2	bioavailability research and risk management in contaminated land
3	
4	Yiming Sun ¹ , Jialun Shen ¹ , Zongquan Sun ¹ , Fujun Ma ¹ , Kevin C Jones ² , Qingbao
5	Gu ^{1*}
6	¹ State Key Laboratory of Environmental Criteria and Risk Assessment, Chinese
7	Research Academy of Environmental Sciences, Beijing 100012, China
8	² Lancaster Environment Centre (LEC), Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA1 4YQ, UK
9	* Authors for correspondence: guqb@craes.org.cn; k.c.jones@lancaster.ac.uk
10	
11	Acknowledgements
12	This work was supported by Budget Surplus of Central Financial Science and
13	Technology Plan (2021-JY-36) and National Key R&D Program of China
14	(2019YFC1803800). Yiming Sun and Qingbao Gu have received research support from
15	Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences (2021-JY-36) and Ministry of
16	Science and Technology of the People's Republic of China (2019YFC1803800),
17	respectively.
10	

A bibliometric analysis and assessment of priorities for heavy metal

20 Abstract

21 Risk assessment has been recognized as an important tool for evaluating heavy metal pollution and 22 providing risk-based information for decision makers. In order to accurately assess the risk of heavy 23 metals in contaminated soil to human health, it is necessary to conduct bioavailability studies on heavy 24 metals in soil. Bioavailability of heavy metals in soils and the implications for risk assessment and land 25 management/remediation - has evolved over the decades and now has considerable practical and 26 economic implications internationally. This article aims to explore it's evolution by undertaking a 27 bibliometric analysis of the research fields which have addressed heavy metal bioavailability in soils, 28 with a focus on the risk assessment of contaminated land and human exposure to soil-borne metals. 29 Bibliometric analysis techniques are applied to monitor and assess the changing research literature on 30 the bioavailability of heavy metals in contaminated soils. Over 5000 articles were found for the period 31 1979-2020. The purpose was not to perform an exhaustive literature review, but to draw out trends and 32 patterns in the literature, and to make observations on past and current priorities. Key words were 33 extracted from the analysis and the roles of different countries in driving the research literature identified. 34 Three phases in literature/subject development were identified. Between 1979-2000 (initial phase, 213 35 articles), studies used extraction procedures and solubility studies to investigate the roles of soil 36 properties on metal form/speciation and focused on bioavailability to (crop) plants in agricultural soils. 37 Between 2001-2010 (slow development phase, 1,105 articles) attention switched to metals introduced in 38 soil amendments and wastes, metal impacts on soil microbial processes, and incorporating bioavailability 39 in risk assessment. More rigorous techniques were being used, such as the Diffusive Gradients in Thin 40 Films (DGT) technique to better understand kinetic and metal speciation in soils and the quantitative 41 relationship to bioavailability. By 2011-2020 (rapid development phase, 3,137 articles), research was 42 being conducted in many countries (site specific, often industrially contaminated and urban sites), with 43 a focus shift to health risk assessment, remediation, and bioavailability to various ecological receptors 44 (e.g. humans and animals), with the development of many methods of bioavailability (e.g. simulated 45 gastro-intestinal tract enzymolysis methods). Some priorities for research on soil heavy metal 46 bioavailability are identified.

47

48 Key words: bibliometric, heavy metal, bioavailability, contaminated soil, phase development

49 1. Introduction

50 With the development of global industrialization, urbanization and modernization over recent decades, 51 soil heavy metal pollution has become a focus for environmental pollution management worldwide 52 (Nriagu, 1996; Järup, 2003). Risk assessment has been recognized as an important tool for evaluating 53 heavy metal pollution and providing risk-based information for decision makers (Fairbrother et al., 2007). 54 Currently, most risk assessments are based on the total concentration of heavy metals in the soil, but 55 these metals are not absorbed with 100% efficiency by biological systems, so the risks of heavy metals 56 in soil are often over-estimated. This leads to higher land management and remediation costs. How to 57 determine the fraction that can be effectively absorbed by the human body (or other receptors, such as 58 grazing animals or crops) is a key part of contaminated land risk assessment. In order to accurately assess 59 the risk of heavy metals in contaminated soil to human health, it is necessary to conduct bioavailability 60 studies on heavy metals in soil - or use methods which can mimic or estimate the available fraction. 61 Although the definition of bioavailability can be different in different research fields (Harmsen, 2007; 62 Meyer, 2002), in the context of soil heavy metal contamination of current study, it refers to the fraction 63 of pollutants in the soil that can transfer into biological systems. For example, for humans this means 64 entering the human body through the oral cavity, skin, breathing and other exposure pathways, passing 65 through the gastrointestinal tract and being absorbed into the human body (Kelley et al., 2002). Many 66 countries have incorporated bioavailability measurement methods into risk assessment techniques. For 67 example, in 2007, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) issued guidelines for 68 evaluating the bioavailability of soil heavy metals in human health risk assessment (USEPA, 2007). 69 Although the logic of assessing the bioavailable fraction, rather than using total metal concentrations, 70 has been appreciated by experts in the field for many years, there is still a lack of consensus about the 71 method(s) to determine the bioavailability of soil heavy metals. The fraction of heavy metal which is 72 bioavailable in soils varies between elements and is influenced by soil types, heavy metal forms, exposure 73 pathways, soil physical and chemical properties, and environmental factors. The focus for research on 74 soil heavy metal bioavailability has differed over time and in different regions of the world, as knowledge 75 and priorities change driven by politics, technologies, improved scientific understanding, economic 76 development etc. (Sun et al., 2019).



Determination of bioavailability, or at least methods to estimate it, can be in vitro and in vivo

