RESEARCH ARTICLE



The phytoremediation effect of *Medicago scutellata* (L.) Mill. on soils under Cd–water stress: a good choice for contaminated dry lands

Shahrbanoo Parsamanesh¹ • Hossein Sadeghi¹

Received: 14 October 2018 / Accepted: 16 July 2019 / Published online: 7 August 2019 © Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2019

Abstract

Recently, due to increased drought risks, need for crops with higher water stress tolerance has increased strongly. Those crops have a wide range of uses such as supplying food as well as land restoration. *Medicago scutellata* (L.) Mill. is a Fabaceae widely cultivated for its capacity to produce high-quality forage. This study was designed as a factorial experiment based on a completely randomized design with three replications. Different cadmium levels were the first factor and included 0, 5, 25, 50, 100, and 125 mg kg⁻¹. Second factor was the drought stress, which had three levels (100, 75, and 50% feed consumption). According to the results, Cd uptake in different organs increased with increasing Cd levels up to 100 mg kg⁻¹ while the water stress had a negative effect on Cd uptake by *M. scutellata*. Average concentration of Cd in the leaves, stems, and roots were 63.16, 30.12, and 20.45 mg kg⁻¹, respectively. The high value of translocation factor (TF) confirms the high ability of *M. scutellata* in translocation Cd from root to shoot. Fe, Zn, and K concentration of different organs significantly decreased with increasing Cd level. Fe and Zn concentration increased by increasing water stress levels in all organs and K concentration of roots decreased while in leaves and shoots increased by increasing water stress level. These results indicate that *M. scutellata* has a good ability for eliminating Cd from contaminated soil attribute to its powerful absorption and accumulation for Cd. It also showed a good performance under the co exposure of water stress and Cd indicated by accumulating proline and K in leaves.

Keywords Phytoremediation · Water stress · Animal consumption · Translocation factor

Introduction

From a global view after climate, soil crust is considered as one of the important parts of the human environment. Soil is not only considered as the living environment for terrestrial organism, especially human, but also a unique environment for the other

Highlights

- Average concentration of Cd in leaves was 63.16 mg kg^{-1} , 6 times more than standard limits.
- Fe, Zn, and K concentration of different organs significantly decreased with increasing Cd level
- It also showed a good performance under the co-exposure of water stress and Cd.
- It cannot be a good choice for phytoremediation due to the further transfer into the food chain

Responsible editor: Elena Maestri

☑ Hossein Sadeghi
 Sadeghih@shirazu.ac.ir; Sadeghi3007@gmail.com

¹ Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Engineering, College of Agriculture, Shiraz University, Shiraz 71441-65186, Iran living organisms such as plants. Soil contamination by inorganic pollutants such as heavy metals is one of environmental hazards that threaten human life today. Soil pollution causes loss of vegetation, reducing the plants growth and development, rangeland degradation, soil erosion, and finally desertification. Excessive accumulation of heavy metals in soil reduces biological activity and fertility resulting in reduced yield and quality loss of products that can be dangerous to human health or animal consumption (Stingu et al. 2012).

Cadmium (Cd) is the most prevalent pollution heavy metal in soil which is toxic to human and animal. Cadmium is used in some kinds of batteries, plastic byproducts, fertilizers, and pesticides (Amini et al. 2005). The total amount of Cd in agricultural soils should not exceed $0.4-0.5 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ and higher values reflect the excessive use of phosphatic fertilizers as well as sewage sludge (Bjelkova et al. 2011; Stingu et al. 2012). During the past 30 to 40 years, using of fertilizers containing phosphoric acid (superphosphate and ammonium phosphate) to agricultural soil in the Iran has increased. Most of agricultural lands in Iran received 100–300 kg superphosphate per hectare annually for more than four decades (Jalali and Khanlari 2008). Amini et al. (2005) assessed 255 top soil samples from central Iran; they reported the total Cd concentration in most of tested samples were more than recommended thresholds of 0.8 mg kg⁻¹. Therefore, ways to remove or degrade this pollutant has been a great concern. Phytoremediation is a green, simple, eco-friendly, sustainable, and cost-effective remediation technology that uses plants to remove and degrade contaminants from the soil. In this regard, *Medicago* species has been widely adopted for the phytoremediation of polluted soils with heavy metals (Lopez et al. 2005; Fan et al. 2008; Wei and Pan 2010). *Medicago sativa* L. has shown the ability to hyperaccumulate heavy metals in its tissues (Angle and Linacre 2005) and to grow well in highly contaminated soils (Amer et al. 2013).

Arid and semi-arid regions comprise more than 60% of Iran (Fakhari and Sadeghi 2016). The average annual rainfall in Iran is about 251 mm and recently, due to increased drought risks, need for crops with higher water stress tolerance has increased strongly (Sadeghi and Robati 2015). Medicago scutellata (L.) Mill. is a Fabaceae widely cultivated for it capacity to produce high-quality forage (Fakhari and Sadeghi 2016). Annual Medicago is found in almost all regions of Iran. More than 556,000 ha of Medicago species are grown as continuous cropping in Iran. This suggests that these plants are appropriate for Iranian pastures. Medicago has several annual species, such as Medicago rigidula L., Medicago polymorpha L., and Medicago scutellata L., which can produce high numbers of seeds. It establishes relatively easily but its early growth in autumn is rapid and erect, making it susceptible to overgrazing (Sadeghi and Fakhari 2016). The barrel medic is adapted to different soil texture types, from sandy to clay, and particularly to well-drained neutral-to-alkaline soils with a pH of 6 to 8; it is suited to warm temperate conditions, especially Mediterraneantype climates, has 250-600 mm annual rainfall with dry hot summers and mild moist winters, and is intolerant of winter frosts. It has poor regrowth for a second harvest, but has a good ability to self-regenerate from seeds present in the soil seed bank (Fakhari and Sadeghi 2016). Legumes are a good choice for phytoremediation since they have the capability of N₂ fixation (Amer et al. 2013). A review of current literature indicated that no research, to best of our knowledge, has yet tested the coexposure of Cd and water stress on the phytoremediation ability of M. scutellata. Therefore, the present study was designed with the intention to evaluate the biochemical response of M. scutellata to Cd-water stress co-exposures and its utilization potential for phytoremediation.

