- PXRF was used to scan different vegetation types at variable moisture
- PXRF accurately quantified Pb, Fe, Cd, and Cu for dry, powder samples
- PXRF reasonably determined Zn and Cu for field moist samples

Elemental Assessment of Vegetation via Portable X-ray Fluorescence (PXRF) Spectrometry

Candice McGladdery¹, David C. Weindorf^{2*}, Somsubhra Chakraborty³, Bin Li⁴, Laura Paulette⁵, Bogdan Duda², Delaina Pearson², Dorina Podar⁶, Nana Yaw O. Kusi²

¹Department of Plant and Soil Science, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

²Department of Plant and Soil Science, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA

³Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, India

⁴Department of Experimental Statistics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

⁵Department of Technical and Soil Sciences, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

⁶Department of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

*Corresponding author: <u>david.weindorf@ttu.edu</u>

Key words: Portable X-ray fluorescence; elemental concentration; vegetation; heavy metals

ABSTRACT

Elemental concentrations in vegetation are of critical importance, whether establishing plant essential element concentrations (toxicity vs. deficiency) or investigating deleterious elements (e.g., heavy metals) differentially extracted from the soil by plants. Traditionally, elemental analysis of vegetation has been facilitated by acid digestion followed by quantification via inductively coupled plasma (ICP) or atomic absorption (AA) spectroscopy. Previous studies have utilized portable X-ray fluorescence (PXRF) spectroscopy to quantify elements in soils, but few have evaluated the vegetation. In this study, a PXRF spectrometer was employed to scan 228 organic material samples (thatch, deciduous leaves, grasses, tree bark, and herbaceous plants) from smelter impacted areas of Romania, as well as NIST certified reference materials, to demonstrate the application of PXRF for elemental determination in vegetation. Samples were scanned in three conditions: as received from the field (moist), oven dry (70° C), and dried and powdered to pass a 2 mm sieve. Performance metrics of PXRF models relative to ICP atomic emission spectroscopy were developed to asses optimal scanning conditions. Thatch and bark samples showed the highest mean PXRF and ICP concentrations (e.g., Zn, Pb, Cd, Fe), with the exceptions of K and Cl. Validation statistics indicate that the stable validation predictive capacity of PXRF increased in the following order: oven dry intact < field moist < oven dried and powdered. Even under field moist conditions, PXRF could reasonably be used for the determination of Zn (R^2_{val} 0.86; RPD 2.72) and Cu (R^2_{val} 0.77; RPD 2.12), while dried and powdered samples allowed for stable validation prediction of Pb (R^2_{val} 0.90; RPD 3.29), Fe (R^2_{val} 0.80; RPD 2.29), Cd (R^2_{val} 0.75; RPD 2.07) and Cu (R^2_{val} 0.98; RPD of 8.53). Summarily, PXRF was shown to be a useful approach for quickly assessing the elemental concentration of vegetation. Future PXRF/vegetation research should explore additional elements and investigate its usefulness in evaluating phytoremediation effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

Soils impacted by metal pollution are common worldwide, often occurring in areas of industrial processing (e.g., petrochemical refining, mining, smelting). Industrial metal pollution can stem from an acute source such as a spill, or via long term accumulation by eolian deposition of dusts (Wuana and Okieimen, 2011). Alternately, metals can also occur naturally in soils as a result of parent material weathering (Micó et al., 2006) or irrigation with metal laden groundwater or surface waters (Roberts et al., 2007); in fact, some metals are also plant essential elements (e.g., Cu, Mg, Zn, etc.). In the soil, such metals pose limited risks to humans, mostly through dermal exposure and direct contact. However, unique plant species are known to differentially accumulate different metals, via absorption of metal-laden water, whereby the metals accumulate in plant organs (e.g., roots, stems, leaves, fruits, seeds). For example, Alyssum spp., Brassica pekinensis, Noccaea (Thlaspi) caerulescens, Arabidopsis halerii, Sedum alfredii, and *Pteris* spp. have been linked to Ni, Pb, and As uptake, respectively (Courbot et al., 2007; Lochlainn et al., 2011; Craciun et al., 2012; Hanikenne et al., 2008, 2013; Halimaa et al., 2014; Li et al., 2003; Srivastava et al., 2006; Xiong, 1997; Zhang et al., 2011). While plant uptake of metals can be of concern if the plants are used as food for human consumption (Millis et al., 2004; Podar et al., 2004; Podar and Ramsey, 2005), certain plant species can also be used as an effective phytoremediation option for metal-laden soils (Brooks et al., 1998; Pollard et al., 2014). Furthermore, a metal hyperaccumulator plant species can be utilized for the purpose of phytomining; where a crop is grown to extract metal from the soil to be harvested and processed for metal recovery (Ali et al., 2013; Barceló and Poschenrieder, 2003; Brooks et al., 1998). Ali et al. (2013) note that the quantity of metal recovered by vegetative hyperaccumulators can vary from a few hundred to several thousand mg kg^{-1} ; the best choices for active *phytomining* are plants featuring a rapid growth rate, aboveground biomass production, highly branched root

system to exploit the maximum amount of contaminated soil, ability to translocate metals from roots to shoots, and easy cultivation/harvest.

For decades, the analytical standard for elemental analysis of plant materials has been atomic absorption spectrophotometry (AAS) (Hanlon, 1998) or inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) (Isaac and Johnson, 1998). In such methods, vegetative samples are subjected to acid digestion while heating, placing all elements into an acidic solution which can then be aspirated across a torch for elemental quantification. While accurate, this approach is time consuming and requires extensive laboratory equipment and consumables. Laboratory-based X-ray fluorescence has also been successfully used to quantify elements in plant material (Watson, 1998), though some limitations such as its inability to detect light elements (e.g., N, B) were noted. By contrast, portable X-ray fluorescence (PXRF) spectrometry is a proximal sensor system which has been shown to provide multi-elemental quantification in soils (Weindorf et al., 2014), water (Pearson et al., 2017), and several other matrices. The key advantages of PXRF relative to traditional laboratory based approaches are that it is fast (60-90 sec), requires no consumables, and is field portable.

A few studies have previously established the applicability of PXRF to vegetation. McLaren et al. (2011) used a Bruker Tracer III-V PXRF (equipped with He purge and Si-Pin detector) to evaluate elemental concentrations in cotton, corn, and wheat. They found significant linear relationships between PXRF and acid digest datasets for Ca, Co, Cr, Fe, K, Mn, Ni, P, S, Si, and Zn, concluding that PXRF "provides an efficient alternative to traditional plant digestion." Paltridge et al. (2012a) used laboratory based energy dispersive XRF to determine Fe and Zn in rice and pearl millet grain. They found strong R² values (0.79 to 0.98) between XRF and ICP methods, concluding that XRF is a convenient and economical approach for elemental determination. Similarly, Paltridge et al. (2012b) found strong correlations between the two methodologies for Zn, Fe, and Se in wheat. Moreover, Sacristán et al. (2016) successfully used PXRF to predict Cu in lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.).

In Romania, extensive metals pollution has been documented in soils; the result of mining and smelting operations in numerous communities (Krüger and Carius, 2001). Previous studies have applied PXRF to examine the spatial variability of metal pollution in soils (Weindorf et al., 2013; Paulette et al., 2015), but fewer studies have evaluated the vegetation supported therein and none have applied PXRF for such evaluation. Importantly, areas in the immediate vicinity of the smelters are used today for active agricultural production, causing concerns over potential metal contamination of harvested crops. Such contamination could occur as soil attached to the outer epidermis of root (e.g., carrots, *Daucus carota*) or underground stems (e.g., potatoes, *Solanum tuberosum*), as dust deposited on the leaves of leafy vegetables (e.g., lettuce, *Lactuca sativa*; spinach, *Spinacia oleracea*; cabbage, *Brassica oleracea*), or accumulated in the shoots by transporters for plant nutrient analogs (Krupa et al., 2002) (e.g., Pb²⁺ substituting for Zn²⁺; Cd²⁺ entering Ca²⁺ transporters).

