galligu was sampled only in
239 3 different depths (i.e. 50mm, 100mm, 150mm; Fig. 13) so for this test, the number of observations was 24.

240 **3. Results and Discussion**

241 **3.1. Galligu concentration in the soil**

242 *3.1.1. Determination of the galligu concentration in the soil through turbidity analysis*

243 The regression line from the calibration process to determine the concentration of galligu in the soil through
244 turbidity analysis is shown in Fig.4. The observed absorbance for the soil-galligu-water suspensions (Section
245 2.5.2) are shown in Table 1. Absorbance was higher in samples with no galligu, and it tended to drop over
246 time due to particle sedimentation. From these results, we were able to build a regression line for each of the
247 tested galligu concentrations (Fig. 4) to be used as benchmark for the determination of the concentration of
248 galligu from the samples collected following the axial and vertical transport tests. In the light of our results,
249 the turbidity test appears to be viable to estimate the concentration of galligu in the soil.

250

Figure 4. Regression line belonging to the calibration process through turbidity analysis (see Section 2.5.2a) for 5 different concentrations of galligu in the soil.

Table 1 Recorded absorbance over time for known concentrations of galligu in the soil determined through UV spectrophotometry.

Galligu concentration (%)	Sedimentation time (minutes)			
	2	10	15	20
0	2.641	2.197	1.798	1.6145
25	1.851	1.363	1.082	0.911
50	1.534	0.954	0.793	0.664
75	0.900	0.582	0.545	0.496
100	0.489	0.484	0.462	0.421

3.1.2 Determination of galligu concentration in the soil through digital image analysis

264 The concentration of galligu in the soil was estimated through digital image analysis by comparing the
265 cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) retrieved from the different images' histograms (Fig.5) through
266 Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) tests (see Section 2.5.2.2). Accordingly, the K-S distance between the CDFs for
267 each of the analysed soil samples are shown in Table 3, where the outcomes from turbidity analysis are also
268 shown for comparison purposes. Galligu concentration in the samples is estimated in the light of the
269 proximity to the CDF obtained for a known galligu concentration. In table 3 the K-S index is compared with
270 the benchmark values of know galligu concentrations (i.e. 0%, 50%, 100%). The lower the distance between
271 CDFs, the closer the sample galligu content is to the one of the reference CDFs obtained in the calibration
272 process. To illustrate our approach for determining galligu concentration through digital image analysis
273 (Section 2.5.2.2), herein we are focusing on the results retrieved from the third runoff simulation test under
274 fern ground cover (i.e. F1T3: fern 1, test 3; Fig.5.b). The CDF for F1T3 differed statistically from the CDFs
275 obtained from the calibration process (Fig. 5a; Section 2.5.2.2). This suggested that the galligu concentration
276 in F1T3 is neither 0 wt%, 50 wt% or 100 wt%. However, the CDF for F1T3 was closer to the CDF obtained
277 for the prepared samples with a 50 wt% and 0 wt% concentration of galligu, suggesting that F1T3 could
278 present a concentration between 0 wt% to 50 wt%. Since the distance is closest to CDF-50, we could
279 assume that the galligu concentration in our example should be closer to 50%. This observation is further
280 supported by the outcomes obtained from turbidity analysis, in which F1T3 showed a galligu concentration of
281 32 wt% (Table 3). The concentration of galligu for F1T3 can be also approached by comparing the image
282 histograms directly (Fig. 5b). Yet, to have a better idea of the concentration of galligu in a given soil sample
283 using this approach, we recommend the generation of CDFs for a larger array of galligu concentrations.
284 Nonetheless, and in support to the goodness of our approach for determining the galligu concentration in the
285 soil from digital image analysis, it is worth noting the similarity of the CDF for F1T12 and CDF-100 (Fig. 5d),
286 which was not observed when comparing the histograms (Fig. 5c).

287
288

289 Figure 5(a). Cumulative Distribution Functions (CDFs) retrieved from the histograms belonging to the digital images from soil
290 samples with known galligu concentration (i.e. 0%,50%, and 100%) and CDF for the simulation run F1T3 (fern cover 1 –
291 simulation test 3).

292 (b) Histograms belonging to the digital images from soil samples containing known concentrations of galligu (i.e. 0 %, 50 %, 100
293 %) and for the simulation run F1T3 (fern 1 – simulation test 3).

294 (c)Histograms belonging to the digital images from soil samples containing known concentrations of galligu (i.e. 0 %, 50 %, 100
295 %) and for the simulation run F1T12 (fern 1 – simulation test 12).

296 (d) Cumulative Distribution Functions (CDFs) retrieved from the histograms belonging to the digital images from soil samples
297 with known galligu concentration (i.e. 0%,50%, and 100%) and CDF for the simulation run F1T12 (fern cover 1 – simulation test
298 12).

299

300

301

302

303

304

305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335

Figure 6. Top: Illustration of the histograms retrieved from the digital images from three soil samples containing different concentrations of galligu; Bottom: digital images from three soil samples with different concentrations of galligu -i.e. 0 %, 50 % and 100 %, corresponding to the above histograms. The histograms with higher concentrations of the pollutant move closer to the right side where white/greyish pixels are. This comes from the colour of galligu particles compared with brownish soil grains. These were used in the calibration process to determine the concentration of galligu in the soil through digital image analysis.

Table 3. Kolomogorov-Smirnov (K-S) tests results from the comparison of the cumulative distribution functions (CDF) for the histograms belonging to the digital images for soil-galligu mixtures collected after rainfall simulation events. F: fern; A: alfalfa; U: unvegetated; T: simulation test number. Critical K-S index=0.120. * Galligu concentration in the samples is estimated in the light

336 of the proximity to the CDF obtained for a known galligu concentration (i.e. 0 %, 50 %, and 100 %) and compared with the results
 337 from the turbidity tests (Section 3.1.1).