Materials and methods

Study site and plant material

This research was conducted as a factorial experiment based on completely randomized design in a greenhouse at the College of Agriculture, Shiraz University (29° 43' N and 52° 35' W), Shiraz, Iran, during 2014. The temperatures of day and night in the greenhouse were set at 28 and 22 °C. The seeds of *Medicago scutellata* were prepared from Pakan Bazr Co. and stored at 5 °C.

Experimental design

Silty clay loam soil collected from the surface layer (0–30 cm) of soils (fine mixed, mesic Typic Calcixerpets soil) in the College of Agriculture was selected for the pot experiments. Some of soil characteristics are presented in Table 1 and the heavy metals of original soil were as follows: absorbable Cd, 0.2 mg kg⁻¹; absorbable Pb, 0.4 mg kg⁻¹; absorbable Cu, 1.31 mg kg⁻¹; and absorbable Ni, 0.15 mg kg⁻¹.

Silty clay loam soil gathered from the top layer (0–30 cm) of soils in the College of Agriculture was selected for the pot experiments. Some of soil characteristics are presented in Table 1. Soil samples were air dried and grounded to pass 2-mm nylon sieve prior to use. The soils were spiked with sulfuric acid cadmium salt at the rate of 0, 5, 25, 50, 100, and 125 mg kg⁻¹ and incubated for 2 weeks. After incubation, each plastic pot was filled with 4 kg of the treated soil. Ten seeds were planted in each pot. After emergence, six plants per pot were kept. Pots were watered at field capacity. Water stress was imposed on the plants 20 days after planting by applying different irrigation regimes (100% as control, 75% and 50% field capacity (FC)) for 3 months. At the end of the trial, different plant organs (roots, shoot, leaves) were separated and sampled for analysis.

Analysis and measurement

The harvested plant parts were washed completely with distilled water, dried at 70 °C, and weighed. For the measurement of mineral elements, plant samples were dried at 550 °C for 4 h to obtain ashes, then extracted with 2 M HCl, filtered through Whatman No. 42 filter paper, and analyzed for Cd, Fe, and Zn by an atomic absorption spectrophotometer (model Perkin Elmer 4110) (Azizian et al. 2011). Potassium concentrations were determined by flame photometry (INESA, FP6410, Shanghai, China). Available metals were determined using diethylene-triamine-pentaacetic acid (DTPA) buffered at pH 7.3. Cadmium was determined by atomic absorption spectrophotometry (AAS).

For the proline measurements, plant's part samples were grounded in liquid nitrogen. The concentration of proline was estimated based on the acid-ninhydrin method (Bates et al.

 Table 1
 Chemical and physical properties of the pot soil

Soil texture	Sand (%)	Silt (%)	Clay (%)	EC ($dS m^{-1}$)	pН
Silt clay loam	16	48	36	0.9	7.1

Table 2 Analysis variance of the effect of cadmium [Cd] and water stress on measured factors of M. scutellata

Source of variance	Degree of	Mean squa	res	Leaves	Soil [Cd]	ТЕ	Root [Fe]	Stem [Fe]	Leaves [Fe]
	needom	Koot [Cu]	[Cd]	[Cd]	Son [Cu]	11	Koot [I'e]		
Cd	5	2674.38**	4204.12**	24905.90**	1050.85**	23.13**	1076071.1^{**}	294258.6**	47704.8**
Water stress	2	780.22**	531.57**	7035.04**	6.97**	0.49 ^{ns}	174645.08**	41365.02**	62278.5**
$Cd \times water stress$	10	133.77**	78.70^{**}	931.92**	2.30**	3.10**	5231.34**	5667.20**	1472.6**
Error	36	1.16	0.52	13.67	0.046	2.08	138.88	67.48	36.78
Coefficient variance		5.27	2.395	5.85	2.41	29.26	1.65	1.74	1.07
Source of	Degree of		Mean squa	res					
variance	freedom	Root [Zn]	Stem [Zn]	Leaves [Zn]	Root [K]	Stem [K]	Leaves [K]	Proline	Crude protein
Cd	5	1854.09**	1367.68**	1586.45**	3860296.3**	6408185.19**	1798611.11**	2.30**	289.8**
Water stress	2	1334.8**	973.45**	351.33**	7744629.63**	2667407.41**	10371666.6**	162**	66.06**
$Cd \times water stress$	10	80.06**	48.45**	12.38**	56407.41 ^{ns}	12074.07**	55444.44**	1.93 ^{ns}	0.07
Error	36	1.35	1.03	0.67	12592.59	8703.7	11666.7	1.64	0.17
Coefficient variance		2.64	2.45	2.23	2.81	2.91	1.98	11.69	2.59

TF translocation factor, ns non-significant

* Significant at $(p \le 0.05)$

** Significant at $(p \le 0.01)$

1973) by spectrophotometer with minor modifications (Fakhari and Sadeghi 2016).