While previous studies established the potential for PXRF analysis of vegetative materials, they stopped short of evaluating a broad range of organic matrices or considering its use for quantification of toxic metals contained therein. As PXRF quickly gains in popularity consideration of its broader use on organic matrices seems timely. Thus, the objective of this study was to statistically evaluate the relationships between ICP- and PXRF-determined elemental data under different scanning conditions (moisture, homogenization) to establish the validity of PXRF for direct elemental analysis of vegetative matrices. We hypothesize that PXRF will provide qualitative estimations of elemental concentrations for field moist samples, and more definitive (quantitative) elemental determinations for samples which have been dried and/or homogenized.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

General Occurrence and Features

Fieldwork for this study was conducted in two locations, Zlatna and Copşa Mică, Romania (Fig. 1). Both cities, located in central part of the country, are known as polluted areas due to industrial mining, ore processing, and smelting operations.

Zlatna processed non-ferrous ores between 1747 and 2002. The main industrial unit in Zlatna was represented by Ampelum S.A. producing H_2SO_4 , Cu, FeSO₄, and MgSO₄. Mining and processing activities generated silica dust, gasses (e.g., SO₂, CO₂, CO, and various N oxides), and metals released as powders and aerosols (especially Pb). Zlatna is situated in Alba County in the Zlatna-Ighiu Depressional corridor of the Ampoi River Valley, a narrow valley with an east-west orientation (Popa, 2005), where the low wind (0.06 m s⁻¹) creates frequent periods (approx.



Fig. 1. Location of Zlatna and Copşa Mică, Romania.

half year) of atmospheric calm allowing metal deposition throughout the valley. The climate is generally wet and cool, with average annual temperature and precipitation between 6-8°C and 800-1,000 mm, respectively (Roşu, 1973). The main vegetation is forest, consisting largely of beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) and sessile oak (*Quercus petrea*). Per the *Romanian System of Soil Taxonomy*, Florea and Munteanu (2012) [US Taxonomic equivalent given per Soil Survey Staff, 2014] characterize 63% of soils in the area as Luvisols [Hapludalfs] (mostly on hills) and 27% as Cambisols [Inceptisols] (mostly Dystricambosols [Dystrudepts] developed on acid rocks and Eutricambosols [Eutrudepts] developed on carbonatic diluvium). On steep slopes, Regosols and Lithosols [Udorthents] comprise ~2.5% while floodplain Alluviosols [Udifluvents] cover ~7.5% of the area (Paulette et al., 2007; Florea and Munteanu, 2012). The latter oft present gleyic properties (Lazăr, 2011). Notably, with the exception of Eutricambosols, the soils are naturally acidic, thus enhancing the risk of metal translocation into plants. Kabata-Pendias (2011) note that metals are potentially bioavailable under acidic (pH 5.60 – 6.15) conditions.

The environmental impact of pollution emissions is augmented through aeolian transport throughout the valley and by water erosion of nearby spoil piles which often carries pollution into the Ampoi River. As a consequence of the dispersion of Pb, Cd, Cu, and Zn aerosols and H_2SO_4 , the vegetation is severely impacted with slopes frequently devoid of vegetation (Popa, 2005).

By comparison, Copşa Mică is a small town in Sibiu County in the Tărnava Mare Valley at the confluence with the Visa Valley surrounded by hills. Prevailing winds typically follow an east-west transect, with calm conditions 40 to 64% of the time (ARPM, 2011; Iordache, 2009). Climate is temperate, with mild winters and warm summers featuring an average annual temperature of 8.5°C and annual average precipitation of 1,300 mm. Kabata-Pendias (2011) argues that in temperate climates the residence time of trace elements in soils can be considerable: Cd 75 to 380 y; Hg 500 to 1,000 y; and for Ag, Cu, Ni, Pb, Se, and Zn, 1,000 to 3,000 y. Natural vegetation of the area is characterized by temperate grasslands (e.g., *Festuca rubra, Poa pratensis, Agrostis tenuis, Phragmites australis*) and beech forest along with *Robinia pseudoacacia*, the latter of which has mostly been planted.

Pollution of the area came from SOMETRA S.A., which opened in 1939 and specialized in non-ferrous metallurgy and S.C. CARBOSIN S.A, a carbon black-producing company operating

from 1935 to 1993. Copşa Mică pollution is so rife, it was featured on the cover of *National Geographic* magazine in June, 1991 (Thompson, 1991); at that time, it was declared the most polluted town in Europe (Harford, 2013). Citing British scientists, Shukman (2007) reported "the vegetation had a Pb content 22 times above the permitted level." Finally, Copşa Mică was nominated as the world's worst place for non-ferrous metal smelter pollution by Mines and Communities (2006). The key pollutants of concern are Pb, Zn, Cd, SO₂, and C dust.

Geologic floodplain deposits are alluvial material, fine sands, silt, and clay at the surface and coarse sand and gravels with depth. On terraces and hills, Pliocene silt-sand mixtures with intercalated clays are common as yellow-gray powders, generally of horizontal stratification (ASSA GRUP S.R.L., 2009). The main soil types in the area are Haplic Regosols and/or Regosols [Udorthents], Albic Luvisols [Hapludalfs], Haplic Phaeozems [Argiudolls] on terraces and hills and Fluvisols [Udifluvents] on floodplains (RECARE Project, 2013).

The natural regeneration of vegetation in Copşa Mică is very slow, especially forest. In areas of high and very high pollution, vegetative growth is stagnant (Direcția Silvică Sibiu, 2008). Morărescu (2014) conducted a study in Copşa Mică to investigate the risk of pollutants on human health; connections were found between the elevated Pb and Cd in soil, dust, and vegetables and levels of those metals in children's blood. The Cd content in vegetables produced in the subjects' gardens was between 5 to 20 mg kg⁻¹ dry matter, two orders of magnitude greater than that permitted by EU food safety regulations (Morărescu, 2014).

Vegetation was characterized by the following species typical of each matrix evaluated: grasses (Arrhenatherum elatius, Bromus arvensis, Calamagrostis epigejos, Carex hirta, Carex sp., Elymus repens, Festuca sp., Phragmites australis, Poa trivialis, Poa sp.), herbaceous (Achillea millefolium, Adonis vernalis, Artemisia vulgaris, Chaerophyllum sp., Chelidonium majus, Dryopteris filix-mas, Equisetum telmateia, Eupatorium cannabinum, Euphorbia sp., Frangula alnus, Galium mollugo, Galium sp., Gentiana sp., Humulus lupulus, Ligustrum sp., Medicago sativa, Mentha longifolia, Rorippa austriaca, Rubus idaeus, Rumex sanguineus, Salvia pratensis, Sambucus nigra, Stellaria media, Tusilago sp.), and deciduous trees (Acer campestre, Acer negundo, Acer pseudoplatanus, Acer sp., Alnus glutinosa, Betula pendula, Betula sp., Catalpa sp., Fagus sylvatica, Frangula alnus, Fraxinus excelsior, Fraxinus sp., Prunus avium, Prunus

spinosa, Robinia pseudoacacia, Quercus sp, Salix alba, Salix caprea, Salix purpurea, Salix triandra, Salix sp.). Leaf litter (thatch) and bark were inherited mostly from deciduous tree species.

Field Methods

Sampling occurred in June, 2017 in and around Copşa Mică and Zlatna, Romania (Fig. 1). Each sampling site was chosen at random, but with deference to variability in vegetative type, land use, and site access. At each site, the location was geolocated via an E-trex global positioning system receiver (Garmin, Olathe, KS) with an accuracy of ~2 m. Five different types of organic materials were sampled: thatch (O horizons), deciduous leaves, grasses, tree bark, and herbaceous plants. With the exception of the former, all other samples were clipped with a small pruning shears and placed in sealed plastic bags for transport to the laboratory. The shears were cleaned between each sampling to prevent any possible cross contamination. Bark was peeled off both live and dead trees; thicknesses ranged from 0.1 mm to 1 cm. Thatch was gently collected by hand, carefully excluding mineral soil; it was also bagged as other samples. Thatch was observed in various states of decay; mostly as Oi and Oe horizons. All samples were placed in a cooler on wet ice, then refrigerated at 4°C until laboratory analysis began within 48 h.