Sample	Galligu concentration (%)			Galligu concentration range (%) [*]	Galligu concentration (%) from turbidity tests
	0	50	100		
	K-S Index				
F1T3	0.581	0.289	0.666	Between 0 % and 50 % - closer to 50 %	32
F1T8	0.609	0.261	0.503	Between 50 % and 100 % - closer to 50 %	16
F1T12	0.782	0.389	0.062	No statistical difference with 100 % CDF	20
F2T3	0.506	0.330	0.722	Between 0 % and 50 % - closer to 50 %	37
F2T8	0.311	0.233	0.619	Between 0 % and 50 % - closer to 50 %	33
F2T12	0.521	0.227	0.586	Between 0 % and 50 % - closer to 50 %	20
A1T3	0.533	0.302	0.686	Between 0 % and 50 % - closer to 50 %	33
A1T8	0.608	0.275	0.633	Between 0 % and 50 % - closer to 50 %	29
A1T12	0.175	0.514	0.883	Between 0 % and 50 % - closer to 50 %	31
U1T3	0.873	0.521	0.232	Between 50 % and 100 % - closer to 100 %	60
U1T8	0.493	0.163	0.442	Close to 50 %	47
U1T12	0.538	0.209	0.489	Close to 50 %	40
U2T3	0.678	0.285	0.169	Between 50 % and 100 % - closer to 100 %	83
U2T8	0.782	0.388	0.218	Between 50 % and 100 % - closer to 100 %	66
U2T12	0.820	0.428	0.125	Between 50 % and 100 % - closer to 100 %	70

338

339 The proposed approach to estimate the concentration of galligu in the soil through digital image analysis was
 340 able to correctly identify the concentration of galligu within the concentration range retrieved from turbidity
 341 tests (see Section 3.1.1) in 13 out of 15 samples (Table 3). However, only 8 of the 15 evaluated samples
 342 approached the CDFs retrieved from the calibration process satisfactorily (i.e. F1T3, F2T3, F2T8, G1T3,
 343 G1T8, U1T8, U1T12, U2T3; Table 3). For the remaining 5 samples (Table 3), it was required to assume the
 344 galligu concentration on the basis of the relative position of their CDFs with respect to the calibration CDFs
 345 (i.e. 0 wt%, 50 wt%, and 100 wt%; Fig. 6). These incongruities could be attributed to the quality of the digital
 346 image to proceed with such analysis, or the conditions in which the images were taken. Samples that are too
 347 wet were avoided, since this may have lehave d to high levels of light reflection, reducing the contrast
 348 between soil and galligu particles. It was also important to spread evenly the solids mixture as a thin layer,
 349 as thicker areas may covered smaller grains and particles and, thus, reducing the contrast between particles.
 350 The latter is evidenced by observing the images for samples F1T8 (i.e. fern 1 – simulation test 8) and F1T12
 351 (i.e. fern 1 – simulation test 12) (Fig. 7), for which the results from the digital image analyses differed
 352 statistically from the outcomes from turbidity analysis (Table 3). As it can be observed in Fig. 9, the solids
 353 were not correctly spread on the aluminium disc (Section 2.5.2.2), leaving white spots or pale areas that
 354 have likely affected the results – i.e. the number of white pixels increased, likely due to presence of galligu
 355 particles and, as a result, this may have overestimated the concentration of galligu. Overall, the digital image

356 analysis appeared to be more sensitive than turbidity tests, and it also constituted a good basis for the
357 indirect estimation of the concentration of galligu in the soil.

358
359 **Figure 7** Digital images for the two soil-galligu samples – Left: F1T8 (fern 1 – simulation test 8); Right: F1T12 (fern 1 – simulation
360 test 12). White spots and pale areas derive from an uneven spread of soil on the aluminium disc.

361

362 **3.2. Phytostabilisation of galligu**

363 *3.2.1 Effect of vegetated ground cover on the axial transport of solids through runoff*

364 The results from the axial transport tests under different ground covers (Section 2.3) are shown in Fig. 8. The
365 results show that the amount of solids (i.e. galligu and soil) transported by runoff is the highest under fallow
366 conditions and the lowest under alfalfa ground cover.

367

368
369

370 Fig. 8 Solids load in the runoff water under different ground covers; F-ferns, A-alfalfa, U-unvegetated.

371

372 Statistically significant differences in terms of solids retention were found between vegetated (F, A) and non-
 373 vegetated (U) ground covers ($\chi^2=50.43$ df=5 $p<0.01$). This confirmed the effect of vegetation cover in
 374 reducing soil erosion through the increase in surface roughness (Thomsen, 2015). Furthermore, the results
 375 showed that alfalfa (A1, A2) was statistically more effective in solids retention than ferns (F1, F2) ($\chi^2=14.39$
 376 df=3 $p<0.01$). The average amount of solid loss in fallow samples was 161.5 g, while in ferns samples 26.08
 377 g and alfalfa 8.77 g. It appeared that *Dryopteris affinis* was able to reduce the loss of solids by almost 84%,
 378 while alfalfa by 94% when compared to fallow soil conditions. These results are in agreement with previous
 379 research on sediment removal efficiency of vegetative strips (Gaharabaghi, et al., 2006). The better
 380 performance of alfalfa could probably be attributed to the more even and dense spread of the seeds over the
 381 axial soil columns compared to the axial columns vegetated with ferns. Ferns were established only on the
 382 central part of the axial soil column (Fig. 2), leaving the edges with no foliage or root cover which is the main

383 action of plants in blocking solids runoff (Gonzalez-Ollauri and Mickovski, 2016; 2017b). In addition, the
 384 protective action to the soil surface against raindrop impact provided by the vegetation cover may have also
 385 led to the observed results (Thurow, 1997). In the treatments with ferns and alfalfa, the ground surface was
 386 partially protected by the aboveground foliage, which reduced the strength of the raindrops upon hitting the
 387 surface. The impact of each raindrop can break the soil aggregates and enhance the erosion and
 388 subsequent solid transportation (Vaezi et al., 2017).