78 procedures (Juhasz et al., 2010; Brattin et al., 2013). As examples, an *in vitro* measure of bioavailability 79 from soil to crop plants may use a chemical extractant to mimic the 'bioavailable fraction'. In vivo 80 bioassay methods can use test plant species, earthworms or micro-organisms. For higher organisms, 81 different animal models have been used. The fraction of heavy metal absorbed by the animal fed known 82 amounts of a prescribed diet is determined by comparing what is ingested by the animal with what is 83 excreted. Obviously this can vary between species and with diet/soil type, because the chemical 84 conditions, residence time, microbiology etc varies in the gastro-intestinal (GI) tract of the different test 85 species. The animal models commonly used for heavy metal determination are primates, pigs, rabbits 86 and mice, but they are limited by ethical considerations, cost and differences in physiology, which limit 87 the use of primates, pigs and rabbits for example (Juhasz et al., 2010; Brattin et al., 2013). Although 88 previous studies have shown that in vivo experiments in mouse models have considerable advantages in 89 determining the bioavailability of heavy metals (Bradham et al., 2011; Bradham et al., 2018; USEPA, 90 2021), they are not suitable for risk assessment of heavy metal contaminated sites at a large scale for 91 ethical reasons and cost issues (Juhasz et al., 2010). Therefore, for sites that require a large number of 92 bioavailability measurements, it is necessary to develop in vitro simulated model systems to replace them. 93 The GI simulation method is currently a widely used *in vitro* simulation method (Juhasz et al., 2009; 94 Denys et al., 2012; Li et al., 2020a). It measures the dissolution rate of soil pollutants in the simulated 95 human GI tract. There are now more than 10 GI simulation methods used worldwide. In addition to GI 96 simulation methods, there are also simpler techniques, which determine the soluble or extractable or 97 labile fractions of heavy metals in soils (Harper et al., 2000). This is where the study of heavy metals in 98 soils began, several decades ago, with a focus on the influences of soil chemistry, and the 99 bioavailability/uptake by plants. For example, Alloway & Morgan (1986) carried out a long-term study 100 concerned with the forms of soil pollutants including Cd, Pb and Ni from various sources and the extent 101 to which these metals were taken up and translocated into the edible parts of different food crops. Baker 102 et al. (1994) assessed the performance of a range of plant species (hyperaccumulator species and non-103 accumulating species) to extract metals under crop conditions.

As this Introduction has briefly shown, this general research topic – bioavailability of heavy metals in soils and the implications for risk assessment and land management/remediation – has evolved over the decades and now has considerable practical and economic implications internationally. In this article we explore it's evolution by undertaking a bibliometric analysis of the research fields which have addressed heavy metal bioavailability in soils, with a focus on the risk assessment of contaminated land and human exposure to soil-borne metals. More specifically, the analysis explores the evolution of the field, its changing focus on different topics, tools and techniques. It identifies those countries where most research and assessment has been undertaken and the trends in literature over past decades. We then use the analysis to consider current research activity, and highlight recent research trends and upcoming priorities.

- 113
- **114 2** Data acquisition and analysis methods

115 **2.1 Data acquisition**

116 This study selected the Web of Science (WOS) core database of the Institute for Scientific Information 117 (ISI) as the data source. WOS is a comprehensive database, widely used in various fields of bibliometric 118 analysis. It can obtain relevant documents of global scientific research, covering the most comprehensive 119 academic information resources in the world over most disciplines, including natural sciences, 120 biomedicine, and engineering technology. The database holds information from >8,700 core academic 121 journals which have the most influence in various research fields, and it is a universal international 122 scientific research analysis tool. Therefore, the literature selected the WOS Core Collections sub-123 database by searching the topics (TS). In the process of advanced database searches, the use of keywords 124 is crucial to the accuracy of the search. The search formula is: TS = (soil AND (heavy metal OR heavy-125 metal) AND (bioavailability OR bio-availability OR bio availability)). The key search time span is 1979-126 2020, the document type is selected as "Article". After screening and manual removing the less relevant 127 documents which are lack of authors/keywords information and irrelevant to the topic, a total of 5,117 128 papers were obtained. After removing any replicated articles, there were 4,455 articles used in the co-129 occurrence and cluster analyses of keywords and country.

130 **2.2 Analysis methods**

This study firstly evaluates the current research status and influencing factors in the field of global heavy metal bioavailability from three perspectives: 1) the time trend characteristics of the number of papers, 2) their countries of origin, and 3) the current research hotspots. In addition, CiteSpace software was used to perform a cluster analysis of the relevance and hot trends in the literature, to identify soil heavy metal bioavailability studies in different countries and regions. The largest cluster in the map is the cluster generated with "soil heavy metal bioavailability" as the theme. Modularity Q and Mean

- 137 Silhouette are two important indicators for evaluating clustering. Modularity Q is an indicator for 138 evaluating the effectiveness of clustering. Modularity Q >0.3 indicates that clustering is effective; Mean 139 Silhouette is an indicator for clustering homogeneity, the larger the value indicates that the homogeneity
- 140 of the cluster is better, and Mean Silhouette >0.7 indicates that the cluster is reliable.
- 141

142 **3 Results and Discussion**

143 **3.1 Yearly publication records**

144 The first article in the field of bioavailability of soil heavy metals identified by the database search 145 was published in 1979 (Bingham, 1979), which explored the relationship between the bioavailability of 146 21 food crops and the heavy metal content of sludge-amended soils. In total, there are 4,455 article records used in this analysis from 1979 to 2020. Figure 1 clearly shows that the number of records for 147 148 each year and cumulative records have increased strongly with time. Based on the cumulative records of 149 publications, research relating to bioavailability of soil heavy metals over the past ~41 years can be 150 divided into three broad phases - an initial phase, a slow development phase and a rapid development 151 phase. Although the precise time points of these phases are somewhat imprecise, we take these to be as 152 follows - an initial phase (213 records) between 1979-2000, a slow development phase (1,105 records) 153 between 2001-2010 and the rapid development phase (3,137 records) between 2011-2020 (and likely still 154 continuing). We present an analysis of these phases to highlight changes in topic focus, country of origin 155 etc., as explained below.



157 Figure 1: Publication records relating to bioavailability of soil heavy metals from 1979 to 2020 in the158 Web of Science database.

159

160 Table 1 shows the top 14 most productive countries (frequency \geq 100) with publications on the 161 bioavailability of soil heavy metals during 1979-2020. Over the whole time period the sequence is as 162 follows: China (1,336), USA (484), Spain (263), Australia (184), France (178), Italy (163), Pakistan (163), 163 Poland (163), India (141), South Korea (129), Iran (125), Brazil (123), UK (113) and Germany (101). 164 China has focused on soil heavy metal bioavailability because of the fast development of urbanization, 165 with the need for evaluation and potential re-development of inner city/industrialised areas. Although the 166 highest frequency among all countries occurred in China, the highest centrality was found in USA (1.06). 167 The greater the centrality, the more research will be carried out through this point, and the centrality 168 exceeds 0.1, which is considered to have a higher influence. Thus, the USA has had the highest influence 169 in the field of soil heavy metal bioavailability so far. 170

171 Table 1 Frequency (Frequency of different countries ≥ 100) and centrality (centrality of keywords ≥ 0.1)

172	of articles relating to	soil heavy meta	l biogygilgbility	in different	countries between	1070 and 2020
$\perp 1 \angle$	of articles relating to	soll neavy meta	l bioavailability	v in different	countries between	19/9 and 2020