Crude protein was estimated from nitrogen by multiplying total N by 6.25, according to the Kjeldahl method described in

Table 3Cadmium concentration $(mg kg^{-1})$ concentration indifferent organs (root, shoot,leaves) of *M. scutellata* at variouswater stress and cadmium levels

W.S.L (FC%)	Cadmium	level (mg kg)				
	0	5	25	50	100	125	Mean
Cd in roots							
50%	0.400k	5.466j	10.366i	14.866g	27.566e	27.133e	14.295C
75%	0.866k	9.366i	12.533h	15.166g	41.333c	38.766d	19.666B
100%	1.083k	10.566i	15.330g	23.266f	59.200a	54.966b	27.394A
Mean	0.783F	8.466E	12.733D	17.776C	42.7A	40.288B	
Cd in shoot							
50%	0.4661	10.133j	13.566i	32.400f	41.220d	55.533b	25.552C
75%	1.206kl	13.490i	19.233g	37.133e	45.666c	55.433b	28.695B
100%	1.80k	15.366h	33.133f	45.920c	64.466a	56.110b	36.134A
Mean	1.157F	12.998E	21.978D	38.487C	50.451B	55.693A	
Cd in leaves							
50%	0.533k	14.333j	18.770j	78.366e	115.510d	56.633g	47.359C
75%	2.190k	17.750j	49.433h	81.750e	127.910c	61.766fg	56.803B
100%	3.110k	28.990i	66.280f	156.530b	180.780a	76.280e	85.332A
Mean	1.948F	20.362E	44.830D	105.551B	141.403A	64.896C	
Cd in soil							
50%	0.2401	2.333j	5.300g	8.300e	8.700d	31.933a	9.468A
75%	0.1731	2.100jk	4.833h	7.760f	8.330e	30.616b	8.970B
100%	0.1071	1.7830k	4.366i	7.600f	8.217e	27.310c	8.230C
Mean	0.173F	2.072E	4.833D	7.889C	8.417B	29.953A	

W.S.L water stress level

Means within each parameter followed by the same letter are not significantly different at $p \le 0.05$. Capital letters are used for the main effects

Table 4The effect of cadmium[Cd] and water stress onTranslocation factor (TF) of*M. scutellata*

W.S.L (FC%)	Cadmium le	evel (mg kg ^{-1})					
	0	5	25	50	100	125	Mean
50%	1.66bcdef	1.92abcde	1.29fgh	2.18ab	1.49defgh	2.02abc	1.76A
75%	1.61cdefg	1.45efgh	1.52cdefgh	2.37a	1.11gh	1.43efgh	1.58A
100%	1.76bcdef	1.46defgh	2.17ab	1.97abcd	1.09gh	1.01h	1.58A
Mean	1.680B	1.61B	1.66B	2.17A	1.23C	1.49CB	

W.S.L water stress level

Means within each parameter followed by the same letter are not significantly different at $p \le 0.05$. Capital letters are used for the main effects

the Association of Official Analytical Chemists (2002). The translocation factor (TF) from root to shoot was calculated as follows (Su et al. 2014):

$$TF = \frac{[Cd]shoot}{[Cd]root}$$

Statistical analysis

This experiment was conducted as a factorial experiment based on a completely randomized design with three replications. Analysis was performed with SAS Program Version 9.1.3 (2004). Different cadmium levels were the first factor and included 0, 5, 25, 50, 100, and 125 mg kg⁻¹. Second factor was the water stress, which had three levels (100, 75, and 50% FC).

Results

Some physiochemical properties of the selected soil for the pot experiment are presented in Table 1. The tested soil has a medium texture (silty clay loam) with no acidity and salinity problem and its cadmium (Cd) level was very low.

ANOVA (Table 2) showed that the interaction effect of the cadmium application and water stress ([CD] \times water stress) was significant on all the measured factors of *Medicago scutellata*, with the exception of potassium concentration in root and proline content, at 1% probability level. However, the main effect of cadmium application and water stress was significant at 1% probability level about potassium concentration in root and proline content (Table 2).

According to Table 3, with increasing the level of cadmium of up to 100 mg kg^{-1} , Cd concentration in roots, stems, and

W.S.L (FC%) Cadmium level (mg kg^{-1}) 0 5 25 50 100 125 Mean Fe in root 50% 1228.36a 1052.66c 1001.33d 645.86i 495.06jk 499.00j 820.38A 75% 679.08B 1226.66a 947.86e 836.00g 476.33kl 284.33m 303.30m 100% 1074.00b 911.43f 783.96h 475.361 256.00n 284.33m 630.85C 1176.34A 970.65B 837.76C 532.51D 345.13F 362.22E Mean Fe in shoot 50% 887.133a 682.433c 512.066g 355.433j 338.333j 351.00ij 521.067A 75% 720.366b 311.333kl 468.844B 616.666e 501.966g 341.066j 321.666k 100% 311.366kl 425.322C 637.33d 578.633f 414.266h 304.1331 306.211 748.278A 625.911B 476.1C 335.956D 321.378E 322.844E Mean Fe in leaves 50% 710.966a 692.4b 662.4c 618.533e 530.733j 534.00ij 624.839A 75% 659.566c 633.4d 541.933hi 509.400k 495.0661 500.033kl 556.567B 100% 586.433f 570.666f 550.533h 501.533kl 414.233m 423.00m 507.733C 652.322A 480.011E 458.678E 632.156B 584.956C 543.156D Mean

W.S.L water stress level

Means within each parameter followed by the same letter are not significantly different at $p \le 0.05$. Capital letters are used for the main effects

Table 5Iron [Fe] concentrationin different organs (root, shoot,leaves) of *M. scutellata* at variouswater stress and cadmium levels