389 Fig. 9. Runoff discharge ($\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$) for the three ground covers evaluated in this study (i.e. F-ferns, A-alfalfa, U-unvegetated).
 390

391

392 The effect of vegetation on the water flux or discharge is shown in Figure 9. Counterintuitively, the runoff
 393 discharge was lower under fallow ground cover than under vegetated covers. The runoff discharge was
 394 statistically significantly different between ferns and fallow ground covers ($\chi^2 = 7.5$ df=3, $p < 0.01$), with a lower
 395 discharge observed for the fallow treatment (Fig. 9). It is worth noting that the opposite result was expected
 396 (Queensland Government, 2015), since part of the runoff would have been captured by the leaves,
 397 percolated through the vadose zone, and be partially absorbed by the roots (Fazio, 2010). However, in our
 398 experiment, roots were not able to absorb water readily due to the briefness of the simulated rainfall events.
 399 Another possibility for our observations could be related with the lower mechanical strength (Gonzalez-
 400 Ollauri and Mickovski, 2017a) and aggregate stability (Shaoshan, 2010) of unvegetated soil following

401 wetting-drying cycles. The latter can lead to the formation of cracks on the ground surface and, as a result, to
402 the rapid infiltration of surface water and subsequent runoff amelioration. In fact, more cracks were observed
403 under fallow soil conditions. It is worth noting that the formation of cracks may be fostered by the high pH
404 (i.e. 12.06) observed in the soil-galligu mixtures (Santonoceto, 2015), which could be also responsible for the
405 poor development of a vegetation cover observed in our experiments (Santonoceto, 2015). Anyhow, our
406 simulation runs were undertaken when the soil columns were water saturated or nearly saturated, which
407 limits the amount of water that infiltrates in the soil and encourages the formation of runoff (Green and Ampt,
408 1974; Penna, 2011). Accordingly, it is also plausible that under vegetated conditions, the soil may retain
409 more water than under fallow conditions (e.g. Manisha, 2011) as a result of different mechanisms influenced
410 by the plant cover – e.g. shading and cooling of the ground surface, alteration of the turbulence patterns atop
411 the ground surface, creation of physical structures that concentrate water, and facilitation of percolation
412 towards deeper soil layers (Shaxson & Barber, 2003). However, in spite of the observations described
413 above, no statistically significant differences in terms of water runoff were observed between fern, alfalfa and
414 the fallow ground covers ($\chi^2=10.05$ df=5 $p>0.01$).

415 ***3.2.2. Effect of vegetated ground cover on the axial transport of galligu through runoff***

416 Vegetation ground covers proved to be effective in the retention of galligu in the soil (Figure 10). We found a
417 statistically significantly higher concentration of galligu in the runoff generated under fallow soil conditions
418 ($\chi^2=21.5731$; df=5; $p<0.01$; Fig. 10) than under vegetated conditions. This result suggested that the root
419 systems were able to trap galligu particles and prevent them from being washed down with the runoff
420 produced after the simulation of rainfall (Section 2.3). On average, ferns were able to reduce galligu in the
421 runoff by 59%, while alfalfa by 62%. The difference between the two vegetated groundcovers (i.e. fern and
422 alfalfa) could have its origin in the topological differences of the root systems between the two evaluated
423 species. Alfalfa tends to develop a dense and deep root system with abundant adventitious roots compared
424 to ferns, which tend to have many fine fibrous roots. This difference could make alfalfa more effective to trap
425 solid contaminants in the soil (Samac, 2007).

426

427

Figure 10 Galligu concentration (in %) in the runoff collected after the series of rainfall simulation events under different ground covers (F: fern; A: alfalfa; U: fallow).

3.2.3 Effect of vegetated ground cover on water percolation

The results from the tests evaluating the vertical transport of galligu through percolation (Section 2.4; Fig. 13) confirmed that vegetated soils have, in general, better drainage conditions than fallow soils (e.g. Istanbuluoglu, 2005). Vegetation roots may lead to the formation of macro-pores (Ahmed, et al., 2015; Lange, et al., 2008), thus encouraging percolation and the potential transportation of galligu down the soil profile. In our experiment, however, we observed an anomalous behaviour in two vegetated samples (i.e. Fern FV1 and alfalfa AV3; Fig. 11). Here, a substantially lower infiltration was measured when compared to fallow soil conditions (Figure 11). More compacted soils tend to not change their textural porosity but tend to be characterised by relict structural pores accessible only through micro-pores of the soil matrix, which could result in a change of the soil hydraulic properties (Richard, et al., 2001). A possible explanation for these results could lie in the natural variability between treatments for which a bigger number of repeats would be necessary. Additionally, this variability and uncertainty could have been induced by the use of a stopwatch and visual observation to determine the percolation time.

447

448

449 **Figure 11** Percolation time for the different ground covers established in the percolation tests (see Section 2.4.2) of this study –
450 i.e. FV: fern; UV: unvegetated; AV: alfalfa.