Laboratory Methods

In the laboratory, samples were scanned with PXRF in three conditions: 1) as received from the field (e.g., field moist), 2) oven dry (70°C), and 3) ground to pass a 2 mm sieve. Grinding of samples was facilitated using a small electric grinder. Compressed air was used to clean the grinder and sieve between sample processing to prevent cross contamination. In preparation for PXRF scanning, the vegetation was compressed into a small bundle (~2 cm thick) and secured on both ends with rubber bands (Fig. 2). As many organic samples feature an inherently low matrix density, bundling effectively increased the probability of matter interacting with X-rays. Devoid that, X-rays may be transmitted through organic matter resulting in suboptimal elemental fluorescence. Samples were placed in a hooded test stand with a Prolene thin film protecting the aperture of the PXRF from vegetative debris. For bark, samples were placed with the outer bark surface facing toward the PXRF aperture. In instances where lichens were interlaced with bark, efforts were made to scan the most densely lichen-laden portion of the bark. Loose thatch which



Fig. 2. A) Bundled vegetation placed directly above the PXRF aperture and secured with rubber bands, B) loose thatch massed in a small pile directly above the PXRF aperture, and C) powdered (ground < 2 mm) bark massed in a small pile directly above the PXRF aperture. All scans shown above were conducted inside a hooded test stand.

was impossible to mass into a bundle was placed upon the thin film directly as a small pile (Fig. 2).

Sample scanning was facilitated using an energy dispersive DP-6000 (Olympus, Waltham, MA) PXRF spectrometer operated in Soil Mode on line power (115 VAC). Samples were bombarded with X-rays from a Rh tube operated at 10 to 40 keV as a sequence of three beams each set to scan for 30 sec; thus, one complete scan was accomplished in 90 sec. Each field moist and oven dry sample was scanned once, while ground powders were scanned in triplicate and reported as a mean. Multiple scans per sample were not attempted on the former due to inherent sample variability in its native condition. For example, bark samples featured highly variable lichen content across their surface. Prior to scanning, the instrument was allowed to warm up for 30 min, then calibrated using a 316 calibration alloy coin. Instrument performance was verified via scanning of NIST certified reference materials (NIST 1515 and 1547). The following data was obtained (PXRF/NIST) [all in mg kg⁻¹]: NIST 1515 Ca (17,667/15,250), Cl (474/582), Fe (165/82.7), Mn (90/54.1), K (20,755/16,080), Rb (11.1/10.2), S (2,076/1,800), Sr (20.9/25.1), Zn (10.7;12.45); NIST 1547 Ca (17,817/15,590), Cl (225/361), Fe (324/219.8), Mn (139/97.8), K (33,040/24,330), Pb (2.5; 0.869), Rb (21/19.65), S (1,834/2,000), Sr (46.1/53), Zn (17.8/17.97). The aforementioned PXRF data reported was the mean of two individual scans for each NIST sample. It is likely that the variability between NIST certified reference material and PXRF data obtained is due to a matrix density effect. To offset that, correction factors (Table 2) were applied in the same manner as Koch et al. (2017) for Ca, Fe, K, Mn, Pb, Sr, and Zn. Both Cd and Cu had no correction factors applied as they were not present in the NIST materials scanned.

Acid digestion of powdered samples was per Galvak et al. (2005) using HNO₃ and HClO₄ in sequence combined with heating at 150°C and 180°C for 1 h each, respectively, in a DigiPREP digestion system (SCP Science, Montreal, QC, Canada). Inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) analysis was accomplished with an iCAP 7400 model instrument (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). High purity argon was used as plasma, auxiliary, and nebulizer gas. The data acquisition integration and wash times were 30 s, with three repetitions, and averaged over the three (Bettinelli et al., 2000). The calibration standards were custom ICP standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (SCP Science, Montreal, QC, Canada),

each diluted to six levels (L1 through L6). Check calibration standards (L2 and L4) were inserted after very 50 samples to check consistency.

Select samples were characterized at 20 keV by an S-4300 (Hitachi, Schaumburg, IL, USA) field emission scanning electron microscope fitted with an energy dispersive X-ray microanalysis (EDAX, Mahwah, NJ, USA) system. The samples were mounted onto Al sample mounts and coated with a thin layer of Au/Pd for conductivity before imaging/EDS analysis. Tomašević et al. (2005) note that since "particles deposited on leaves have complex shapes, quite different from an ideal flat sample, there may be over- or underestimation of the actual atomic concentration, but this does not prevent identification of the most important particle types."

Statistical Methods

Summary statistics were calculated for each organic matrix at both sites. Further, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to evaluate significant interactions between elements detected. Data quality levels were assessed per the US EPA (2007) whereby definitive level (DL), quantitative screening (Quant), qualitative screening (Qual), and below detection limit (BDL) statistical standards are as follows: $R^2 = 0.85 - 1.00$ and RSD % $\leq 10\%$; $R^2 = 0.70 - 1.00$ and RSD % < 20%; $R^2 = <0.70$ and RSD % is < 20%; elemental concentration is below the detection limit, respectively. To improve the capability to fit models and objectively test their results, the elements with missing PXRF and/or ICP values were removed prior statistical modeling. Simple linear regression (SLR) was used to correlate between the PXRF elemental data for each organic matrix and ICP measured elements powder samples using R 2.11.0 (R Development Core Team, 2014). For individual element, the whole dataset was randomly split into 70% calibration and 30% validation sets. Model assessment for both SLR was done using root mean squared error (RMSE), residual prediction deviation (RPD), the coefficient of determination (R²) and the ratio of performance to interquartile range (RPIQ) (Chakraborty et al., 2017a,b).

$$R = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_i)^2}$$
(1)
$$RMSE = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\frac{(\hat{Y}_i - Y_i)^2}{n} \right]}$$
(2)

$$RPD = \left[\frac{1/(n-1)\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - \bar{Y}_i)^2}{1/n\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2}\right]_{Validation}^{0.5}$$
(3)

where, Y_i , \hat{Y}_i , \bar{Y}_i and n denote observed target variable, predicted target variable, mean of the target variable and sample number, respectively. Notably, RPIQ is an indicator of the goodness of the calibration models and was calculated as the interquartile range IQ/RMSE of prediction:

$$IQ = Q3 - Q1 \tag{4}$$

where Q3 and Q1 are the third and first quartile, respectively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

One key advantage of PXRF is its ability to simultaneously report multiple elements, inclusive of both metals and plant essential elements. Devoid the latter, plants are unable to complete their life cycle given that their function is irreplaceable by other elements (Marschner, 1995; Barker and Pilbeam, 2007). However, several metals dualistically function as plant essential elements. Based on the amounts needed by the plants, the mineral elements which serve as essential plant nutrients have been grouped into macronutrients and micronutrients. A few mineral elements, other than the macro- and micronutrients, have been shown to positively affect only a limited number of plant species; they are classified as *beneficial* mineral nutrients (Marschner, 1995; Barker and Pilbeam, 2007). The general plant nutrient classes are given in Table 1. And as a baseline for comparison, Epstein and Bloom (2005) offer the following as general ranges of elemental concentrations in crop plants (dry weight basis): P (0.15-0.5%), S (0.1-1.5%), K (0.8-8.0%), Ca (0.1-6.0%), Mg (0.05-1.0%), Fe (20-600 mg kg⁻¹), Mn (10-600 mg kg⁻¹), Zn (10-250 mg kg⁻¹), Cu (2-50 mg kg⁻¹), Ni (0.05-5.0 mg kg⁻¹), B (0.2-800 mg kg⁻¹), and Cl (10-80,000 mg kg⁻¹).

The results of elemental concentrations in the various organic matrices tested as part of this study are given in Tables 3a and 3b. Samples from Copşa Mică and Zlatna were kept separate given the different types of smelting conducted at the two sites. For several elements, PXRF determined concentrations generally increased in the following order: wet < oven dry < powder. The magnitude of increases were both element and matrix dependent. The summary statistics presented in Tables 3a and 3b include all discreet values (with correction factors applied) reported for each moisture condition. Correction factors were derived from mean recoveries of

Table 1. General grouping of plant nutrients.

| Group of mineral nutrients | Elements | Amounts needed by plants |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Macronutrients | N, P, K, S, Mg, Ca | < 0.1% of dry mass |
| Micronutrients | Fe, Mn, Zn, Cu, B, Mo, Cl, Ni | < 0.01% of dry mass |
| Beneficial | Na, Si, Co | |

| Element | NIST 1515 | NIST 1547 | Mean Recovery | Correction Factor |
|---------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ca | 1.16 | 1.14 | 1.15 | 0.87 |
| Fe | 2.00 | 1.47 | 1.73 | 0.58 |
| Mn | 1.66 | 1.42 | 1.54 | 0.65 |
| Κ | 1.29 | 1.36 | 1.32 | 0.76 |
| Sr | 0.83 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 1.17 |
| Zn | 0.86 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 1.08 |
| Pb | | 2.88 | 2.88 | 0.35 |

 Table 2. Elemental mean recovery by portable X-ray fluorescence spectrometry and correction factor applied based upon NIST certified reference values.