 Table 6
 Zinc [Zn] concentration

 in different organs (root, shoot, leaves) of *M. scutellata* at various

 water stress and cadmium levels

0 5 25 50 100 1 Zn in root 50% 81.366a 56.633c 51.433d 39.666f 28.033i 5 50% 59.610b 56.966c 47.133e 37.533g 26.366ij 3 100% 56.500c 45.733e 32.600h 25.133j 19.780k 3 Mean 65.828A 53.111B 43.722C 34.111D 24.728E 4 Zn in shoot 50% 72.233a 54.8cd 48.566f 38.200h 26.33k 5 50% 72.233a 54.8cd 43.466g 36.033i 22.510f 3 100% 55.133c 44.833g 30.566j 25.900k 18.43m 3 Mean 61.589A 50.911B 40.867C 33.378E 22.411F 3			ever (ing kg	.)				
Zn in root State State		0	5	25	50	100	125	Mean
50%81.366a56.633c51.433d39.666f28.033i575%59.610b56.966c47.133e37.533g26.366ij3100%56.500c45.733e32.600h25.133j19.780k3Mean65.828A53.111B43.722C34.111D24.728E4Zn in shoot50%72.233a54.8cd48.566f38.200h26.33k575%57.400b53.100e43.466g36.033i22.510f3100%55.133c44.833g30.566j25.900k18.43m3Mean61.589A50.911B40.867C33.378E22.411F3	Zn in root							
75%59.610b56.966c47.133e37.533g26.366ij3100%56.500c45.733e32.600h25.133j19.780k3Mean65.828A53.111B43.722C34.111D24.728E4Zn in shoot50%72.233a54.8cd48.566f38.200h26.33k575%57.400b53.100e43.466g36.033i22.510f3100%55.133c44.833g30.566j25.900k18.43m3Mean61.589A50.911B40.867C33.378E22.411F3	50%	81.366a	56.633c	51.433d	39.666f	28.033i	57.500c	52.439A
100%56.500c45.733e32.600h25.133j19.780k3Mean65.828A53.111B43.722C34.111D24.728E4Zn in shoot50%72.233a54.8cd48.566f38.200h26.33k575%57.400b53.100e43.466g36.033i22.510f3100%55.133c44.833g30.566j25.900k18.43m3Mean61.589A50.911B40.867C33.378E22.411F3	75%	59.610b	56.966c	47.133e	37.533g	26.366ij	39.4fg	44.503B
Mean 65.828A 53.111B 43.722C 34.111D 24.728E 4 Zn in shoot 50% 72.233a 54.8cd 48.566f 38.200h 26.33k 5 50% 72.233a 54.8cd 43.466g 36.033i 22.510f 3 100% 55.133c 44.833g 30.566j 25.900k 18.43m 3 Mean 61.589A 50.911B 40.867C 33.378E 22.411F 3	100%	56.500c	45.733e	32.600h	25.133j	19.780k	31.65h	35.233C
Zn in shoot 72.233a 54.8cd 48.566f 38.200h 26.33k 5 75% 57.400b 53.100e 43.466g 36.033i 22.510f 3 100% 55.133c 44.833g 30.566j 25.900k 18.43m 3 Mean 61.589A 50.911B 40.867C 33.378E 22.411F 3	Mean	65.828A	53.111B	43.722C	34.111D	24.728E	42.85C	
50%72.233a54.8cd48.566f38.200h26.33k575%57.400b53.100e43.466g36.033i22.510f3100%55.133c44.833g30.566j25.900k18.43m3Mean61.589A50.911B40.867C33.378E22.411F3	Zn in shoot							
75%57.400b53.100e43.466g36.033i22.510f3100%55.133c44.833g30.566j25.900k18.43m3Mean61.589A50.911B40.867C33.378E22.411F3	50%	72.233a	54.8cd	48.566f	38.200h	26.33k	53.233de	48.889A
100%55.133c44.833g30.566j25.900k18.43m3Mean61.589A50.911B40.867C33.378E22.411F3	75%	57.400b	53.100e	43.466g	36.033i	22.510f	35.330i	41.306B
Mean 61.589A 50.911B 40.867C 33.378E 22.411F 3	100%	55.133c	44.833g	30.566j	25.900k	18.43m	35.233j	34.183C
	Mean	61.589A	50.911B	40.867C	33.378E	22.411F	39.6D	
Zn in leaves	In in leaves							
50% 64.833a 50.533d 42.800e 33.266g 22.466k 3	50%	64.833a	50.533d	42.800e	33.266g	22.466k	34.866f	41.461A
75% 56.066b 42.666e 32.566gh 31.533h 19.533l 3	75%	56.066b	42.666e	32.566gh	31.533h	19.5331	32.133gh	35.750B
100% 53.100c 41.633e 29.466i 27.666j 16.330m 2	100%	53.100c	41.633e	29.466i	27.666j	16.330m	28.500ij	32.767C
Mean 58.00A 44.944B 34.944C 30.80E 19.433F 3	Mean	58.00A	44.944B	34.944C	30.80E	19.433F	31.833D	

W.S.L water stress level

Means within each parameter followed by the same letter are not significantly different at $p \le 0.05$. Capital letters are used for the main effects

leaves increased but then decreased at the level of 125 mg kg⁻¹ and the Cd concentration of different organs (roots, stems, and leaves) reduced with increasing water stress level from 100 to 50% FC (Table 3). The highest Cd average concentration of root was observed at 100 mg kg⁻¹ and 100% FC which increased 54-fold compared with the control (0 mg kg⁻¹)

cadmium and 100% FC). Cadmium concentration of roots from 100 to 125 mg kg⁻¹ decreased 7% (Table 3). The highest Cd average of shoot and leaves belonged to 100 mg kg⁻¹ and 100% FC which increased 35-fold and 58-fold compared with the control, respectively (Table 3). The average concentrations of Cd in leaves, stems, and roots were 63.16, 30.12, and