Country	Frequency	Centrality	Keywords	Frequency	Centrality
China	1336	0.16	Contamination	499	0.49
USA	484	1.06	Availability	404	0.41
Spain	263	0.11 Cu		842	0.36
Australia	184	0.05	Element	121	0.34
France	France 178 0.09 Remediation		Remediation	310	0.25
Italy	163	0.05	Adsorption	288	0.25
Pakistan	163	0.03	Phytoremediation	227	0.23
Poland	163	0.03	Heavy metal	2,891	0.22
India	141	0.01	Sediment	351	0.17
South Korea	129	0.03	Speciation	699	0.13
Iran	125	0	Amendment	258	0.13
Brazil	123	0.01	Accumulation	681	0.11
UK	113	0.03	Toxicity	412	0.11
Germany	101	0.09	Mobility	249	0.1

173

174 **3.2 Keyword frequency analysis**

175 Keywords are the core of a bibliometric analysis and indicate the research hotspots in the subject

area. The software analysis tools identified different keywords and different numbers of keywords in the

177 different time periods. This reflects the dominance/strength of different topics, the research hotspots of

178 the research field, and the frontiers and trends of research. The data of 4,455 articles was imported into 179 the CiteSpace software to generate a keyword co-occurrence map of the bioavailability of heavy metals 180 in soil. The keywords with a frequency of greater than or equal to 100 are shown in Figure 2, while Table 181 1 & Table S1 gives detailed information of frequency and centrality. The keywords "soil", "heavy metal", 182 and "bioavailability" appeared 1,149, 2,891 and 1,734 times, respectively. From Figure 2 and Table 1, research content revolves around three aspects of soil heavy metal bioavailability, namely: migration and 183 184 transformation, risk assessment, remediation. There are 2,891 articles relating to heavy metals, with a 185 focus on Cd, Zn, Pb and Cu. There are 1,734 articles relating to bioavailability, mainly focused on plant 186 availability. There are 1,149 articles relating to soil, with the main focus on agricultural soil. There are 187 680 articles relating to contaminated soil.

In addition to the frequency of keywords, centrality is also a major indicator to determine research hotspots. Centrality refers to the mediating effect of a node in a certain field and its influencing factors. The greater the centrality, the more research will be carried out through this point; if the centrality > 0.1, it is considered to have a higher influence. In the keyword co-occurrence map, keywords with high centrality are usually displayed with a purple aperture (Figure 2). The results indicate that heavy metal, Cu, accumulation, speciation, contaminated soil, sediment, remediation, adsorption, amendment, mobility, phytoremediation, and element have the greatest influence (Table 1).



196

195

197 Figure 2 Co-occurrence map of key research keywords (frequency \geq 100) for the bioavailability of soil

198 heavy metals in 1979-2020

3.3 Changes over time in the research hotspots and frontiers relating to soil heavy metal bioavailability

By analyzing temporal changes in clustering keywords, trends in the field of soil heavy metal bioavailability research focus are identified which provides a reference for considering future research directions. Keyword clustering can focus on the research field, to help decipher and understand the knowledge structure basis of the field, and aggregate closely related words to highlight relatively independent research fields.

207 **3.3.1 Main research keywords in the initial phase (1979-2000)**

208 Figure 3 shows the research keywords of soil heavy metal bioavailability focused on six aspects 209 between 1979-2000 - namely #0 sewage sludge, #1 heavy metal, #2 sequential extraction procedure, #3 210 community DNA fingerprint, #4 desorption kinetics and #5 heavy metal geochemistry. In this initial 211 development phase, research on soil heavy metal bioavailability mainly focused on the speciation (#2, 212 #4) and geochemistry (#5), with a focus on heavy metals entering agricultural soils due to the addition 213 of sewage sludge (#0) as a soil amendment. This was a hot topic in Europe and North America at this 214 time, with countries discussing whether addition of sludge to land needed to be regulated/controlled, 215 because of the presence of heavy metals (Towers & Paterson, 1997). Analysis of the 213 research articles 216 published in the 1979-2000 timeframe identified four burst keywords (Figure 4A) - Zn, Cu, sewage 217 sludge and pH.

218 Studies during this phase often focused on specific sites, soil types and chemical extraction methods 219 to assess heavy metal release and forms in soils (Chlopecka, 1996; Cieśliński et al., 1996; Krishnamurti 220 et al., 1995; Rieuwerts & Farago, 1995). For example, Krishnamurti et al (1995) explored the speciation 221 of soil particulate-bound Cd by using a sequential chemical extraction procedure. Chlopecka (1996) 222 evaluated the forms of Cd, Zn and Pb in contaminated calcareous and gleved soils. Cieśliński et al (1996) 223 showed soil types affected on Cd bioaccumulation and distribution within the plants. Researchers 224 realized that the bioavailability of heavy metals might change with their speciation. Focus turned to 225 bioavailability rather than the total concentration of heavy metals (Alexander, 2000). During this period, 226 chemical methods were developed to measure the speciation of heavy metals - single extraction and 227 sequential extraction methods. Researchers found that speciation of heavy metals varied with soil 228 properties and chemical extractants. The principle of sequential extraction methods is to use a series of

229 reagents to extract heavy metals step-by-step, with weaker then stronger extractants. This approach can 230 reveal the binding status of metals and soil solid phase components. It can help with understanding of 231 their adsorption-desorption, migration and transformation processes in the soil, and their soil plant 232 nutrient (e.g. Cu, Zn) chemistry and environmental chemistry. During this period, the Tessier five/seven-233 step sequential extraction method (Tessier et al., 1979), the BCR four-step sequential extraction method 234 (Whalley & Grant, 1994; Rauret et al., 1999) and the Maiz three-step sequential extraction method (Maiz 235 et al., 1997) were proposed. Although the Tessier method has been studied and tested for a relatively long 236 time, it still has some shortcomings, such as multiple extraction steps, possible re-sorption and re-237 distribution during the extraction process, and weak reproducibility of experimental results (Pueyo et al, 238 2004). The BCR method was based on the Tessier methods, adapted by the European Community Bureau 239 of Reference, which generated the first standard reference material for geochemical speciation studies 240 (BCR601). This method has relatively simple steps and accurate results; it has been widely used to 241 determine the speciation of heavy metals in soils and sediments (Davidson et al., 1994). 242

#1 heavy metal #0 sewage sludge **#2 sequential extraction procedure** #4 desorption kinetics #5 heavy metal geochemistry