451

452 **3.2.4 Effect of vegetated ground cover on the vertical transport of galligu through percolation**

453

454 With regard to the assessment of the vertical transport of galligu under different ground covers (Section 2.4;
455 Fig. 12), the results suggest that vegetation could contribute to the transport of galligu in depth along the soil
456 column. Although no statistically significant differences were found between vegetated and fallow ground
457 covers ($\chi^2=5.96$; $df=7$; $p>0.05$), our observations indicate that the devised methodology could be used to
458 assess the vertical movement of galligu within the soil under different ground covers.

459

Figure 12 Galligu concentration (%) at three different soil column depths (i.e. 1: Top, 2: Middle; and 3: Bottom) and under different ground covers –i.e. F: Fern; AV: Alfalfa; UV: Fallow.

In the vegetated treatments, galligu appeared to be equally spread in all the three soil depths evaluated (i.e. 50 mm, 100 mm, 150 mm; Fig. 13). The fallow treatments, however, showed a deficit of galligu in the bottom layer when compared to the vegetated ground covers (Fig. 12). This was evidenced by measuring the length of the polluted zone at the end of the rainfall simulation tests (see Section 2.4.2). Under the fern cover, the limit between polluted and unpolluted sections appeared deeper in the soil column compared to the other ground covers tested herein. This may be related to the length of the fern roots, which were longer than the alfalfa roots. As a result, deeper preferential flow paths could have appeared in the soil column vegetated with ferns (Wildenschld,1994), which could have allowed the particles of galligu to move down the soil column through the macro-pores created by the root systems (Bodner,2014). This could be regarded as a negative effect of vegetation in the stabilisation of galligu. The downward movement galligu might constitute a hazard to the contamination of groundwater reservoirs.

Figure 13 Illustration of the zones sampled within the vertical soil columns to evaluate the vertical movement of galligu –i.e. Top (green), middle (yellow), bottom (red).

4. Conclusion

Vegetation was able to reduce the transport of solids (i.e. soil and galligu) axially with respect to fallow soil following the simulation of heavy rainfall events. Accordingly, vegetation effectively limited the runoff of galligu, with alfalfa being the most effective ground cover. Our observations suggest that phytostabilisation with ferns and alfalfa can be an effective method to reduce the mobilisation of galligu through runoff. However, vegetation fostered the vertical transportation of galligu in the soil column, where alfalfa showed a greater retention capacity. Yet, it must be noted that alfalfa did not reach maturity in the course of this study. We recommend the replication of the experiment described herein with fully grown plants to assess whether there are any significant changes in the percolation of galligu.

489 Turbidity and image-based analyses were confirmed as viable methods to estimate the concentration of
490 galligu within the soil. However, we encourage further investigation to define more accurate protocols aiming
491 at quantifying the concentration of galligu in the soil accurately, as with the suggested approaches we were
492 only able to distinguish the potential range of galligu concentration in the soil. Undoubtedly, the original
493 approaches elaborated herein to estimate the concentration of galligu in the soil provide a good basis for
494 further work focusing on polluted soil by solid contaminants and to apply the resulting knowledge into the
495 sustainable remediation of polluted soils with vegetation.

496

497 **Acknowledgements**

498 The study was funded by the BEAM Research Centre of the Glasgow Caledonian University through the
499 Green4Brown Project (M315-10363). We thank Jackie Harvey and Graeme Baillie (Glasgow City Council),
500 and Iain Hall (SWECO) for access to data. Dr Ollauri's contribution funded by UK EPSRC through the
501 SECURE network (grant ref.: EP/M008347/1/FP2017006SM). Prof. Mickovski's contribution funded by
502 Erasmus+ project ECOMED (575796-EPP-1-2016-1-ES-EPPKA2-KA; www.ecomedbio.org). We thank
503 Kimberly Wray of Innovid for the help and support with the graphics in this study.

504

505 **References**

- 506 Abreu, M., 2012. *Cistus salviifolius* a promising species for mining wastes remediation. *Journal of*
507 *Geochemical Exploration*, Volume 13, February 2012, pp. 86-93.
- 508 Adams, R.C. et al., 1951. The utilization of organic wastes in N.Z.: Second interim report of the
509 interdepartmental committee, New Zealand: s.n.
- 510 Aftalion, F., 1991. *A History of the International Chemical Industry*. University of Pennsylvania press,
511 Philadelphia, US
- 512 Agnello, A. et al., 2016. Comparative bioremediation of heavy metals and petroleum hydrocarbons
513 cocontaminated soil by natural attenuation, phytoremediation, bioaugmentation and
514 bioaugmentationassisted phytoremediation. *Science of The Total Environment*, Volume 563-564, pp. 693-
515 703.
- 516 Ahmed, F., Gulliver, S. & Nieber, J., 2015. Field infiltration measurements in grassed roadside drainage
517 ditches: Spatial and temporal variability. *Journal of Hydrology*, Volume 530, pp. 604-611.
- 518 Aislabie, J. & Lloyd-Jones, G. 1995. A review of bacterial degradation of pesticides. *Australian Journal of Soil*
519 *Research*. Volume 33(6). pp. 925-942

520 Alkorta, I. & Garbisu, C., 2001. Phytoremediation of organic contaminants in soils. *Bioresource Technology*
521 Volume 79(3) September 2001, Pages 273-276

522 Alvarenga, P., 2008. Evaluation of composts and liming materials in the phytostabilization of a mine soil
523 using perennial ryegrass. *Science Total Environment*, 15(406), pp. 43-56.