Table 3a. PXRF and ICP elemental data summary for five vegetative samples types from Copşa Mică, Romania.

| Ca | | | | | | Ca | lcium | | | | | | 1 [| Mn | | | | | | ſ | /langai | nese | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---------------------|--------|----|-----------------------|--------|-------|---------------------|--------|----|---------------------|-------|-----|----------------------|----|----------|-----|----|-----------|---------------|---------|-----------|-----|----|-------------|------|
| | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | | | | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | n† | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | | | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ - | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | | | mg kg | 1 | | mg kg | ⁻¹ | | mg kg | 1 | - | mg kg | 1 |
| Bark | 23 | 6,821 - 40,269 | 19,755 | 23 | 7,079 - 62,430 | 19,325 | 23 | 16,881 - 53,420 | 37,830 | 23 | 8.90 - 44.94 | 30.07 | Ва | ark | 23 | 38 - 229 | 104 | 23 | 38 - 196 | 114 | 23 | 53 - 284 | 105 | 23 | 0.31 - 0.79 | 0.38 |
| Deciduous Tree Leaves | 25 | 980 - 13,064 | 5,162 | 25 | 4,291 - 53,714 | 18,294 | 25 | 2,656 - 37,148 | 16,391 | 25 | 6.38 - 71.30 | 34.75 | De | eciduous Tree Leaves | 25 | 9 - 70 | 32 | 25 | 28 - 161 | 71 | 25 | 35 - 160 | 64 | 25 | 0.32 - 0.53 | 0.39 |
| Grass | 24 | 435 - 5,699 | 1,736 | 24 | 1,344 - 15,279 | 6,699 | 24 | 2,837 - 9,488 | 5,793 | 24 | 5.23 - 24.26 | 11.96 | Gr | rass | 24 | 14 - 151 | 44 | 24 | 50 - 185 | 112 | 24 | 62 - 255 | 115 | 24 | 0.33 - 0.65 | 0.41 |
| Herbaceous | 23 | 789 - 8,868 | 3,421 | 23 | 6,958 - 58,682 | 27,699 | 23 | 5,698 - 42,811 | 21,986 | 23 | 16.47 - 205.35 | 84.00 | He | erbaceous | 19 | 5 - 70 | 23 | 23 | 11 - 255 | 98 | 23 | 21 - 135 | 72 | 23 | 0.35 - 0.93 | 0.51 |
| Thatch | 24 | 4,253 - 145,989 | 34,066 | 24 | 10,284 - 143,541 | 59,136 | 24 | 8,703 - 65,213 | 37,150 | 24 | 10.38 - 64.60 | 33.86 | Th | hatch | 24 | 83 - 461 | 200 | 24 | 111 - 586 | 329 | 24 | 101 - 545 | 207 | 24 | 0.39 - 1.54 | 0.63 |

| Cd | | | | | | Ca | dmium | ŧ | | | | | Pb | | | | | | | Lead | 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---------------------|-----|----|---------------------|-----|-------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------------------|------|-----------------------|----|------------|---------------|----|-------------|-------|------|--------------|-------|----|---------------------|-------|
| | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | | | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ - | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | L | | | mg kg | ⁻¹ | - | mg kg | 1 | | mg kg | 1 | - | mg kg ⁻¹ | 1 |
| Bark | 18 | 13 - 100 | 50 | 17 | 16 - 110 | 46 | 23 | 14 - 187 | 60 | 23 | 0.31 - 0.97 | 0.52 | Bark | 23 | 73 - 9,878 | 2,559 | 23 | 62 - 10,774 | 2,598 | 23 | 100 - 10,955 | 3,291 | 22 | 0.31 - 117.35 | 29.54 |
| Deciduous Tree Leaves | 11 | 9 - 27 | 13 | 12 | 10 - 49 | 18 | 21 | 10 - 51 | 15 | 25 | 0.29 - 0.58 | 0.32 | Deciduous Tree Leaves | 20 | 1 - 99 | 14 | 25 | 1 - 114 | 20 | 25 | 2 - 160 | 22 | 5 | 0.04 - 1.01 | 0.34 |
| Grass | 9 | 11 - 26 | 15 | 2 | 19 - 22 | 21 | 7 | 12 - 18 | 14 | 24 | 0.28 - 0.32 | 0.30 | Grass | 20 | 1 - 214 | 16 | 23 | 2 - 267 | 20 | 24 | 3 - 233 | 21 | 2 | 0.82 - 3.09 | 1.96 |
| Herbaceous | 15 | 9 - 18 | 13 | 6 | 12 - 31 | 19 | 14 | 11 - 27 | 15 | 23 | 0.29 - 0.40 | 0.32 | Herbaceous | 17 | 1 - 39 | 5 | 23 | 1 - 123 | 17 | 23 | 2 - 133 | 19 | 1 | | 1.52 |
| Thatch | 18 | 12 - 63 | 33 | 20 | 15 - 760 | 83 | 22 | 15 - 265 | 57 | 24 | 0.32 - 1.31 | 0.50 | Thatch | 24 | 21 - 3,838 | 964 | 24 | 23 - 35,620 | 3,031 | 24 | 19 - 14,314 | 2,143 | 20 | 2.40 - 101.07 | 19.11 |

| Cu | | | | | | C | opper‡ | | | | | | 1 [| Sr | | | | | | | Stronti | um | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---------------------|-----|----|---------------------|-----|--------|---------------------|-----|----|---------------------|------|-----|-----------------------|----|----------|-----|----|----------|-----------------|---------|----------|-----|----|---------------------|------|
| | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | | | | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | | | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | · | - [| | | mg kg | 1 | | mg kg | g ⁻¹ | | mg kg | 1 | | mg kg ⁻¹ | i |
| Bark | 22 | 12 - 839 | 229 | 23 | 9 - 941 | 238 | 23 | 27 - 1,365 | 335 | 23 | 0.29 - 1.43 | 0.58 | | Bark | 23 | 34 - 173 | 80 | 23 | 26 - 150 | 78 | 23 | 46 - 150 | 98 | 23 | 0.17037 | 0.26 |
| Deciduous Tree Leaves | 1 | | 7 | 15 | 5 - 20 | 13 | 21 | 5 - 5,405 | 275 | 25 | 0.28 - 1.41 | 0.37 | | Deciduous Tree Leaves | 25 | 3 - 72 | 14 | 25 | 3 - 202 | 43 | 25 | 4 - 152 | 43 | 25 | 0.15 - 0.39 | 0.26 |
| Grass | 2 | 24 - 34 | 29 | 10 | 11 - 41 | 19 | 24 | 14 - 174 | 51 | 24 | 0.31 - 0.85 | 0.39 | | Grass | 14 | 1 - 10 | 4 | 24 | 4 - 35 | 12 | 24 | 5 - 40 | 13 | 24 | 0.15 - 0.22 | 0.18 |
| Herbaceous | 0 | | | 17 | 6 - 42 | 20 | 22 | 6 - 62 | 22 | 23 | 0.29 - 0.51 | 0.38 | | Herbaceous | 18 | 2 - 19 | 8 | 23 | 8 - 110 | 45 | 23 | 11 - 113 | 51 | 23 | 0.18 - 0.82 | 0.38 |
| Thatch | 23 | 7 - 727 | 172 | 24 | 13 - 8,492 | 639 | 24 | 34 - 2,419 | 341 | 24 | 0.28 - 2.59 | 0.67 | | Thatch | 24 | 14 - 87 | 50 | 24 | 23 - 168 | 89 | 24 | 26 - 158 | 90 | 24 | 0.18 - 0.38 | 0.26 |