#3 community dna fingerprint

243

Figure 3 Cluster map of research keywords on the bioavailability of soil heavy metals during 1979-2000. 244

Based on the log-likelihood analysis, Modularity Q is 0.7007, Weighted Mean Silhouette S=0.9262. Each 245

- 246 module in the keyword clustering map is a cluster. The larger the module, the greater the number of
- 247 keywords in the cluster. The text on the module is the name of the cluster, and the largest cluster is marked with #0.
- 248
- 249

A Top 4 Keywords with the Strongest Citation Bursts			C Top 25 Keywords with the Strongest Citation Bursts			
Keywords Year Strength Beg	gin End	1979 - 2000	Variation	V	Desta	E-1 2011 2020
Zn 1979 4.63 199	1 1995		Keywords	Year Strength	Begin	End 2011 - 2020
Cd 1979 4.98 199	1 1996		Zn	2011 17.9	2011	2013
Sewage sludge 1979 4.54 199	7 1996		Extractability	2011 7.61	2011	2015
pi 1575 5.6 155	1776		Fractionation	2011 6.03	2011	2013
B Top 19 Keywords with the Strongest Citation Bursts			Element	2011 5.96	2011	2012
			Cu	2011 5.31	2011	2012
Keywords	Year Strength B	gin End 2001 - 2010	Solubility	2011 4.97	2011	2014
Dutch field soil	2001 4.21 2 0	01 2003	Behavior	2011 7.51	2013	2016
Manganese	2001 2.81 20	01 2003	Biosolid	2011 6.08	2013	2016
Solubility	2001 4.66 20	02 2003	Extraction method	2011 6.08	2013	2014
EDTA	2001 3.45 2 0	04 2005	Microorganism	2011 5.49	2013	2016
Microorganism	2001 3.31 2 0	04 2006	Organic amendment	2011 4.53	2015	2018
Phytoremediation	2001 3.13 20	04 2005	Manganese	2011 4.48	2015	2017
Rhizosphere	2001 3.03 2 0	04 2007	Street dust	2011 5.79	2016	2017
Organic acid	2001 3 20	04 2005	Amended soil	2011 5.31	2016	2017
Phosphorus	2001 3.12 2 0	06 2007	Pyrolysis temperature	2011 5.05	2016	2020
Sample	2001 3.12 2 0	06 2007	Release	2011 4.83	2016	2017
Waste	2001 2.57 20	06 2007	China	2011 13.51	2017	2018
Behavior	2001 3.46 2 0	07 2008	Mining area	2011 7.36	2017	2018
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon	2001 3.15 2 0	07 2010	Surface sediment	2011 6.42	2017	2018
Mine	2001 2.89 20	07 2010	Yield	2011 5.3	2017	2020
Immobilization	2001 5.65 20	08 2010	DGT	2011 4.59	2017	2018
Risk assessment	2001 4.51 2 0	08 2010	Rice	2011 9.27	2018	2020
Biosolid	2001 4.26 2 0	08 2010	Diversity	2011 7.21	2018	2020
Amendment	2001 3.26 2 0	08 2010	Paddy soil	2011 6.68	2018	200
BCR	2001 2.71 20	08 2010	Reduction	2011 5.08	2018	2020

Figure 4 Strongest citation bursts of top keywords relating to soil heavy metal bioavailability during 1979-2000 (A), 2001-2010 (B) and 2011-2020 (C).

253

254 **3.3.2 Main research keywords in the slow development phase (2001-2010)**

255 Figure 5 shows the research hotspots on soil heavy metal bioavailability between 2001-2010. During 256 the slow development phase, research continued to focus on the speciation (#5, #8, #7) of heavy metals, 257 and sewage sludge (#2). Studies on the influence of soil types emerged (e.g. agricultural soil (#4) and 258 calcareous soil (#6)). New research keywords showed studies exploring the influence of soil amendments 259 (#1), studies on soil-plant interactions (test plant species (#3)) and the impacts of heavy metals on soil 260 microbial processes (basal respiration (#9)). 261 Analyzing 1,105 article records, 19 burst keywords were obtained (Figure 4B) which included: Dutch 262 field soil, manganese, solubility, EDTA, microorganism, phytoremediation, rhizosphere, organic acid, 263 phosphorus, sample, waste, behavior, mine, immobilization, risk assessment, biosolid, amendment.

- 264 These highlight that studies were focusing on the solubility, extractability and interactions of metals from
- 265 soils, the effects of various soil treatments and amendments on heavy metals in soils, and risk assessment
- and remediation of metal contaminated soils.



Figure 5 Cluster map of research keywords of the bioavailability of soil heavy metals during 2001-2010. Based on the log-likelihood analysis, Modularity Q is 0.7704, Weighted Mean Silhouette S=0.9216. Each module in the keyword clustering map is a cluster. The larger the module, the greater the number of keywords in the cluster. The text on the module is the name of the cluster, and the largest cluster is marked with #0.

273

274 (1) Speciation (#5, #8, #7) of heavy metals:

275 During this period, speciation of heavy metals in soils measured by sequential extraction methods 276 still was a hot topic, with a focus on methods to evaluate metal availability in studies around the world 277 (e.g. in China and Canada). For example, Lu et al (2003) analyzed the mobility and bioavailability of Cu, Zn, Pb and Cr based on the ~150 soil samples from 20 urban and 3 non-urban soil profiles in Nanjing, 278 279 China. Li et al (2006) applied the short sequential extraction procedure for the determination of available 280 fraction of Zn, Cu and Cd in Harbin, China. Preciado & Li (2006) evaluated Cu, Fe, Pb, Mn and Zn of 281 roadside sediments using sequential extraction method in British Columbia, Canada. China had the 282 highest frequency of publications on bioavailability at this time (Table S2), as urbanization and re-283 development of contaminated sites became an important environmental issue in the country (Sun et al., 284 2019, 2022).

285 (2) Heavy metals in sewage sludge-amended soils (#2):

During the 2001-2010 period, applications of sludge to land remained an important topic, while the production of sewage sludge in urban areas of developing countries increased in line with greater urbanization and industrialization. Landfill, farmland utilization and incineration accounted for a large proportion of sludge disposal in developed countries. The EU's policy on waste treatment was to produce no waste, minimize the amount of waste produced, recycle, incinerate, and landfill. Agricultural use and 291 landfilling were the two most important methods of sludge disposal in most countries. The carbon and 292 nutrient value of sludge provided benefits to soils, while the heavy metal content could be a concern. 293 This is why the content of heavy metals in the sludge should meet standards for the control of sludge 294 applications to land and why the bioavailability of metals to crops and the potential impacts on soil 295 processes and organisms has been investigated.