Table 7Potassium [K]concentration in different organs(root, shoot, leaves) of*M. scutellata* at various waterstress and cadmium levels

W.S.L (FC%)	Cadmium l	evel (mg kg ⁻¹))				
	0	5	25	50	100	125	Mean
K in root							
50%	3800c	3733.33c	3033.33f	2400.00h	153.33j	2533.33h	2838.89C
75%	4000b	4033.33b	3466.66d	2833.33g	1833.33i	2800.00g	3161.11B
100%	4466.66a	4533.33a	3800.00c	3133.33f	2400.00h	3300.00e	3605.56A
Mean	4088.89A	4100A	3433.33B	2788.89C	1922.22D	2877.78C	
K in shoot							
50%	5400.00a	5433.33a	4600.00c	4166.66e	3766.66f	4400.00d	4627.78A
75%	4833.33b	4766.66bc	3766.66f	3600.00f	3000.00gh	4100.00e	4011.11B
100%	4100.00e	4066.66e	3000.00gh	2900.00h	2700.00i	3133.33g	3316.67C
Mean	4777.78A	4755.56A	3788.89B	3555.56C	3155.56D	3877.78B	
K in leaves							
50%	7566.66a	7600.00a	7033.00b	5400.00e	3800.00j	5900.00d	6216.67A
75%	6800.00c	6766.66c	6000.00d	4800.00g	3033.33k	5000.00f	5400.00B
100%	6033.00d	6000.00d	5066.66f	4100.00i	2500.001	4500.00h	4700.00C
Mean	6800.00A	6788.89A	6033.33B	4766.67D	3111.11E	5133.33C	

W.S.L water stress level

Means within each parameter followed by the same letter are not significantly different at $p \le 0.05$. Capital letters are used for the main effects

Table 8 Proline and crude protein content of *M. scutellata* at various water stress and cadmium levels

W.S.L (FC%)	Cadmium	n level (mg kg)				
	0	5	25	50	100	125	Mean
Proline (µM/g d	lry weight)						
50%	11.37c	12.31c	12.81bc	14.50ab	14.833ab	15.13a	13.495A
75%	7.53de	11.40c	12.11c	12.90bc	13.13abc	13.14abc	11.747B
100%	6.47e	6.86de	7.166de	8.267d	8.300de	8.83d	7.651C
Mean	8.459D	10.19C	10.69BC	11.889AB	12.089A	12.456A	
Crude protein (4	%)						
50%	19.76c	19.20c	17.50d	13.43f	8.26i	6.46j	14.106C
75%	21.43b	21.60b	19.160c	15.16e	10.33h	7.96i	15.870B
100%	23.30a	23.60a	21.30b	17.10d	12.56g	10.16h	17.933A
Mean	21.50A	21.178A	19.32B	15.23C	10.39D	8.20E	

W.S.L water stress level

Means within each parameter followed by the same letter are not significantly different at $p \le 0.05$. Capital letters are used for the main effects

20.45 mg kg⁻¹, respectively. In other words, the average concentrations of Cd in leaves and shoots were 3.08 and 1.47 times higher than roots, respectively. The highest amount of Cd in soil was observed at 125 mg kg⁻¹ Cd under 50% FC which was 298 times higher than control (0 mg kg⁻¹ cadmium and 100% FC) (Table 3).

The highest translocation factor (TF) was observed at the concentration of 50 mg kg⁻¹ under 75% FC while the lowest one, with 50% reduction, was observed at 125 mg kg⁻¹ under 100% FC (Table 4). In all treatments, the TF was more than 1 which reflected the high ability of *M. scutellata* in translocation Cd from root to shoot (Table 4).

According to Table 5, the average of iron (Fe) concentration in different organs (root, shoot, and leaves) decreased with the increasing Cd level from 0 to 125 mg kg⁻¹. Under water stress, the Fe concentration of different organs significantly increased. In all tested organs, the highest Fe concentration belonged to the 0 mg kg⁻¹ Cd and 50% FC while the lowest one was observed at 100 mg kg⁻¹ and 100% FC (Table 5).

Table 6 showed that Zinc (Zn) concentration in different organs increased significantly with the increasing water stress level from 100 to 50% FC. Similar to Fe concentration, in all organs (roots, shoots, and leaves), the highest Zn concentration belonged to the 0 mg kg⁻¹ Cd under 50% FC while the lowest one was observed at 100 mg kg⁻¹ and 100% FC. Also, the average of Zn concentration in different organs decreased with increasing Cd level from 0 to 125 mg kg⁻¹ (Table 6).

Potassium (K) concentration of different organs significantly decreased with the increasing Cd level up to 100 mg kg⁻¹ but increased at 125 mg kg⁻¹ compared with 100 (Table 7). K concentration of roots decreased while in leaves and shoots increased by increasing water stress level. The highest amount of K concentration in all organs belonged to the 5 mg kg⁻¹ Cd under 50% FC while the lowest one was observed at 100 mg kg⁻¹ Cd and 100% FC in the case of shoots and leaves and 100 mg kg⁻¹ and 50% FC in the case of roots (Table 7).