| Fe | | | | | | 1 | Iron | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---------------------|-------|----|---------------------|--------|------|---------------------|-------|----|---------------------|-------|
| | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | |
| Bark | 23 | 70 - 13,300 | 3,899 | 23 | 151 - 12,791 | 4,827 | 23 | 239 - 12,268 | 3,950 | 22 | 0.83 - 1.59 | 9.50 |
| Deciduous Tree Leaves | 25 | 8 - 367 | 67 | 25 | 39 - 1,391 | 228 | 25 | 57 - 518 | 150 | 6 | 0.04 - 1.59 | 0.49 |
| Grass | 22 | 13 - 1,696 | 207 | 24 | 135 - 2,052 | 403 | 24 | 59 - 2,032 | 291 | 5 | 0.17 - 8.11 | 2.73 |
| Herbaceous | 23 | 7 - 136 | 40 | 23 | 55 - 1,679 | 449 | 23 | 56 - 1,793 | 365 | 12 | 0.09 - 4.04 | 1.44 |
| Thatch | 24 | 405 - 11,698 | 4,666 | 24 | 807 - 58,736 | 10,693 | 24 | 648 - 13,018 | 5,638 | 24 | 0.87 - 51.74 | 17.84 |

| Γ | Zn | | | | | | | Zin | c | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----|--------------|-------|----|---------------|--------|-----|---------------------|-------|----|---------------------|-------|
| | | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | | mg kg | 1 | | mg kg | 1 | | mg kg ⁻¹ | · | | mg kg ⁻¹ | · |
| В | ark | 23 | 233 - 13,751 | 4,425 | 23 | 395 - 14,887 | 4,949 | 23 | 590 - 29,669 | 7,120 | 23 | 0.81 - 36.29 | 11.97 |
| D | eciduous Tree Leaves | 25 | 9 - 917 | 117 | 25 | 44 - 2,283 | 324 | 25 | 65 - 2,431 | 377 | 7 | 0.93 - 8.56 | 2.71 |
| G | rass | 24 | 7 - 630 | 86 | 24 | 50 - 1,381 | 280 | 24 | 76 - 1,237 | 304 | 5 | 0.06 - 3.88 | 1.56 |
| н | erbaceous | 22 | 7 - 81 | 34 | 23 | 36 - 774 | 278 | 23 | 66 - 733 | 279 | 13 | 0.12 - 3.49 | 0.90 |
| Т | hatch | 24 | 377 - 14,240 | 4,160 | 24 | 658 - 152,193 | 13,960 | 24 | 779 - 37,354 | 7,334 | 24 | 0.78 - 48.27 | 12.86 |

| к | | | | | | Pota | assiur | n | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---------------------|-------|----|---------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|--------|----|---------------------|--------|
| | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | |
| Bark | 23 | 2,047 - 17,668 | 6,133 | 23 | 1,969 - 16,170 | 5,919 | 23 | 1,090 - 12,908 | 5,407 | 23 | 4.45 - 32.70 | 11.79 |
| Deciduous Tree Leaves | 25 | 2,696 - 13,633 | 5,975 | 25 | 3,848 - 110,276 | 28,029 | 25 | 5,873 - 50,130 | 22,478 | 25 | 21.89 - 128.42 | 67.01 |
| Grass | 24 | 1,512 - 13,151 | 6,810 | 24 | 2,075 - 103,217 | 39,787 | 24 | 6,233 - 79,113 | 38,609 | 24 | 21.08 - 113.45 | 77.79 |
| Herbaceous | 23 | 2,472 - 7,524 | 5,081 | 23 | 14,264 - 218,309 | 61,754 | 23 | 16,158 - 101,269 | 47,408 | 23 | 26.93 - 239.41 | 136.76 |
| Thatch | 24 | 913 - 9,638 | 3,563 | 24 | 2,978 - 25,107 | 6,960 | 24 | 1,632 - 9,964 | 4,085 | 24 | 6.07 - 20.36 | 11.74 |

[†]Only discreet values reported; 'ND' non-detected elements omitted

tho correction factor applied as either none present in NIST certified reference materials or levels were below PXRF detection limit

Table 3b. PXRF and ICP elemental data summary for five vegetative samples types from Zlatna, Romania.