(3) Phytoremediation (Studies on the influence of soil types emerged (e.g. agricultural soil (#4)
and calcareous soil (#6)), Studies on soil-plant interactions (Brassica juncea (#3)), The impacts
of heavy metals on soil microbial processes (basal respiration (#9)) and Studies exploring the
influence of soil amendments (#1)):

300 During this period, the area of soil contaminated by heavy metals is expanding rapidly. Research on 301 the remediation of contaminated soils was developing rapidly and became a popular research field. In-302 depth development of the occurrence and development processes of contaminated soil, contaminated soil 303 remediation research and applications became important in this phase. Research on the remediation of 304 contaminated agricultural soil has become a current hot scientific issue and frontier field. Conventional 305 physical and chemical treatment technologies, such as soil replacement, washing, heat treatment, 306 solidification, vitrification were being explored and were coupled with studies that investigated changes 307 in metal form, availability and effects. Phytoremediation was an attractive concept, because it was 308 presented as a 'green technology' (Raskin & Ensley, 2000), but it has many practical limitations (Sarwar 309 et al, 2017). Literature explored how plant stabilization may be a way to reduce the bioavailability of 310 polluting elements in situ (Yan et al., 2020), rather than a permanent method to remove pollutants from 311 the soil (Adeoye et al., 2022). For example, phytostabilization is one of widely used techniques of 312 phytoremediation, which seeks to physically stabilize the contaminated site with vegetation cover 313 (Adeoye et al., 2022). In this technique, some plants with high metallic-tolerant ability have been applied 314 to reduce the bioavailability of heavy metals in soils, further to immobilize these metals belowground 315 and reduce the possibility of these metals from entering to the food chain. For example, a variety of 316 *Miscanthus* \times *giganteus* has been reported that can reduce metal accumulation in above-ground biomass 317 (Zgorelec et al., 2020).

318

319 **3.3.3** Main research keywords in the fast development phase (2011-2020)

13

Figure 6 shows the research hotspots of soil heavy metal bioavailability during 2011-2020. During this fast development phase, more diverse research on soil heavy metal bioavailability has taken place than the initial and slow development phases (#1, #0, #11, #12). Research has developed on health risk assessment (#8) and remediation (#2, #14, #3) of soil heavy metal in industrial soils (#13). In addition, research interests have started to focus on contamination factors (#15) and mechanisms of action (#4, #9, #10, # 6) of soil heavy metals.

Analyzing 3,137 article records, 25 burst keywords were obtained (Figure 4C). These are: Zn, extractability, fractionation, element, Cu, solubility, behavior, biosolid, extraction method, microorganism, organic amendment, manganese, street dust, amended soil, pyrolysis temperature, release, China, mining area, surface sediment, yield, DGT, rice, diversity, paddy soil and reduction.



331

330

Figure 6 Cluster map of research keywords of the bioavailability of soil heavy metals during 2011-2020.
Based on the log-likelihood analysis, Modularity Q is 0.7768, Weighted Mean Silhouette S=0.9113. Each
module in the keyword clustering map is a cluster. The larger the module, the greater the number of

keywords in the cluster. The text on the module is the name of the cluster, and the largest cluster is marked
with #0.

- 337
- 338

339 (1) Health risk assessment (#8) of soil heavy metal:

340 The World Health Organization's definition of a comprehensive risk assessment is "a scientific 341 method for estimating the risks of humans, biological populations and natural resources". It was 342 formulated in 2001 with the assistance of the US Environmental Protection Agency and the World 343 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. A comprehensive evaluation framework for 344 health and ecology was established, and suggestions and methods for comprehensive evaluation of health 345 and ecology risks were put forward. The European Union has also formulated technical guidelines for 346 comprehensive health and ecological risk assessment, recommending and guiding EU member states to 347 adopt a new comprehensive assessment system to carry out environmental risk assessment. Since the 1990s, scientists realized the limitations of artificially separating health risks and ecological risks for 348 349 evaluation, and have begun to explore comprehensive health and ecological risk assessment schemes. 350 This requires an assessment of the ability of heavy metals to transfer from soils to different receptors.

351 In recent years, there has been a wider realization of the complexity of contaminated sites and the 352 physical and chemical properties of pollutants in site management practices, and the potential risks to 353 human health and the environment are very different. In order to reasonably allocate the limited resources, 354 human, material, and financial resources among the large number of contaminated sites, countries have 355 shifted from the original application of common site cleaning standards, including soil standards for 356 contaminated site evaluation and remediation to risk-based methods and management methods (USEPA, 357 2007). Studies on bioavailability and the implications of metals in contaminated land have therefore been developed in this period (Li et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2019; Li et al., 2020b). For example, Li et al (2016) 358 359 explored the bioavailability prediction of arsenic by using different animal models and found mouse liver 360 or kidney can be used as the target organs of arsenic. Further, Zhu et al (2019) showed the unified 361 bioaccessibility model (UBM) assay as a robust method can predict the relative bioavailability of As, Cd 362 and Pb in contaminated soils by comparing the correlation between mouse models and the UBM gastric 363 phase assay.

364

365

5 (2) Remediation (#2, #14, #3) of soil heavy metal:

There are many types of remediation technologies for contaminated sites, and new remediation technologies appear from time to time (Gong et al., 2018). According to classification methods, remediation technologies can be divided into different two types (Ifon et al., 2019). For example,

369 according to the location of the remediation treatment project, it can be divided into *in-situ* or *ex-situ* 370 remediation approaches. Commonly used in-situ remediation techniques include bioremediation and 371 immobilization and stabilization. Commonly used ex-situ remediation techniques are immobilization and 372 stabilization, incineration, thermal desorption, and bioremediation. Bioremediation technology is 373 currently the most commonly used innovative technology. Although many contaminated site remediation 374 technologies have been developed, they all have certain limitations on their scope of application, 375 especially potentially high cost. Therefore, besides of developing the new type of remediation 376 technologies, methods that can accurately evaluate the remediation target value are essential. Currently, 377 the studies of bioavailability of heavy metals in soils have been a hot topic for evaluating the soil 378 remediation target value (Bisht, 2018).

379

380 (3) Mechanisms of action (#4, #9, #10, # 6) of soil heavy metals:

381 During this period, many studies of soil heavy metal bioavailability have been carried out on soil-382 plant action mechanisms. Low-molecular-weight organic acids play an important role in the 383 morphological changes and bioavailability of heavy metal elements, and have attracted the attention of 384 researchers. The low-molecular-weight organic acids secreted by plant roots participate in soil formation 385 and promote mineral dissolution; change the physical and chemical properties of rhizosphere soil and 386 promote the absorption of nutrients by plants; relieve symptoms of hypoxia and reduce metal and other 387 toxicities. Elemental toxicity to plants, etc., can also form complexes or chelates with metal ions, thereby 388 changing the mobility of metals in the soil (Riaz et al., 2021).