According to Table 8, proline content increased significantly with the increasing Cd level and water stress. The highest amount of proline content was observed at 125 mg kg⁻¹ Cd under 50% FC while the lowest one belonged to the control treatment. Unlike proline, the percentage of crude protein decreased significantly with the increasing Cd level and water stress. The highest percentage of crude protein was observed in control treatment while the lowest belonged to 125 mg kg⁻¹ Cd and 50% FC. By consuming Cd, protein content decreased significantly (Table 8).

The result of correlation analysis (Table 9) showed that the highest correlation coefficient was observed between Zn concentrations in roots with Zn concentration in shoot (0.991^{**}). Protein had negative and significant correlation with proline and Cd concentration in different organs; however, it showed a positive and significant correlation with other measured elements (Fe, Zn, and K). K showed a negative and significant correlation with Cd and positive and significant correlation with Zn and Fe concentration in different organs. Fe and Cd showed a negative and significant correlation within different organs (Table 9).

Discussion

In this study, the effect of different Cd levels of soil on the biochemical response of *Medicago scutellata* was investigated under water stress. According to the results, Cd uptake in different organs increased with increasing Cd levels up to 100 mg kg⁻¹ while the water stress had a negative effect on Cd uptake by *M. scutellata*. These results are supported by

ī

** Correlation is significant at $p \leq 0.01$

τı

Correlation coefficient between the measured variables

Table 9

	TF	Protein	Proline	K in leaves	K in shoot	K in root	Zn in leaves	Zn in shoot	Zn in root	Fe in leaves	Fe in shoot	Fe in root	Cd in leaves	Cd in shoot	Cd in roo
Cd in root Cd in shoot Cd in shoot Fe in root Fe in root Fe in leaves Zn in shoot Zn in shoot Zn in shoot K in root K in leaves Protine Protein	$\begin{array}{c} 0.300^*\\ -\ 0.115^{\rm fns}\\ 0.178^{\rm lns}\\ 0.178^{\rm lns}\\ 0.178^{\rm lns}\\ 0.241^{\rm lns}\\ 0.241^{\rm lns}\\ 0.145^{\rm lns}\\ 0.168^{\rm lns}\\ 0.168^{\rm lns}\\ 0.168^{\rm lns}\\ 0.145^{\rm lns}\\ 0.168^{\rm lns}\\ 0.155^{\rm lns}\\ 0.$	$\begin{array}{l} -0.744^{\text{we}}\\ -0.825^{\text{we}}\\ -0.8259^{\text{we}}\\ 0.559^{\text{we}}\\ 0.511^{\text{we}}\\ 0.571^{\text{we}}\\ 0.571^{\text{we}}\\ 0.571^{\text{we}}\\ 0.561^{\text{we}}\\ 0.855^{\text{we}}\\ 0.855^{\text{we}}\\ 0.569^{\text{we}}\\ 0.569^{\text{we}}\\ -0.606^{\text{we}}\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.087^{ns}\\ 0.231^{ns}\\ 0.072^{ns}\\ -0.254^{ns}\\ -0.252^{ns}\\ 0.093^{ns}\\ 0.045^{ns}\\ 0.045^{ns}\\ -0.01^{ns}\\ -0.01^{ns}\\ 0.245^{ns}\\ 0.245^{ns}\\ 0.017^{ns}\\ 0.017^{ns}\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -0.812 \\ -0.811 \\ -0.925 \\ 0.868 \\ 0.868 \\ 0.821 \\ 0.875 \\ 0.904 \\ 0.926 \\ 0.926 \\ 0.894 \\ 0.657 \\ 0.393 \\ 0.393 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -0.690^{**}\\ -0.707^{**}\\ 0.751^{**}\\ 0.753^{**}\\ 0.877^{**}\\ 0.890^{**}\\ 0.894^{**}\\ 0.845^{**}\\ 0.393^{**} \end{array}$	- 0.612** - 0.698** 0.725** 0.728** 0.459** 0.570** 0.570** 0.618** 0.710**	- 0.798 ** - 0.881 ** 0.755 ** 0.928 ** 0.928 ** 0.946 **	-0.762^{**} -0.893^{**} 0.843^{**} 0.876^{**} 0.991^{**}	- 0. 732 ** - 0. 705 ** 0.815 ** 0.815 ** 0.815 **	- 0.864 ** - 0.865 ** - 0.778 ** 0.893 ** 0.836 **	- 0.771 *** - 0.901 *** 0.931 **	- 0.900 *** (0.965 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 **** (0.833 *** (0.833 *** (0.833 ***)))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	759***).816**	••• 906.0	
* Correlation	is signific	ant at $p \leq 0$.05												

29071

Shen et al. (2002) who founded that Cd uptake of corn (*Zea mays* L.) increased with the increasing Cd level of soil. Azizian et al. (2011) also found the same results about Cd concentration of corn (*Zea mays* L.) and oat (*Avena sativa* L.) under different irrigation treatments. Gardea-Torresdey et al. (2000) reported that nickel uptake of (*Medicago sativa* L.) increased with increasing soil nickel and shoots showed to have more nickel concentration than the roots. In contrast, Bjelkova et al. (2011) observed that the most Cd was accumulated by roots in linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) cultivars. These phenomena may be due to a difference in chemical functional groups in the plants species roots and shoots.