| Ca | | | | | | Calci | ium | | | | | | Mn | | | | | | Ma | angane | se | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | | | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | n† | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | - | mg kg ⁻¹ | | - | mg kg | · | | - | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | - | mg kg | 1 | | mg kg | 1 |
| Bark | 22 | 3,300 - 46,675 | 20,814 | 22 | 4,166 - 54,002 | 26,843 | 22 | 9,158 - 59,283 | 35,230 | 22 | 7 - 77 | 35 | Bark | 22 | 32 - 661 | 167 | 22 | 59 - 746 | 246 | 22 | 58 - 561 | 179 | 22 | 0.31 - 1.47 | 0.54 |
| Deciduous Tree Leaves | 20 | 936 - 12,342 | 5,126 | 20 | 5,557 - 47,876 | 21,636 | 20 | 7,264 - 34,640 | 16,533 | 20 | 15 - 84 | 43 | Deciduous Tree Leaves | 20 | 8 - 619 | 91 | 20 | 44 - 1,402 | 253 | 20 | 39 - 1,042 | 163 | 20 | 0.34 - 4.21 | 0.76 |
| Grass | 22 | 591 - 4,802 | 1,837 | 21 | 2,747 - 64,314 | 11,721 | 22 | 3,010 - 16,655 | 7,200 | 22 | 5 - 24 | 13 | Grass | 22 | 15 - 232 | 46 | 21 | 51 - 627 | 190 | 22 | 67 - 567 | 172 | 22 | 0.35 - 1.36 | 0.55 |
| Herbaceous | 22 | 726 - 11,853 | 3,302 | 22 | 6,742 - 87,318 | 25,793 | 22 | 4,864 - 36,256 | 16,198 | 22 | 8 - 95 | 43 | Herbaceous | 22 | 6 - 112 | 32 | 22 | 27 - 1,063 | 194 | 22 | 33 - 754 | 110 | 22 | 0.34 - 2.67 | 0.64 |
| Thatch | 21 | 1,871 - 125,638 | 66,718 | 21 | 19,775 - 236,130 | 91,687 | 21 | 20,435 - 73,549 | 44,444 | 21 | 14 - 51 | 27 | Thatch | 21 | 33 - 5,400 | 1,181 | 21 | 172 - 6,536 | 1,548 | 21 | 122 - 3,167 | 811 | 21 | 0.38 - 5.72 | 1.34 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | · | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cd | | | | | | Cadmi | ium‡ | | | | | | Pb | | | | | | | Lead | | | | | |
| | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | | | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | mg kg | | | mg kg 1 | | - | mg kg 1 | | • | mg kg | · | | - | mg kg ' | · | | mg kg | | - | mg kg | · | | mg kg | · |
| Bark | 13 | 14 - 20 | 16 | 10 | 11 - 23 | 16 | 15 | 10 - 19 | 14 | 22 | 0.28 - 0.33 | 0.31 | Bark | 22 | 1 - 6,565 | 496 | 22 | 3 - 3,486 | 249 | 22 | 2 - 3,219 | 385 | 7 | 0.09 - 34.04 | 11.21 |
| Deciduous Tree Leaves | 10 | 10 - 18 | 13 | 3 | 15 - 19 | 17 | 17 | 10 - 17 | 14 | 20 | 0.29 - 0.34 | 0.31 | Deciduous Tree Leaves | 10 | 1 - 2 | 1 | 18 | 1-6 | 3 | 19 | 1 - 3 | 2 | 0 | | |
| Grass | 11 | 9 - 19 | 14 | 4 | 17 - 24 | 21 | 7 | 12 - 18 | 15 | 22 | 0.28 - 0.32 | 0.30 | Grass | 10 | 1 - 3 | 1 | 19 | 2 - 16 | 5 | 22 | 2 - 16 | 4 | 0 | | |
| Herbaceous | 11 | 10 - 15 | 13 | 4 | 15 - 20 | 18 | 14 | 11 - 29 | 14 | 22 | 0.29 - 0.45 | 0.31 | Herbaceous | 5 | | 1 | 21 | 1 - 14 | 4 | 21 | 1 - 13 | 2 | 1 | | 0.02 |
| Thatch | 5 | 12 - 25 | 20 | 1 | | 35 | 9 | 12 - 19 | 14 | 21 | 0.29 - 0.34 | 0.31 | Thatch | 21 | 7 - 94 | 41 | 21 | 15 - 287 | 92 | 21 | 16 - 398 | 82 | 7 | 0.01 - 4.90 | 1.03 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>(</u>) | | | | | | Conn | ort | | | | | | Sr | | | | | | C+ | rontiu | m | | | | |
| Cu | | Wet | | | Dry | Сорр | er‡ | Powder | | | ICP | | Sr | | Wet | | | Dry | St | rontiu | m Powder | | | ICP | |
| Cu | n | Wet | Δνσ | n | Dry | Сорр | per‡ | Powder Bange | Δνσ | n | ICP Bange | Δνσ | Sr | n | Wet | Δνσ | n | Dry | St Avg | rontiu n | m Powder Bange | Δνσ | n | ICP Range | Δνσ |
| Cu | n | Wet Range | Avg | n | Dry Range | Copp Avg | n | Powder Range | Avg | n | ICP Range | Avg | Sr | n | Wet Range | Avg | n | Dry Range | St Avg | n n | m Powder Range | Avg | n | ICP Range | Avg |
| Cu | n 20 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 11 - 3.360 | Avg | n 22 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 9 - 5.831 | Copp Avg | n - 22 | Powder Range mg kg ⁻¹ 18 - 3.292 | Avg | n 22 | ICP Range mg kg 0.31 - 3.91 | Avg | Sr Bark | n | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 | Avg | <u>n</u> | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 191 | St Avg | n n - 22 | m Powder Range mg kg ⁻¹ 5 - 216 | Avg 1 | 22 | ICP Range mg kg 0.15 - 0.52 | Avg |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves | n 20 3 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 11 - 3,360 7 - 15 | Avg 559 10 | n 22 20 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 9 - 5,831 8 - 45 | Copp Avg 521 23 | n - 22 19 | Powder Range mg kg ⁻¹ 18 - 3,292 6 - 51 | Avg 541 23 | n - 22 20 | ICP Range mg kg 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 | Avg 0.95 0.35 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves | n 22 17 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 1 - 19 | Avg 50 8 | n 21 20 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 191 2 - 47 | St Avg 60 25 | n - 22 20 | m Powder Range mg kg [*] 5 - 216 5 - 55 | Avg ¹ 67 28 | n 22 20 | ICP Range mg kg 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 | Avg 0.24 0.23 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass | n 20 3 1 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 11 - 3,360 7 - 15 | Avg 559 10 7 | n 22 20 17 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 9 - 5,831 8 - 45 13 - 71 | Copp Avg 521 23 33 | n - 22 19 22 | Powder Range mg kg ⁻¹ 18 - 3,292 6 - 51 28 - 99 | Avg 541 23 56 | n 22 20 22 | ICP Range mg kg 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass | n 22 17 9 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 | Avg 50 8 3 | n 21 20 20 | Dry <u>Range</u> mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 | St Avg 60 25 13 | rontiu | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 | Avg ¹ 67 28 12 | n 22 20 22 | ICP Range mg kg 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 0.15 - 0.22 | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous | n 20 3 1 0 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 11 - 3,360 7 - 15 | Avg 559 10 7 | n 22 20 17 21 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 9 - 5,831 8 - 45 13 - 71 7 - 82 | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 | n - 22 19 22 22 | Powder Range mg kg ⁻¹ 18 - 3,292 6 - 51 28 - 99 6 - 47 | Avg 541 23 56 25 | n 22 20 22 22 | ICP Range 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous | n 22 17 9 18 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 | Avg 50 8 3 6 | n 21 20 20 22 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 | St Avg 60 25 13 37 | n - 22 20 22 22 22 | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 | Avg 1 67 28 12 35 | n 22 20 22 22 | ICP Range mg kg 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 0.15 - 0.22 0.17 - 0.59 | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch | n 20 3 1 0 21 | Wet <u>Range</u> mg kg ⁻¹ 11 - 3,360 7 - 15 18 - 1,214 | Avg 559 10 7 346 | n 22 20 17 21 21 | Dry Range 9 - 5,831 8 - 45 13 - 71 7 - 82 74 - 2,368 | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 586 | n - 22 19 22 22 21 | Powder Range | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 | n 22 20 22 22 22 21 | ICP Range 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 0.33 - 1.52 | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch | n 22 17 9 18 21 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 | n 21 20 20 22 21 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 34 - 149 | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 | n - 22 20 22 22 22 21 | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 | Avg ¹ 67 28 12 35 80 | n 22 20 22 22 21 | ICP Range 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 0.15 - 0.22 0.17 - 0.59 0.17 - 0.28 | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch | n 20 3 1 0 21 | Wet Range | Avg 559 10 7 346 | n 22 20 17 21 21 | Dry Range 9 - 5,831 8 - 45 13 - 71 7 - 82 74 - 2,368 | Copp | n - 22 19 22 22 21 | Powder Range | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 | n 22 20 22 22 21 | ICP Range mg kg 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 0.33 - 1.52 | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch | n 22 17 9 18 21 | Wet <u>Range</u> mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 | n 21 20 20 22 21 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 34 - 149 | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 | n 22 20 22 22 22 21 | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 | Avg 1 67 28 12 35 80 | n 22 20 22 22 21 | ICP Range mg kg 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 0.15 - 0.22 0.17 - 0.28 | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Fe | n 20 3 1 0 21 | Wet Range | Avg 559 10 7 346 | n 22 20 17 21 21 | Dry Range 9 - 5,831 8 - 45 13 - 71 7 - 82 74 - 2,368 | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 586 Iro | n 22 19 22 21 21 | Powder Range mg kg ⁻¹ 18 - 3,292 6 - 51 28 - 99 6 - 47 59 - 1,378 | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 | n 22 20 22 22 21 | ICP Range mg kg 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 0.33 - 1.52 | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Zn | n 22 17 9 18 21 | Wet <u>Range</u> mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 | n 21 20 20 22 21 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 34 - 149 | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 | n 22 20 22 21 Zinc | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 | Avg 1 67 28 12 35 80 | n 22 20 22 22 21 | ICP Range mg kg 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 0.15 - 0.22 0.17 - 0.28 | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Fe | n 20 3 1 0 21 | Wet Range | Avg 559 10 7 346 | n 22 20 17 21 21 | Dry Range | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 586 Iro | n - 22 19 22 21 n | Powder Range mg kg ⁻¹ 18 - 3,292 6 - 51 28 - 99 6 - 47 59 - 1,378 Powder | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 | n 22 20 22 22 21 | ICP Range mg kg 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 0.33 - 1.52 | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Zn | n 22 17 9 18 21 | Wet <u>Range</u> mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 Wet | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 | n 21 20 20 22 21 | Dry Range 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 34 - 149 Dry | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 | n 22 20 22 22 21 Zinc | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 Powder | Avg 67 28 12 35 80 | n 22 20 22 22 21 | ICP Range mg kg 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 0.15 - 0.22 0.17 - 0.59 0.17 - 0.28 | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Fe | n 20 3 1 0 21 n | Wet <u>Range</u> mg kg ⁻¹ 11 - 3,360 7 - 15 18 - 1,214 Wet <u>Range</u> | Avg 559 10 7 346 Avg | n 22 20 17 21 21 n | Dry Range 9 - 5,831 8 - 45 13 - 71 74 - 2,368 Dry Range | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 586 Iro Avg | n 22 19 22 21 n n | Powder Range 18 - 3,292 6 - 51 28 - 99 6 - 47 59 - 1,378 Powder Range | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 Avg | n 22 20 22 22 21 n | ICP Range 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 0.33 - 1.52 ICP Range | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 Avg | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Zn | n 222 17 9 18 21 n | Wet <u>Range</u> mg kg ⁻¹ 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 Wet Range | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 Avg | n 21 20 20 22 21 n | Dry Range mg kg ³ 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 34 - 149 Dry Range | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 Avg | n 22 20 22 21 Zinc n | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 Powder Range | Avg | n 22 20 22 22 21 n | ICP Range 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 0.15 - 0.32 0.17 - 0.39 0.17 - 0.28 ICP Range | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 Avg |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Fe | n 20 3 1 0 21 n | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 11 - 3,360 7 - 15 - - 18 - 1,214 | Avg 559 10 7 346 Avg | n 22 20 17 21 21 n | Dry Range | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 586 Iro Avg | n - 22 19 22 21 - n n - | Powder Range | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 Avg | n 22 20 22 21 n | ICP Range mg kg 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 0.33 - 1.52 ICP Range mg kg | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 Avg | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Zn | n 22 17 9 18 21 n | Wet <u>Range</u> 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 Wet <u>Range</u> mg kg ⁻¹ | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 Avg | n 21 20 20 22 21 n | Dry Range 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 34 - 149 Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 Avg | rontiu n 22 20 22 21 Zinc n - | m Powder <u>Range</u> 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 Powder Range mg kg | Avg 1 67 28 12 35 80 Avg 1 | n 22 20 22 21 n | ICP Range mg kg 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.22 0.17 - 0.28 0.17 - 0.28 ICP Range | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 Avg |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Fe Bark | n 20 3 1 0 21 n 22 | Wet Range | Avg 559 10 7 346 Avg 2,861 | n 22 20 17 21 21 21 | Dry Range mg kg ⁻¹ 9 - 5,831 8 - 45 13 - 71 7 - 82 74 - 2,368 | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 586 Iro Avg 2,058 | n - 22 19 22 21 22 21 n n - 22 | Powder Range | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 Avg 2,271 | n 22 20 22 21 n | ICP Range mg kg 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 0.33 - 1.52 ICP Range mg kg 0.29 - 30.46 | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 Avg | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Zn Bark | n 22 17 9 18 21 n - 22 | Wet Range 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 Wet Range Wet 39 - 1,757 | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 8 8 3 6 3 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 | n 21 20 20 22 21 n 22 | Dry Range 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 34 - 149 Dry Range 40 - 4,964 | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 Avg 656 | n 22 20 22 21 Zinc n - 22 | m Powder <u>Range</u> mg kg 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 Powder <u>Range</u> | Avg 1 67 28 12 35 80 Avg 1 597 | n 22 20 22 21 n 14 | ICP Range 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.22 0.17 - 0.29 0.17 - 0.28 ICP Range | Avg -1 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 Avg -1 1.38 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Fe Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves | n 20 3 1 0 21 <i>n</i> 22 20 | Wet Range | Avg 559 10 7 346 Avg 2,861 53 | n 22 20 17 21 21 21 | Dry Range | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 586 Iro Avg 2,058 265 | n - 22 19 22 21 22 21 n n - 22 20 | Powder Range | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 Avg 2,271 125 | n 22 20 22 21 n | ICP Range 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.30 - 0.42 0.33 - 1.52 ICP Range | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 Avg 4 8.35 0.12 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Zn Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves | n 222 17 9 18 21 | Wet Range 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 39 - 1,757 8 - 475 | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 4vg 505 106 | n 21 20 20 22 21 n 22 21 | Dry Range 4 - 191 2 - 47 3 - 32 8 - 173 34 - 149 Dry Range d0 - 4,964 40 - 4,964 51 - 1,207 | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 Avg 656 349 | rontiu n 22 20 22 21 22 21 2 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 Powder Range G3 - 2,095 63 - 2,095 | Avg 1 67 28 12 35 80 Avg 1 597 346 | n 22 20 22 21 n 14 7 | ICP Range 0.15 - 0.52 0.15 - 0.32 0.15 - 0.32 0.17 - 0.59 0.17 - 0.59 0.17 - 0.59 0.17 - 0.59 0.17 - 5.58 0.05 - 5.58 0.25 - 2.95 | Avg -1 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 Avg -1 1.38 1.86 |
| Cu Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Fe Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass | n 20 3 1 0 21 n 22 20 22 | Wet Range mg kg ⁻¹ 11 - 3,360 7 - 15 - | Avg 559 10 7 346 Avg 2,861 53 64 | n 222 200 177 211 211 21 20 200 21 | Dry Range | Copp Avg 521 23 33 32 586 Iro Avg 2,058 265 437 | n - 22 19 22 21 n n - 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 21 | Powder Range | Avg 541 23 56 25 428 Avg 2,271 125 172 | n 22 20 22 22 21 n | ICP Range mm kg 0.31 - 3.91 0.29 - 0.41 0.32 - 0.41 0.33 - 1.52 ICP Range 0.29 - 30.46 0.01 - 0.27 0.08 - 0.63 | Avg 0.95 0.35 0.37 0.36 0.68 Avg 4 8.35 0.12 0.33 | Sr Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass Herbaceous Thatch Zn Zn Bark Deciduous Tree Leaves Grass | n 222 17 9 18 21 n 22 19 22 | Wet Range 4 - 170 1 - 19 1 - 5 1 - 22 6 - 156 Wet Range 39 - 1,757 8 - 475 4 - 110 | Avg 50 8 3 6 63 4vg 505 106 29 | n 21 20 20 22 21 n 22 21 22 20 21 | Dry Range | St Avg 60 25 13 37 81 Avg 656 349 193 | rontiu n 22 20 22 21 Zinc n - 22 20 21 Zinc 20 22 21 21 21 22 20 22 21 22 20 22 20 22 20 22 20 22 20 22 20 20 | m Powder Range 5 - 216 5 - 55 3 - 30 10 - 112 38 - 151 Powder Range G3 - 2,095 40 - 1,193 50 - 585 | Avg 1 67 28 12 35 80 Avg 1 597 346 199 | n 22 20 22 21 n 14 7 1 | ICP Range | Avg 0.24 0.23 0.17 0.25 0.21 Avg 1.38 1.86 0.88 |