524 American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM). 1995. Annual Book of ASTM Standards,
525 Designation D4972 -95a: Standard Test Method for pH of Soils

526 An S., Mentler A., , Mayerd H., Blum W. E.H. 2010. Soil aggregation, aggregate stability, organic carbon and
527 nitrogen in different soil aggregate fractions under forest and shrub vegetation on the Loess Plateau, China.
528 *CATENA* Volume 81, Issue 3, 15 June 2010, Pages 226-233

529 Arienzo, M., 2004. The potential of *Lolium perenne* for revegetation of contaminated soils from a
530 metallurgical site. *Science Total Environment*, Volume 319(1-3), pp. 13-25.

531 ASH, 2002. ASH remediation management. See : [http://www.ashremediation.co.uk/portfolio-posts/widnes-](http://www.ashremediation.co.uk/portfolio-posts/widnes-galligu-stabilisation-1/)
532 [galligu-stabilisation-1/](http://www.ashremediation.co.uk/portfolio-posts/widnes-galligu-stabilisation-1/) [Accessed 24 July 2017].

533 Bakken, L. 1985. Separation and Purification of Bacteria from Soil, *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*,
534 Volume 49(6), Pages 1482-1487

535 Ballou, D. P., Benore, M. & Ninfa, A. J., 2010. *Fundamental Laboratory Approaches for Biochemistry and*
536 *Biotechnology*. Second Edition University of Michigan: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. Michigan

537 Barton, C. Marx, D. Adriano, D. Jun K. B., Newman, L., Czapka, S. , Blake, J 2005. Phytostabilization of a
538 landfill containing coal combustion waste. *Environmental Geosciences*. 12(4). 251-265.

539 Bertos Fernandez , M & Simons, Stefaan & Hills, Colin & Carey, Paula. (2004). A review of accelerated
540 carbonation technology in the treatment of cement-based materials and sequestration of CO(2). *Journal of*
541 *hazardous materials*.

542 Bocanegra, J. J. C., Mora, E. E. & Gonzalez, G. I. C., 2017. Encapsulation in ceramic material of the metals
543 Cr, Ni, and Cu contained in galvanic sludge via the solidification/stabilization method. *Journal of*
544 *Environmental Chemical Engineering*, 5(4), pp. 3834-3843.

545 Bodner, G. & Leitner, D. & Kaul, H.. 2014. Coarse and fine root plants affect pore size distributions
546 differently. *Plant and Soil*. 380(1-2). 133-151.

547 Bolan, N. & Brennan, R., 2011. Bioavailability of N, P, K, Ca, Mg, S, Si, and Micronutrients. In: *Handbook of*
548 *soil sciences: resource management and environmental impacts* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press,
549 pp. 11-1 to 11-80.

550 Bolt, G., 1978. *Soil chemistry: A. basic elements*. Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Amsterdam,
551 Netherlands

552 Bonfranceschi, B., Flocco, C. & Donati, E., 2009. Study of the heavy metal phytoextraction capacity of two
553 forage species growing in an hydroponic environment. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, Volume 165(1-3), pp.
554 366-371.

555 Brakke, M., 1951. Density Gradient Centrifugation: A New Separation Technique. *J. Am. Che. Soc.*, 73(4),
556 pp. 1847-1848.

557 BSBI, 2016. Botanical Society of Britain and Ireland. See: <http://bsbi.org/> [Accessed 28 February 2017].

BSI, 2008. BS EN 1097-7:2008 Tests for mechanical and physical properties of aggregates. Determination of the particle density of filler. Pyknometer method, s.l.: BSI.

BSI, 2013. BS ISO 3310-2:2013 Test sieves. Technical requirements and testing. Test sieves of perforated metal plate , s.l.: BSI.

Carter, M. & Bentley, S., 1991. Correlations of soil properties. London: Penetech Press Publishers. London UK

CEH, 2007. Centre for Ecology & Hydrology. See : http://www.pollutantdeposition.ceh.ac.uk/heavy_metals [Accessed 15 February 2017].

Chang, J. S., 2009. Heavy metal and arsenic accumulating fern species as potential ecological indicators in As-contaminated abandoned mines. *Ecological Indicators*, 9(6), pp. 1275-1279.

Chau, N., 2016. Fern cover and the importance of plant traits in reducing erosion on steep soil slopes. *CATENA*, Volume 151, April 2017, pp. 98-106.

Chen, F. et al., 2015. Physiological responses and accumulation of heavy metals and arsenic of *Medicago sativa* L. growing on acidic copper mine tailings in arid lands. *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, Volume 157, October 2015, pp. 27-35.

Chen, Y. & Yu, C. P., 1991. Sedimentation of Fibers from Laminar Flows in a in a Horizontal Circular Duct. *Aerosol Science and Technology*, 14(3), pp. 343-347.

Conesa, H., Faz, A., Arnaldos, R. 2007. Initial studies for the phytostabilization of a mine tailing from the Cartagena-La Union Mining District (SE Spain). *Chemosphere*. 66(1). 38-44.

Cox, L. & Koenig, R., 2010. Solutions to soil problems. II: High pH (alkaline soil), Utah: Utah State University. Cooperative Extension.

Davis, A., M., S., Sharma, H. & Minami, C., 2009. Trace element behaviour at the root–soil interface: implications in phytoremediation. *Environ. Exp. Bot.*, Volume 67(1), pp. 243-259.

Denman L., M. P. & Breen, P., 2007. Water quality improvement through bioretention media: Nitrogen and phosphorus removal. *Water Environ. Res.*, Volume 3(78), pp. 284-293.

Espiritu, K. 2016 How to Deal With Transplant Shock (Online) See: <https://www.epicgardening.com/transplant-shock/> [Accessed 16 February 2017]

Fayiga, A., 2016. Arsenic hyperaccumulating fern: Implications for remediation of arsenic contaminated soils. *Geoderma*, 284, December 2016, pp. 132-143.