389 Studies have shown that the root exudates can change the physical and chemical properties of the 390 rhizosphere environment such as pH, Eh and other physical and chemical properties. Root exudates 391 provide nutrition and energy for rhizosphere microorganisms. These microorganisms can convert 392 macromolecular exudates into various low-molecular-weight compounds such as organic acids. In-depth 393 study of the effectiveness of heavy metals in rhizosphere soil is helpful for understanding the 394 environmental behavior of heavy metals in soil plant systems and evaluating the health risks of 395 contaminated soils. In addition, plant roots can also cause the release of metals in different forms (Huang 396 et al., 2014; Zhalnina et al., 2018).

397

398 4. Current research status and a forward look

399 This study is a systematic bibliometric analysis of heavy metal bioavailability research and risk 400 management in contaminated land during 1979-2020. In these 40+ years, the total number of article 401 records of soil heavy metal bioavailability around the world shows an almost exponential upward trend. 402 This indicates that researchers are paying increasing attention to the field. Among 75 studied countries, 403 China is the most productive, which suggests it is the most active in this research area. This might because 404 of the fast development of urbanization after 2000, with the need for evaluation and potential re-405 development of inner city/industrialized areas. Especially during 2011-2020, the total number of article 406 records from China is at least 5 times that of other countries. According to this development trend and 407 the needs of the current national conditions, it is expected that China will continue to pay attention to 408 research on the bioavailability of soil heavy metals for a long time. It is worth noting that although the 409 number of publications in the US is not the highest, it has the highest centrality, showing that the US has 410 been the most influential country in this field of study. The early urbanization and industrialization 411 development has enabled the US to have a relatively complete management system in soil heavy metal 412 contaminated sites, especially in soil pollution risk assessment and remediation technologies. These 413 experiences can be of benefit to other countries, such as China, where they could be used as a reference. 414 Through keyword clustering analysis on soil heavy metal bioavailability, the main research hotspots 415 during 2011-2020 were more than before 2011. The main keywords more recently were "health risk assessment", "remediation", "mechanisms of action" of soil heavy metals, indicating these issues have 416 417 become more important to the re-development of contaminated land in recent years. In addition, "rice", 418 "paddy soil" and "mining area" have the strongest citation bursts, which suggests that agricultural land 419 and industrial land is still a research subject. Therefore, future research will continue to be conducted in 420 agricultural and industrial land, but the challenge is still how to determine accurate estimation of soil 421 heavy metal bioavailability of large-scale land areas.

The keyword clustering analysis of three stages also indicated that studies on the bioavailability of heavy metals in soils are reliant on the development and use of appropriate validated methodologies. In the initial phase (1979-2000), researchers mainly focused on extraction bioavailability measurement methods. Examples include use of single or sequential extractants, EDTA complexing etc. Subsequent approaches, in the slow development phase (2001-2010) and more recently (2011-2020) have seen much more rigorously researched and scientifically based procedures being tested, validated and used widely. 428 Probably one of the best examples is the Diffusive Gradients in Thin Films (DGT) passive sampler, for 429 which the theory, research applications and practical applications for measuring speciation and 430 bioavailability have been widely explored (Davison and Zhang, 1994; Zhang et al., 1995; Zhang et al., 1998; Harper et al., 2000; Muhammad et al., 2012; Senila et al., 2012). This approach has been most 431 432 widely tested for soil-plant bioavailability work. More recently, the development of animal based, 433 enzymolysis and simulated GI tract methods have been developed. During the development of science 434 and techniques, many methods of bioavailability of heavy metals in soils have been invented, and they 435 have their own advantages. For example, gastrointestinal simulation assays are commonly used in the 436 risk assessment of contaminated land currently, with more than 10 different gastrointestinal simulation 437 assays so far. However, they can give inconsistent results between methods, and can involve complex 438 procedures. In the current phase of the field's development, these tools and methodologies have gained 439 more acceptance and are being routinely deployed as part of the site evaluation, risk assessment and 440 remediation projects in several countries. They may not yet be part of formal 'approved' methodologies 441 by government agencies, but this may be an outcome in the coming years.

442

443 Author contribution

All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by Yiming Sun. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Yiming Sun, Kevin Jones and Qingbao Gu, and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

448

449 Data availability

- 450 Data available in supplementary information.
- 451
- 452 Declarations
- 453 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

454

455 **Ethical statement**

456 This is a review study on the bibliometric analysis of soil heavy metal bioavailability. All data of the

research was obtained from Web of Science. The research does not involve any experiments relating to

458 human or animal subjects.