4,584 21 2.17 - 62.53 20.14

Thatch

21

91 - 9,788 1,253 21 318 - 11,037 1,654 21 195 - 7,800 1,233 14 0.28 - 14.59 3.78

| К | | | | | | Potass | ium | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---------------------|-------|----|---------------------|--------|-----|---------------------|--------|----|---------------|--------|
| | | Wet | | | Dry | | | Powder | | | ICP | |
| | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg | n | Range | Avg |
| | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg ⁻¹ | | | mg kg | -1 |
| Bark | 22 | 1,531 - 14,663 | 5,873 | 22 | 1,910 - 19,551 | 8,143 | 22 | 1,594 - 31,749 | 7,470 | 22 | 4.67 - 87.63 | 15.48 |
| Deciduous Tree Leaves | 20 | 2,877 - 8,520 | 5,073 | 20 | 10,053 - 57,919 | 31,426 | 20 | 6,620 - 51,210 | 20,911 | 20 | 34.72 - 112.4 | 70.45 |
| Grass | 22 | 2,938 - 13,341 | 6,854 | 21 | 19,208 - 103,399 | 54,468 | 22 | 24,226 - 73,222 | 47,939 | 22 | 1.13 - 110.8 | 79.93 |
| Herbaceous | 22 | 2,350 - 10,063 | 6,317 | 22 | 16,992 - 170,219 | 69,799 | 22 | 13,430 - 126,653 | 46,629 | 22 | 18.92 - 176.7 | 104.22 |
| Thatch | 21 | 682 - 15,435 | 6,918 | 21 | 3,319 - 30,980 | 10,834 | 21 | 2,126 - 18,487 | 5,151 | 21 | 5.99 - 20.81 | 10.06 |

777 - 32,883

7,497 21

795 - 18,990

[†]Only discreet values reported; 'ND' non-detected elements omitted

21

309 - 11,725

4,445 21

Thatch

\$No correction factor applied as either none present in NIST certified reference materials or levels were below PXRF detection limit

NIST vegetative samples relative to reported PXRF values (Koch et al., 2017). However, only samples with discreet values for wet, dry, and powdered conditions were included in SLR modeling; this allows for correlation comparisons between moisture conditions based upon a fixed number of samples. Notably, the number of samples reported for each of the four assessments (PXRF field moist, dry, powder, and ICP) were variable based upon instrumental detection limits. For example, Cu was only detected in one deciduous tree leaf sample from Copşa Mică under wet conditions, but upon drying and then powdering, Cu was detected in 15 and 21 samples, respectively.