Fazio J.R., 2010, How Trees Can Retain Stormwater Runoff, Tree City USA Bulletin 2010 Arbor Day Foundation, Nebraska City, Nebraska.

Gharabaghi, Bahram & Rudra, Ramesh & Goel, Pradeep. (2006). Effectiveness of Vegetative Filter Strips in Removal of Sediments from Overland Flow. *Water Quality Research Journal of Canada*, Volume 41(3)

Ghosh, M., Singh, S.P.;2005, A Review On Phytoremediation Of Heavy Metals And Utilization Of Its Byproducts, Biomass and Waste Management Laboratory, School of Energy and Environmental Studies, Faculty of Engineering Sciences, Devi Ahilya University, Indore , India

Gomes, M. A. d. C., 2016. Metal phytoremediation: General strategies, genetically modified plants and applications in metal nanoparticle contamination. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*, Volume 134(1), pp. 133-147.

597 Gomes H., William M. Mayes, Mike Rogerson, Douglas I. Stewart, Ian T. Burke, 2016. Alkaline residues and
 598 the environment: a review of impacts, management practices and opportunities. *Journal of Cleaner*
 599 *Production*, Volume 112, Part 4

600 Gonzalez-Ollauri, A., Mickovski, S.B., 2016. Using the root spread information of pioneer plants to quantify
 601 their mitigation potential against shallow landslides and erosion in temperate humid climates. *Ecol. Eng.*
 602 95, October 2016, 302–315.

603 Gonzalez-Ollauri, A., Mickovski, S.B., 2017a. Plant-soil reinforcement response under different soil
 604 hydrological regimes. *Geoderma* 285, 141–150.

605 Gonzalez-Ollauri, A., Mickovski, S.B., 2017b. Plant-Best: A novel plant selection tool for slope protection.
 606 *Ecol. Eng.* 106, 154–173.

607 Greenwood, E., 1999. *Ecology and Landscape Development: The Mersey Basin*, Liverpool University Press
 608 and National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside. Liverpool, UK

609 Greipsson, S., 2011. Phytoremediation. *Nature Education*, 3(10).

610 Halton Borough Council, 2013. *Contaminated Land Strategy 2008-2013*, Widnes: UK

611 Hao, X., Zhou, D., Wang, Y. & Chen, H., 2004. Study of rye grass in copper mine tailing treated with peat
 612 and chemical fertilizer. *Acta Pedol. Sin.*, Volume 41, pp. 645-648.

613 Hazrat, Ali, Ezzat, Khanb Muhammad, Anwar, Sajad, 2013. Phytoremediation of heavy metals—Concepts
 614 and applications. *Chemosphere* Volume 91, Issue 7, May 2013, Pages 869-881

615 He, C., Yu, R., Chen, Z. & Sun, H., 2016. Research on unattended hoisting in solid waste disposal.
 616 *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 41(35), pp. 15817-15820.

617 Hopkins, B. et al., 2007. *Managing Irrigation Water Quality for Crop Production in Pacific Northwest*, Oregon
 618 State: Pacific Northwest Extension. Oregon

619 ISO/TC 190, 2009. ISO 11277:2009 Soil quality — Determination of particle size distribution in mineral soil
 620 material — Method by sieving and sedimentation,

621 Istanbuluoglu, E. & Bras, R. 2005. Vegetation-modulated landscape evolution: Effects of vegetation on
 622 landscape processes, drainage density, and topography. *Journal of Geophysical Research*. 110(F2), June
 623 2005

624 Johnson, D., 2003. Stabilization of galligu. In: Moore, Fox & Elliot, *Land reclamation*. Nottingham: Lafarge
 625 Envirocem Solutions, pp. 151-158. Nottingham, UK

626 Kiefer, D., 2002. It was all about alkali. *Today's Chemist at Work*, 6(45), p. 11.

627 Kinidi Lennevey and Shanti Salleh, "Phytoremediation of Nitrogen as Green Chemistry for Wastewater
 628 Treatment System," *International Journal of Chemical Engineering*, vol. 2017, Article ID 1961205, 12 pages,
 629 2017.

630 Klute, A, 1986. *Methods of Soil Analysis: Part 1- Physical and Mineralogical Methods*. Soil Science Society
 631 of America, American Society of Agronomy. Madison, WI

632 Kolmogorov, A., 1933. Sulla determinazione empirica di una legge di distribuzione. *G. Ist. Ital. Attuari*,
 633 Volume 4, pp. 83-91.

634 Kruskal, W. & Wallis, A., 1952. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *Journal of the American*
635 *Statistical Association*, 47(260), pp. 583-621.

636 Lange, B., Luescher, P. & Germann, P., 2008. Significance of tree roots for preferential infiltration in stagnant
637 soils. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, Volume 13(10).

638 Li, J. & Poon, S., 2017. Innovative solidification/stabilization of lead contaminated soil using incineration
639 sewage sludge ash. *Chemosphere*, Volume 173, January 2017, pp. 143-152.

640 Lucas, W. & Greenway, M., 2008. Nutrient retention in vegetated and non-vegetated bioretention
641 mesocosms. *Water Environ. Res.*, 5(134), pp. 613-623.

642 Malayeri, Behrooz & Chehregani Rad, Abdolkarim & Yousefi, Nafiseh & Lorestani, Bahareh. (2008).
643 Identification of the Hyper Accumulator Plants in Copper and Iron Mine in Iran. *Pakistan journal of biological*
644 *sciences: PJBS*. 11. 490-2.

645 Manisha M., 2011 .Evaporation and Transpiration | Plant Physiology, See at:
646 <http://www.biologydiscussion.com/plant-physiology-2/evaporation-and-transpiration-plant-physiology/70595>
647 [Accessed 15 December 2018].