459

460 **Reference**

- Adeoye, A. O., Adebayo, I. A., Afodun, A. M., & Ajijolakewu, K. A. (2022). Chapter 12 Benefits and
 limitations of phytoremediation: Heavy metal remediation review. In R. A. Bhat, F. M. P. Tonelli,
 G. H. Dar & K. Hakeem (Eds.), Phytoremediation (pp. 227-238): Academic Press.
- Alexander, M. (2000). Aging, bioavailability, and overestimation of risk from environmental pollutants.
 Environmental Science & Technology, 34(20), 4259–4265. https://doi.org/10.1021/es001069+
- Alloway, B. J. & Morgan, H. (1986). The Behaviour and Availability of Cd, Ni and Pb in Polluted Soils.
 In: Assink, J. W., Van Den Brink, W. J. (eds) Contaminated Soil. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-5181-5_9
- Baker, A. J. M., McGrath, S. P., Sidoli, C. M. D., & Reeves, R. D. (1994). The possibility of in situ heavy
 metal decontamination of polluted soils using crops of metal-accumulating plants. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 11*(1), 41-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/0921-3449(94)90077-9
- Bingham, FT. (1979). Bioavailability of Cd to food crops in relation to heavy metal content of sludgeamended soil. *Environmental Health Perspectives 28*:39-43 https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.792839
- Bisht, A. S. (2018). Commercial surfactants for remediation: mobilization of trace metals from estuarine
 sediment and bioavailability. Springer.
- Bradham KD, Scheckel KG, Nelson CM, Seales PE, Lee GE, Hughes MF, Miller BW, Yeow A, Gilmore
 T, Serda SM, Harper S, Thomas DJ. (2011). Relative bioavailability and bioaccessibility and
 speciation of arsenic in contaminated soils. *Environmental health perspectives*, *119*(11), 1629-1634.
 https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1003352
- Bradham, K. D., Diamond, G. L., Nelson, C. M., Noerpel, M., Scheckel, K. G., Elek, B., Chaney, R. L.
 Ma, Q & Thomas, D. J. (2018). Long-term in situ reduction in soil lead bioavailability measured
 in a mouse model. *Environmental science & technology*, *52*(23), 13908-13913.
- 483 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b04684
- Brattin, W., & Casteel, S. (2013). Measurement of arsenic relative bioavailability in swine. Journal of *Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part A, 76*(7), 449-457.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/15287394.2013.771562
- Chlopecka, A. (1996). Assessment of form of Cd, Zn and Pb in contaminated calcareous and gleyed soils
 in Southwest Poland. *Science of The Total Environment*, *188*(2-3), 253-262.
- Cieśliński, G., Van Rees, K., Huang, P., Kozak, L., Rostad, H., & Knott, D. (1996). Cadmium uptake and
 bioaccumulation in selected cultivars of durum wheat and flax as affected by soil type. *Plant and soil*, *182*(1), 115-124.
- 492 Davidson, C. M., Thomas, R. P., McVey, S. E., Perala, R., Littlejohn, D., & Ure, A. M. (1994).
 493 Evaluation of a sequential extraction procedure for the speciation of heavy metals in sediments.
 494 Analytica Chimica Acta, 291(3), 277-286.
- 495 Davison, W., & Zhang, H. (1994). In situ speciation measurements of trace components in natural waters
 496 using thin-film gels. *Nature*, 367(6463), 546-548 https://doi.org/10.1038/367546a0
- 497 Denys, S., Caboche, J., Tack, K., Rychen, G., Wragg, J., Cave, M., Jondreville, C., & Feidt, C. (2012).
 498 In vivo validation of the unified BARGE method to assess the bioaccessibility of arsenic, antimony,

- 499 cadmium, and lead in soils. *Environmental science & technology*, 46(11), 6252-6260.
 500 https://doi.org/10.1021/es3006942
- Fairbrother, A., Wenstel, R., Sappington, K., & Wood, W. (2007). Framework for metals risk assessment.
 Ecotoxicology and environmental safety, 68(2), 145-227.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2007.03.015
- Gong, Y., Zhao, D., & Wang, Q. (2018). An overview of field-scale studies on remediation of soil
 contaminated with heavy metals and metalloids: Technical progress over the last decade. *Water research*, 147, 440-460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.10.024
- Harmsen, J. (2007). Measuring bioavailability: from a scientific approach to standard methods. *Journal of Environmental quality*, 36(5), 1420-1428. https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2006.0492
- Harper M.P., Davison W., & Tych W. (2000). DIFS—a modelling and simulation tool for DGT induced
 trace metal remobilisation in sediments and soils. *Environmental Modelling & Software, 15*, 55-66.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/s1364-8152(99)00027-4
- Huang, X. F., Chaparro, J. M., Reardon, K. F., Zhang, R., Shen, Q., & Vivanco, J. M. (2014).
 Rhizosphere interactions: root exudates, microbes, and microbial communities. *Botany*, 92(4), 267275. https://doi.org/10.1139/cjb-2013-0225
- Ifon, B. E., Togbé, A. C. F., Tometin, L. A. S., Suanon, F., & Yessoufou, A. (2019). Metal-contaminated
 soil remediation: phytoremediation, chemical leaching and electrochemical remediation. In *Metals in Soil-Contamination and Remediation* (pp. 534-554). London: IntechOpen.
- 518 Järup L (2003) Hazards of heavy metal contamination. British Medical Bulletin, 68 (1),167-182
- Juhasz, A. L., Weber, J., Naidu, R., Gancarz, D., Rofe, A., Todor, D., & Smith, E. (2010). Determination
 of cadmium relative bioavailability in contaminated soils and its prediction using in vitro
 methodologies. *Environmental science* & *technology*, 44(13), 5240-5247.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/es1006516
- Juhasz, A. L., Weber, J., Smith, E., Naidu, R., Rees, M., Rofe, A., Kuchel, T., & Sansom, L. (2009).
 Assessment of four commonly employed in vitro arsenic bioaccessibility assays for predicting in
 vivo relative arsenic bioavailability in contaminated soils. *Environmental science & technology*,
 43(24), 9487-9494. https://doi.org/10.1021/es902427y
- Kelley, M. E., Brauning, S. E., Schoof, R. A., & Ruby, M. V. (2002). Assessing oral bioavailability of
 metals in soil. Battelle Press.
- Krishnamurti, G., Huang, P., Van Rees, K., Kozak, M., & Rostad, H. (1995). Speciation of particulatebound cadmium of soils and its bioavailability. *Analyst*, *120*(3), 659-665.
- Li, H. B., Li, M. Y., Zhao, D., Li, J., Li, S. W., Xiang, P., Juhasz, A.L., & Ma, L. Q. (2020a). Arsenic,
 lead, and cadmium bioaccessibility in contaminated soils: measurements and validations. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, 50(13), 1303-1338.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/10643389.2019.1656512
- Li, J., Li, C., Sun, H. J., Juhasz, A. L., Luo, J., Li, H. B., & Ma, L. Q. (2016). Arsenic relative
 bioavailability in contaminated soils: comparison of animal models, dosing schemes, and biological
 end points. *Environmental science* & *technology*, 50(1), 453-461.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b04552
- Li, S. W., Li, M. Y., Sun, H. J., Li, H. B., & Ma, L. Q. (2020b). Lead bioavailability in different fractions
 of mining-and smelting-contaminated soils based on a sequential extraction and mouse kidney
 model. *Environmental Pollution*, 262, 114253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114253
- 542 Li, Y., Wang, Z., & Zhao, W.-J. (2006). Application of Short Sequential Extraction Procedure (SSEP) for