Suitable plants for phytoremediation should be able to prevent the transportation of heavy metals to the aerial parts and keep them at the root level thus preventing them from entering to the food chain (Stingu et al. 2012), or they are grown for industrial, non-food purpose such as using in textile or furniture industry. In our study, the average concentrations of Cd in leaves and shoots were 3.08 and 1.47 times higher than roots. respectively. The high value of translocation factor (TF) confirms the high ability of M. scutellata in translocation Cd from root to shoot. Since the main application of *M. scutellata* is for forage production for feeding animals, this factor should be taken into consideration. Studies have shown that cattle which graze on metal contaminated plants will accumulate the toxic metals in their bodies which could then be passed to humans (Chamberlain and Miller 1982). The standard limit of Cd is 0.1 mg kg^{-1} of the weight of the plant for human consumption and 10 mg kg⁻¹ for animal consumption, while in our study, it was 63.16 mg kg⁻¹ just in leaves.

In our study, Cd concentration of different organs (roots, stems, and leaves) reduced with increasing water stress level; similar findings were reported by Angle et al. (2003) who observed higher metal uptake as well as biomass production at higher soil moisture.

Fe, Zn, and K concentration of different organs significantly decreased with the increasing Cd level. Wong et al. (1986) observed a significant reduction in Zn and Fe by increasing Cd level and stated it can be due to the antagonistic effects of accumulation of Cd in plant tissues on the uptake of these essential metals. Yildiz (2005) reported that Zn concentration in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) and corn (*Zea mays* L.) plant decreased by increasing Cd level. Also, similar findings were reported by Veselov et al. (2003) and Sandalio et al. (2001) in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) and pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) plants. Cd toxicity in plants can be due to the interaction with essential nutrients for the plant which cab affect the balance of nutrients and reduced plants fertility. Cadmium and zinc are chemically similar; hence, they are competing with each other for absorbing by plants (Nazar et al. 2012).

Fe and Zn concentration increased by increasing water stress level in all organs and K concentration of roots decreased while in leaves and shoots increased by increasing water stress level. These results are in line with the findings of Alizadeh (2010) in corn (*Zea mays* L.). Osmotic advantage of K in improving cell water saturation under water stress is well documented which can explain the reason of its translocation from roots to the aerial parts under water stress (Cakmak 2005; Zhao 2000).

According to the result, proline content increased significantly with increasing Cd level and water stress. Proline acts as an osmolyte as well as an osmoprotectant under stressed condition which helps in protecting of enzymes, biological membranes, and photosynthetic apparatus from oxidative damages (Batish et al. 2006). Since proline supplies energy for growth and survival, its accumulation during stress helps the plant to tolerate the stressed condition better and easier (Gill and Toteja 2010). The observations made in this study are parallel with that in earlier studies (Shah et al. 2001; Mehta and Gaur 1999; Parida et al. 2008). According to the results, protein content decreased significantly by increasing Cd level. Cd alters the conformation of proteins such as enzymes and transporter proteins due to its strong affinity as ligands to sulfhydryl and carboxylic group (Nazar et al. 2012). Studies have shown the activity of reactive oxygen species during stress can damage biological molecules such as proteins and lipids (Molassiotis et al. 2006).

Conclusion

The forage crop M. scutellata can be considered as a Cd accumulator plant species. It also showed a good performance under the co-exposure of water stress and Cd indicated by accumulating proline and K in leaves. Its translocation factor was more than 1 which reflected the high ability of M. scutellata in translocation Cd from root to shoot. The amount of Cd accumulation in leaves is about 63 mg kg^{-1} which is 6 times more than standard limit for animal consumption. Since the main application of *M. scutellata* is for forage production for feeding animals and it does not have any remarkable non-food uses, it cannot be a good choice, due to the further transfer into the food chain. However, the ability enhancement of Cd translocation to M. scutellata shoot in higher concentrations of soil Cd indicates a great performance of the plant for Cd phytoextraction and could be introduced as Cd hyperaccumulator plant.

References

Alizadeh O (2010) Evaluation effect of water stress and nitrogen rates on amount of absorbtion some macro and microelement in corn plant mycorrhiza and nonmycorrhiza. Adv Nat Appl Sci 4:153–158. https://doi.org/10.3923/rjbsci.2010.350.355