648 Maron, P.A., Schimann, H., Ranjard, L., Brothier, E., Domenach, A., Lensi, R., Nazaret, S. 2006 Evaluation
649 of quantitative and qualitative recovery of bacterial communities from different soil types by density gradient
650 centrifugation. *European Journal of Soil Biology*. Volume 42, Issue 2, April–June , Pages 65-73

651 Marvin, L. & Bishop, T., 1993. *Experimental design and analysis*. II Blacksburg: Valley Book Company.
652 Blacksburg, VA

653 Maude D., A & L Whitmore, R. (2002). *A Generalized Theory of Sedimentation*. *British Journal of Applied*
654 *Physics*. Volume 9(12).

655 MET Office, 2007. Fact sheet no. 3: Water in the atmosphere. *Natl. Metereolog. Libr. Arch.*. 1. 1-26.

656 Meyers, G., 2008. Developing your web presence. [Online] Available at: [http://developing-your-web-](http://developing-your-web-presence.blogspot.it/2008/04/galligu-and-assorted-niceties.html)
657 [presence.blogspot.it/2008/04/galligu-and-assorted-niceties.html](http://developing-your-web-presence.blogspot.it/2008/04/galligu-and-assorted-niceties.html) [Accessed 22 July 2017].

658 Moore, H.M., Fox, H.R., Elliot, S. *Land Reclamation - Extending Boundaries: Proceedings of the 7th*
659 *International Conference*, Runcorn, UK, 13-16 May 2003

660 McCutcheon C. S., Rock A. S. (2001) *Phytoremediation: state of the science conference and other*
661 *developments*, *International Journal of Phytoremediation*, 3, 1–11.

662 Muthusaravanan, S., Sivarajasekar, N., Vivek, J.S. et al. 2018. *Phytoremediation of heavy metals:*
663 *mechanisms, methods and enhancements Environ Chem Lett* Volume 16, Issue 4, pp 1339–1359

664 Nandita, S., 2010. Arsenic accumulation pattern in 12 Indian ferns and assessing the potential of *Adiantum*
665 *capillus-veneris*, in comparison to *Pteris vittata*, as arsenic hyperaccumulator. *Bioresource Technology*,
666 101(23), pp. 8960-8968.

667 Nanthi, B., 2011. Chapter four - *Phytostabilization: A Green Approach to Contaminant Containment*. Elsevier
668 Inc., Volume 112, pp. 145-204.

669 Penna, D., van Meerveld, I., Gobbi, A. , Borga, M., Dalla Fontana, G. 2010. The Influence of Soil Moisture on
670 Threshold Runoff Generation Processes in an Alpine Headwater Catchment. *Hydrology and Earth System*
671 *Sciences Discussions*. 7.

672 Pérez-Lopéz, D. 2014. *Erica andevalensis* and *Erica australis* growing in the same extreme environments:
673 phytostabilization potential of mining areas. *Geoderma*, 230(231), pp. 194-203.

674 Pimentel, D. , Zuniga, R. & Morrison, D. 2005. Update on the Environmental and Economic Costs
675 Associated with Alien-Invasive Species in the United States. *Ecological Economics*. 52. 273-288.

676 Rahman, M. A., 2011. Aquatic arsenic: Phytoremediation using floating macrophytes. *Chemosphere*, 83(5),
677 pp. 633-646.

678 Raquel, R., 2012. A methodological approach to evaluate arsenic speciation and bioaccumulation in different
679 plant species from two highly polluted mining areas. *Science of the Total Environment*, Volume 414, pp. 600-
680 607.

681 Read, J., Fletcher, T., Wevil, T. & Deletic, A., 2009. Plant traits that enhance pollutant removal from
682 stormwater in biofiltration systems. *Int.J. Phytoremediation*, 1(12), pp. 34-53.

683 Reed, P., 2013. Galligu: An Environmental Legacy of the Leblanc Alkali Industry, 1814-1920. Royal Society
684 of Chemistry- Environmentla Chemistry Group- Bulletin , pp. 22-26.

685 Richard, G. et al., 2001. Effect of compaction on the porosity of a silty soil: influence on unsaturated
686 hydraulic properties. *European Journa of Soil Science*, Volume 52(1), Pages 49-58

687 Ruiz-Chancho, M. J., 2008. Arsenic speciation in plants growing in arsenic-contaminated sites.
688 *Chemosphere*, 71(8), pp. 1522-1530.

689 Samac, D. A., Malvick, D., Hedulson, B., Gibbs, A., & Holingsworth, C. (2007). Alfalfa root health and
690 disease management: a foundation for maximizing production potential and stand life. Univerity of
691 Minnesota. Minnesota

692 Santonoceto C., 2015. Caratteristiche chimiche e chimico-fisiche del terreno. Università degli studi di Reggio
693 Calabria, Italy

694 Schneider, C., W.S., R. & K.W., E., 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis. *Nat Methods*,
695 9(7), pp. 671-675.

696 Shaxson, F. & Barber, R., 2003. Optimizing soil moisture for plant production. The significance of soil
697 porosity, Rome: Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations (FAO). Italy

698 Shukla, S. et al., 1992. Solidification/stabilization study for the disposal of pentachlorophenol. *Journal of*
699 *Hazardous Materials*, 30(3), pp. 317-331.

700 Sun, Y. 2010. Spatial, sources and risk assessment of heavy metal contamination of urban soils in typical
701 regions of Shenyang, China. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, Volume 174, pp. 455-462.