- the Determination of Zn, Cu, and Cd Contents in Riverbed Sludge in Hejiagou, Harbin, China1
 1Supported by the National Key Basic Research Priorities Program of China (No. 2004CB3418501). *Chemical Research in Chinese Universities*, 22(6), 696-702. https://doi.org/10.1016/S10059040(06)60193-1
- Lu, Y., Gong, Z., Zhang, G., & Burghardt, W. (2003). Concentrations and chemical speciations of Cu,
 Zn, Pb and Cr of urban soils in Nanjing, China. *Geoderma*, *115*(1-2), 101-111.
- Maiz I, Esnaola MV, Millán E (1997) Evaluation of heavy metal availability in contaminated soils by a
 short sequential extraction procedure. *Science of The Total Environment, 206*, 107-115.
- Meyer, J. S. (2002). The utility of the terms "bioavailability" and "bioavailable fraction" for metals.
 Marine Environmental Research, 53(4), 417-423. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0141-1136(01)00121-0
- Muhammad, I., Puschenreiter, M., & Wenzel, W. W. (2012). Cadmium and Zn availability as affected by
 pH manipulation and its assessment by soil extraction, DGT and indicator plants. *Science of The Total Environment*, *416*, 490-500.
- 556 Nriagu, J. O. (1996). A history of global metal pollution. *Science*, 272(5259), 223-223.
 557 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.272.5259.223
- Preciado, H. F., & Li, L. Y. (2006). Evaluation of Metal Loadings and Bioavailability in Air, Water and
 Soil Along Two Highways of British Columbia, Canada. *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution, 172*(1), 81108. doi: 10.1007/s11270-005-9063-0
- Pueyo, M., Lopez-Sanchez, J., & Rauret, G. (2004). Assessment of CaCl2, NaNO3 and NH4NO3
 extraction procedures for the study of Cd, Cu, Pb and Zn extractability in contaminated soils. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 504(2), 217-226.
- 564 Raskin, I., & Ensley, B. D. (2000). Phytoremediation of toxic metals: John Wiley.
- Rauret, G., López-Sánchez, J. F., Sahuquillo, A., Rubio, R., Davidson, C., Ure, A., & Quevauviller, P.
 (1999). Improvement of the BCR three step sequential extraction procedure prior to the certification
 of new sediment and soil reference materials. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring, 1*(1), 57-61.
 https://doi.org/10.1039/A807854H
- Riaz, U., Aslam, A., Zaman, Q., Javeid, S., Gul, R., Iqbal, S., Javid, S., Murtaza, D. G., & Jamil, M.
 (2021). Cadmium contamination, bioavailability, uptake mechanism and remediation strategies in
 soil-plant-environment system: a critical review. *Current Analytical Chemistry*, 17(1), 49-60.
 https://doi.org/10.2174/1573411016999200817174311
- 573 Rieuwerts, J. S., & Farago, M. E. (1995). Lead contamination in smelting and mining environments and
 574 variations in chemical forms and bioavailability. *Chemical Speciation & Bioavailability*, 7(4), 113575 123.
- Sarwar, N., Imran, M., Shaheen, M. R., Ishaque, W., Kamran, M. A., Matloob, A., . . . Hussain, S. (2017).
 Phytoremediation strategies for soils contaminated with heavy metals: Modifications and future
 perspectives. *Chemosphere*, 171, 710-721. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.12.116
- Senila, M., Levei, E. A., & Senila, L. R. (2012). Assessment of metals bioavailability to vegetables under
 field conditions using DGT, single extractions and multivariate statistics. *Chemistry Central Journal*,
 6(1), 1-10.
- Sun, Y., Li, H., Guo, G., Semple, K. T., & Jones, K. C. (2019). Soil contamination in China: Current
 priorities, defining background levels and standards for heavy metals. *Journal of Environmental Management, 251*, 109512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109512
- Sun, Y., Li, H., Lei, S., Semple, K., Coulon, F., Hu, Q., Gao, J., Guo, G., & Jones, K. C. (2022).
 Redevelopment of urban brownfield sites in China: motivation, history, policies and improved

- 587 management. *Eco-Environment & Health*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eehl.2022.04.005
- Tessier, A. P. G. C., Campbell, P. G., & Bisson, M. J. A. C. (1979). Sequential extraction procedure for
 the speciation of particulate trace metals. *Analytical chemistry*, 51(7), 844-851.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/ac50043a017
- Towers W, Paterson E (1997) Sewage sludge application to land a preliminary assessment of the
 sensitivity of Scottish soils to heavy metal inputs. *Soil Use & Management*, 13, 149-155.
- USEPA (United States Environment Protection Agency) (2007) Guidance for Evaluating the Oral
 Bioavailability of Metals in Soils for Use in Human Health Risk Assessment. OSWER 9285, 7-80.
- USEPA (United States Environment Protection Agency) (2021) EPA scientists develop method for
 assessing bioavailability of arsenic & lead in contaminated soils. Retrieved December 10, 2021,
 from https://www.epa.gov/land-research/epa-scientists-develop-method-assessing-bioavailability arsenic-lead-contaminated.
- Whalley, C., & Grant, A. (1994). Assessment of the phase selectivity of the European Community Bureau
 of Reference (BCR) sequential extraction procedure for metals in sediment. *Analytica Chimica Acta*,
 291(3), 287-295.
- Yan, A., Wang, Y., Tan, S. N., Mohd Yusof, M. L., Ghosh, S., & Chen, Z. (2020). Phytoremediation: a
 promising approach for revegetation of heavy metal-polluted land. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 11,
 359.
- Zgorelec, Z., Bilandzija, N., Knez, K., Galic, M., & Zuzul, S. (2020). Cadmium and Mercury
 phytostabilization from soil using *Miscanthus* × giganteus. Scientific Reports, 10(1), 6685.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-63488-5
- Zhalnina, K., Louie, K. B., Hao, Z., Mansoori, N., da Rocha, U. N., Shi, S., Cho, H., Karaoz, U., Loqué,
 D., & Brodie, E. L. (2018). Dynamic root exudate chemistry and microbial substrate preferences
 drive patterns in rhizosphere microbial community assembly. *Nature microbiology*, *3*(4), 470-480.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-018-0129-3
- 612 Zhang, H., Davison, W., Knight, B., & McGrath, S. (1998). In situ measurements of solution
 613 concentrations and fluxes of trace metals in soils using DGT. *Environmental science & technology*,
 614 32(5), 704-710. https://doi.org/10.1021/es9704388
- Zhang, H., Davison, W., Miller, S., & Tych, W. (1995). In situ high resolution measurements of fluxes of
 Ni, Cu, Fe, and Mn and concentrations of Zn and Cd in porewaters by DGT. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 59(20), 4181-4192. https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(95)00293-9
- 618 Zhu, X., Li, M. Y., Chen, X. Q., Wang, J. Y., Li, L. Z., Tu, C., Luo, Y. M., Li, H. B., & Ma, L. Q. (2019).
- As, Cd, and Pb relative bioavailability in contaminated soils: Coupling mouse bioassay with UBM
- assay. Environment international, 130, 104875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.05.069