- Amer N, Al Chami Z, Al Bitar L, Mondelli D, Dumontet S (2013) Evaluation of Atriplex halimus, Medicago lupulina and Portulaca oleracea for phytoremediation of Ni, Pb and Zn. Int J Phytoremediation 15:498–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/15226514. 2012.716102
- Amini M, Khademi H, Afyuni M, Abbaspour KC (2005) Variability of available cadmium in relation to soil properties and land use in an arid region in central Iran. Water Air Soil Pollut 162:205–218. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-005-6273-4
- Angle JS, Linacre NA (2005) Metal phytoextraction a survey of potential risks. Int J Phytoremediation 7:241–254. https://doi.org/10. 1080/16226510500215779
- Angle JS, Baker AJM, Whiting NS, Chaney RL (2003) Soil moisture effects on uptake of metals by *Thlaspi*, *Alyssum*, and *Berkheya*. Plant Soil 256:325–332. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2004.04. 001
- Association of Official Analytical Chemists International (AOAC) (2002) Official methods of analysis, of AOAC international (17th ed.). Method, 950.46
- Azizian A, Amin S, Noshadi M, Maftoon M, Emam Y (2011) Phytoremediation potential of corn and oat for increased levels of soil cadmium under different irrigation intervals. Iran Agric Res 30(1):47–60
- Bates LS, Waldern RP, Teave ID (1973) Rapid determination of free proline for water stress studies. Plant Soil 39:205–209
- Batish DR, Singh HP, Setia N, Kaur S, Kohli RK (2006) 2-Benzoxazolinone (BOA) induced oxidative stress, lipid peroxidation and changes in some antioxidant enzyme activities in mung bean (*Phaseolus aureus*). Plant Physiol Biochem 44:819–827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2006.10.014
- Bjelkova M, Gencurova V, Griga M (2011) Accumulation of cadmium by flax and linseed cultivars in field-simulated conditions: a potential for phytoremediation of Cd-contaminated soils. Ind Crop Prod 33: 761–774. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2011.01.020
- Cakmak I (2005) The role of potassium in alleviating detrimental effects of abiotic stresses in plants. J Plant Nutr Soil Sci 168:521–530. https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.200420485
- Chamberlain WF, Miller JA (1982) Barium in forage plants and the manure of cattle treated with barium. J Agric Food Chem 30:463–465
- Fakhari F, Sadeghi H (2016) The effect of pod elimination on water stress in relation to antioxidant enzymes activity and proline in three annual medics species. J Crop Sci Biotechnol 19:109–115. https://doi. org/10.1007/s12892-015-0097-6
- Fan S, Li P, Gong Z, Ren W, He N (2008) Promotion of pyrene degradation in rhizosphere of alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.). Chemosphere 71:1593–1598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2007.10.068
- Gardea-Torresdey JL, Tiemann KJ, Gonzalez JH, Cano-Aguilera I, Henning JA, Townsend MS (2000) Ability of *Medicago sativa* (alfalfa) to remove nickel ions from aqueous solution. Proceedings of the 10th Annual Conference on Hazardous Waste Research 239-248
- Gill SS, Toteja N (2010) Reactive oxygen species and antioxidant machinery in abiotic stress tolerance in crop plants. Plant Physiol Biochem 48:909–930. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2010.08.016
- Jalali M, Khanlari ZV (2008) Cadmium availability in calcareous soils of agricultural lands in Hamadan, Western Iran. Soil Sediment Contam 17:256–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/15320380802006970
- Lopez ML, Peralta-Videa JR, Benitez T, Gardea-Torresdey JL (2005) Enhancement of lead uptake by alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*) using EDTA and a plant growth promoter. Chemosphere 61:595–598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2005.02.028
- Mehta SK, Gaur JP (1999) Heavy-metal-induced proline accumulation and its role in ameliorating metal toxicity in *Cohlorella vulgaris*. New Phytol 143:253–259
- Molassiotis A, Sotiropoulos T, Tanou G, Diamantidis G, Therios I (2006) Boron-induced oxidative damage and antioxidant and nucleolytic

responses in shoot tips culture of the apple rootstock EM9 (*Malus domestica* Borkh). Environ Exp Bot 56:54–62. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.envexpbot.2005.01.002

- Nazar R, Iqbal N, Masood A, Khan MIR, Syeed S, Khan NA (2012) Cadmium toxicity in plants and role of mineral nutrients in its alleviation. Am J Plant Sci 3:1476–1489. https://doi.org/10.4236/ajps. 2012.310178
- Parida AK, Dagaonkar VS, Phalak MS, Aurangabadkar LP (2008) Differential response of the enzymes involved in proline biosynthesis and degradation in drought tolerant and sensitive cotton genotypes during drought stress and recovery. Acta Physiol Plant 30: 619–627. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11738-008-0157-3
- Sadeghi H, Fakhari F (2016) Response of growth and nitrogen fixation to pod elimination of three annual *Medicago* species submitted to drought and subsequent recovery. Can J Plant Sci 96:757–764
- Sadeghi H, Robati Z (2015) Response of *Cichorium intybus* L. to eight seed priming methods under osmotic stress conditions. Biocatal Agric Biotechnol 4:443–448. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcab.2015. 08.003
- Sandalio LM, Dalurzo HC, Gomes M, Remero-Puertas MC, delRio LA (2001) Cadmiuminduced changes in the growth and oxidative metabolism of Pea plants. J Exp Bot 52:2115–2126
- SAS Institute Inc (2004) SAS/STAT 9.1 User's Guide. SAS Publishing, Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute Inc., pp 5136
- Shah K, Kumar RG, Verma S, Dubey RS (2001) Effect of cadmium on lipid peroxidation, superoxide anion generation and activities of antioxidant enzymes in growing rice seedlings. Plant Sci 161: 1135–1144

- Shen ZG, Li XD, Wang CC, Chen HM, Chua H (2002) Lead phytoextraction from contaminated soil with high-biomass plant species. J Environ Qual 31:1893–1900
- Stingu A, Volf I, Popa VI, Gostin I (2012) New approaches concerning the utilization of natural amendments in cadmium phytoremediation. Ind Crop Prod 35:53–60. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.indcrop.2011.06.005
- Su Y, Liu J, Lu Z, Wang X, Zhang Z, Shi G (2014) Effects of iron deficiency on subcellular distribution and chemical forms of cadmium in peanut roots in relation to its translocation. Environ Exp Bot 97:40–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2013.10.001
- Veselov D, Kudoyarova G, Symonyan M, Veselov S (2003) Effect of Cadmium on ion uptake transpiration and cytokinin content in wheat seedlings. Bulg J Plant Physiol Special issue pp 353–359
- Wei SQ, Pan SW (2010) Phytoremediation for soils contaminated by phenanthrene and pyrene with multiple plant species. J Soils Sediments 10:886–894
- Wong MK, Chuah GK, Ang KP, Koh LL (1986) Interactive effects of lead, cadmium and copper combinations in the uptake of metals and growth of Brassica chinensis. Environ Exp Bot 26(4):331–339
- Yildiz N (2005) Response of Tomato and Corn plants to increasing Cd levels in nutrient culture. Pak J Bot 37(3):593–599
- Zhao HC (2000) Influence of water stress on the lipid physical membrance from *P*. betuloefolia. Bio Interfaces 19:181–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-7765(00)00153-3

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.