702 SWECO, 2014. Scottish contaminated land forum- Sighthill TRA Site Visit, Glasgow: SWECO. UK

703 Thurow T. L. and Hester J.W. 2018. How an increase or reduction in juniper cover alters rangeland
704 hydrology Texas Natural Resources Server See at: [https://texnat.tamu.edu/library/symposia/juniper-ecology-](https://texnat.tamu.edu/library/symposia/juniper-ecology-and-management/how-an-increase-or-reduction-in-juniper-cover-alters-rangeland-hydrology/)
705 [and-management/how-an-increase-or-reduction-in-juniper-cover-alters-rangeland-hydrology/](https://texnat.tamu.edu/library/symposia/juniper-ecology-and-management/how-an-increase-or-reduction-in-juniper-cover-alters-rangeland-hydrology/) [Accessed 20
706 January 2017]

707 Thomsen, L. , Baartman, J. Barneveld, R. Starkloff, T & Stolte, J. 2015. Soil surface roughness: comparing
708 old and new measuring methods and application in a soil erosion model. *SOIL*. 1. 399-410.

709 Tremlovà, J., 2016. Arsenic compounds occurring in ruderal plant communities growing in arsenic
710 contaminated soils. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, Volume 123, pp. 108-115.

711 Upadhyay M. K., Yadav P., Shukla A., Srivastava S.2018. Utilizing the Potential of Microorganisms for
712 Managing Arsenic Contamination: A Feasible and Sustainable Approach *Frontiers in Environmental Science*
713 Volume.6 2018 Page 24

714 Vaezi, A., Ahmadi, M. & Cerdà, A., 2017. Contribution of raindrop impact to the change of soil physical
715 properties and water erosion under semi-arid rainfalls. *Science of the total environment*, Volume 583, pp.
716 382-392.

717 Valente, T., 2012. Natural stabilization of mine waste-dumps — Evolution of the vegetation cover in
718 distinctive geochemical and mineralogical environments. *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*
719 *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, Volume 123, pp. 152-161.

720 Vipulanandan, C. & Krishnan, S., 1990. Solidification/stabilization of phenolic waste with cementitious and
721 polymeric materials. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 24(2-3), pp. 123-136.

722 Wang, J. et al., 2008. Phytoremediation of petroleum polluted soil. *Petroleum Science*, Volume 5, pp. 167-
723 171.

724 Wang, M. et al., 2012. Phytoremediation of pyrene contaminated soils amended with compost and planted
725 with ryegrass and alfalfa. *Chemosphere*, 87(3), pp. 217-225.

726 Ward, E., 2015. Naples Daily News. See at: [http://archive.naplesnews.com/community/gardening-the-ph-of-](http://archive.naplesnews.com/community/gardening-the-ph-of-your-soil-can-affect-plantgrowth-and-health-ep-1071358042-331319431.html/)
727 [your-soil-can-affect-plantgrowth-and-health-ep-1071358042-331319431.html/](http://archive.naplesnews.com/community/gardening-the-ph-of-your-soil-can-affect-plantgrowth-and-health-ep-1071358042-331319431.html/) [Acceessed 03 August 2017].

728 Wildenschild, D., H., Jensen, K., Villholth, K. & Illangasekare, T. 1994. A Laboratory Analysis of the Effect of
729 Macropores on Solute Transport. *Ground Water*. 32. 381 - 389

730 Wong, M., 2003. Ecological restoration of mine degraded soils, with emphasis on metal contaminated soils.
731 *Chemosphere*, Volume 50, pp. 775-780.

732 Zhang, C. 2016. Effects of heavy metals and soil physicochemical properties on wetland soil microbial
733 biomass and bacterial community structure. *Science of total Environment*, Volume 557, pp. 785-790.

734

735

736

737 **List of figure captions**

738 Figure 1. Axial soil columns used for runoff simulations

739 Figure 2. Preparation and transplantation of ferns into axial soil column

740 Figure 3. Vertical soil column preparation

741 Figure 4. Regression line belonging to the calibration process through turbidity analysis

742 Figure 5(a). Cumulative Distribution Functions (CDFs) retrieved from the histograms belonging to the digital
743 images (b). Histograms belonging to the digital images from soil samples containing known concentrations of
744 galligu. (c) . Histograms belonging to the digital images from soil samples containing known concentrations
745 of galligu and for the simulation run F1T12. (d) Cumulative Distribution Functions (CDFs) retrieved from the
746 histograms belonging to the digital images from soil samples with known galligu concentration (i.e. 0%,50%,
747 and 100%) and CDF for the simulation run F1T12

748 Figure 6. Illustration of the histograms retrieved from the digital images and digital images from three soil
749 samples with different concentrations of galligu

750 Figure 7. Digital images for the two soil-galligu samples

751 Figure 8. Solids load in the runoff water under different ground covers

752 Figure 9. Runoff discharge ($\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$) for the three ground covers evaluated in this study

753 Figure 10. Galligu concentration (in %) in the runoff collected after the series of rainfall simulation events
754 under different ground covers

755 Figure 11. Percolation time for the different ground covers established in the percolation tests

756 Figure 12. Galligu concentration (%) at three different soil column depths

757 Figure 13. Illustration of the zones sampled within the vertical soil columns to evaluate the vertical movement
758 of galligu

759

760 **List of table captions**

761 Table 1. Recorded absorbance over time for known concentrations of galligu in the soil determined through
762 UV spectrophotometry.

763 Table 2. Recorded absorbance for known concentrations of galligu determined through UV
764 spectrophotometry

765 Table 3. Kolomogorov-Smirnov (K-S) tests results from the comparison of the cumulative distribution
766 functions (CDF) for the histograms belonging to the digital images for soil-galligu mixtures collected after
767 rainfall simulation events.