In many instances, the highest elemental concentrations were found in bark and thatch. In Copsa Mică, Paulette et al. (2015) previously identified high concentrations of Pb and Cu, with substantive concentrations of V, Mn, and Zn as well. PXRF determined Pb concentrations in powders were similarly high; herbaceous, grass, and deciduous samples averaged 19, 21, and 22 mg kg⁻¹ while thatch and bark were 2,143 and 3,291 mg kg⁻¹, respectively. Similarly, mean PXRF determined Zn concentrations in powders were 279, 304, and 377 mg kg⁻¹ for herbaceous, grass and deciduous samples; thatch (7,334 mg kg⁻¹) and bark (7,120 mg kg⁻¹) were orders of magnitude higher. This suggests concentration of metals in recalcitrant organics (thatch, bark) which are not actively growing, or in fact may be degrading. Concentrations in thatch support similar findings of Paulette et al. (2015) in mineral soils, where means of 6,455 mg kg⁻¹ (Zn) and 4,957 mg kg⁻¹ (Pb) were reported. Contrary to the pattern of highest elemental concentrations occurring in thatch and bark, K and Cl showed the highest mean PXRF powder concentrations in grass (38,609; 8,142 mg kg⁻¹) and herbaceous (47,408; 6,457 mg kg⁻¹) samples, respectively. Data for Cl was not shown in Table 2 as it was not part of the suite of elements determined via ICP. The high concentration of K and Cl may be a reflection of solubility of these ions in solution. Both K and Cl are quite mobile in the phloem of plants (also S, P, Mg); Fe, Mn, Zn, Cu, and Mo feature intermediate mobility whereas Ca, Sr, Ba, Li, Si, and B are immobile (Epstein and Bloom, 2005). Even so, Ca levels were high, ranging from powder means of grass at 5,793 mg kg⁻¹ to bark at 37,830 mg kg⁻¹. However, the observed levels of Ca, K, and Cl fit well within common plant concentrations established by Epstein and Bloom (2005). Epstein and Bloom (2005) also note that heavy metal mobility in the phloem of plants is oft associated with their precipitation as various oxides, hydroxides, or carbonates at slightly alkaline pH; complexation with organic acids such as malate and other metal-chelating compounds may increase mobility

within the phloem, but are species specific. Elemental concentrations of P, K, Mg, Zn, Cu, and B tend to be higher in phloem than xylem, while the reverse is true for Mn and Ca (Miranda et al., 2002; Epstein and Bloom, 2005).

In Zlatna, Weindorf et al. (2013) found that Pb, As, Co, Cu, and Cd exceeded governmental action limits in soils for more than 50% of the area. In support of these findings, our study revealed elevated levels of Pb and Cu, especially in bark and thatch samples. Powder samples of the former yielded means of 385 and 82 mg kg⁻¹ (Pb) and 541 and 428 mg kg⁻¹ (Cu), respectively. While some Pb was smelted in Zlatna, the main focus there was the exploitation of Cu whereas the RomPlumb smelter operated in Copşa Mică depositing much higher Pb levels to the surrounding environment. In fact, deciduous, grass, and herbaceous powder samples in Zlatna featured mean Pb concentrations of 2, 4, and 2 mg kg⁻¹, respectively; far lower than comparable vegetation in Copşa Mică. Not surprisingly, high concentrations of Cl, K, and Ca were found in Zlatna samples. Among the types of samples evaluated, grass featured the highest mean PXRF powder concentrations of Cl (7,930 mg kg⁻¹) and K (47,939 mg kg⁻¹). By contrast, it also showed the lowest Ca content (mean 7,200 mg kg⁻¹), while the means of bark and thatch both exceeded 35,000 mg kg⁻¹. Across all sample types, our study produced a mean powder Cd concentration (13.9 mg kg⁻¹) roughly double that of mineral soil (7.6 mg kg⁻¹)(Weindorf et al., 2013).

For many elements (e.g., Zn, Pb, Cd, Fe) thatch and bark showed the highest mean ICP concentrations. Yet K was consistently highest in herbaceous and grass samples. The two elements showing the most stability in ICP results across samples types were Sr (0.17 - 0.25 mg kg⁻¹ Zlatna; 0.18 - 0.38 mg kg⁻¹ Copşa Mică) and Cd (0.30 - 0.31 mg kg⁻¹ Zlatna; 0.30 - 0.52 mg kg⁻¹ Copşa Mică).

Performance metrics of PXRF models relative to ICP are given in Table 4 and Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6. SLR models were executed for predicting the ICP-based elemental results for various matrices using PXRF elemental data as inputs. In the moist conditions model, results were less robust except for Pb (R^2_{cal} 0.74; RMSE_{cal} 11.74), Zn (R^2_{cal} 0.76; RMSE_{cal} 3.91), Cu (R^2_{cal} 0.77; RMSE_{cal} 0.22) and Cd (R^2_{cal} 0.56; RMSE_{cal} 0.16). Validation statistics indicate that even under field moist conditions, PXRF can reasonably be used for the determination of Zn (R^2_{val} 0.86; RMSE_{val} 3.50) and Cu (R^2_{val} 0.77; RMSE_{val} 0.37). Surprisingly, the predictive capability of

| Element | R ² _{cal} | RMSE _{cal} ^a | RPD _{cal} ^b | Bias _{cal} ^c | RPIQ _{cal} | R ² _{val} | RMSE _{val} ^d | RPD _{val} ^e | Biasval | RPIQ _{val} |
|---------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------|----------------------------|
| | | | | I | Moist | | | | | |
| Pb | 0.74 | 11.74 | 1.98 | 0.00 | 1.65 | 0.40 | 19.68 | 1.32 | -2.74 | 1.03 |
| Fe | 0.49 | 7.96 | 1.41 | -9.03x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 1.77 | 0.19 | 14.16 | 1.13 | -3.50 | 0.88 |
| Zn | 0.76 | 3.91 | 2.07 | -3.37x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 1.83 | 0.86 | 3.50 | 2.72 | -0.80 | 2.29 |
| K | 0.01 | 50.19 | 1.01 | 2.71x10 ⁻¹⁶ | 1.53 | 0.00 | 51.23 | 1.01 | 1.29 | 1.45 |
| Ca | 0.001 | 28.48 | 1.00 | 4.29x10 ⁻¹⁶ | 1.00 | 0.00 | 24.78 | 1.00 | 0.46 | 1.08 |
| Mn | 0.54 | 0.40 | 1.48 | -3.60x10 ⁻¹⁹ | 0.44 | 0.30 | 0.48 | 1.21 | -0.01 | 0.39 |
| Cu | 0.77 | 0.22 | 2.14 | -1.53x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 1.75 | 0.77 | 0.37 | 2.12 | -0.07 | 0.92 |
| Sr | 0.006 | 0.09 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.83 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 1.03 | -0.005 | 1.53 |
| Cd | 0.56 | 0.16 | 1.53 | 4.75x10 ⁻¹⁸ | 1.48 | 0.59 | 0.09 | 1.61 | 0.022 | 2.54 |
| | | | | | Dry | | | | | |
| Pb | 0.33 | 18.74 | 1.24 | 4.03x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 1.04 | 0.39 | 19.90 | 1.31 | -2.81 | 1.02 |
| Fe | 0.57 | 7.30 | 1.54 | -6.19x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 1.93 | 0.09 | 16.84 | 0.95 | 0.38 | 0.74 |
| Zn | 0.86 | 3.02 | 2.68 | -3.65x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 2.37 | 0.08 | 28.77 | 0.33 | 3.87 | 0.27 |
| K | 0.62 | 31.38 | 1.62 | 1.81x10 ⁻¹⁶ | 2.45 | 0.26 | 44.23 | 1.17 | 6.26 | 1.68 |
| Ca | 0.05 | 27.69 | 1.03 | -2.037x10 ⁻¹⁶ | 1.02 | 0.04 | 25.27 | 0.98 | 1.94 | 1.06 |
| Mn | 0.72 | 0.31 | 1.90 | -2.16x10 ⁻¹⁸ | 0.57 | 0.39 | 0.45 | 1.29 | 0.03 | 0.42 |
| Cu | 0.68 | 0.27 | 1.78 | -1.70x10 ⁻¹⁸ | 1.46 | 0.04 | 1.20 | 0.65 | 0.20 | 0.28 |
| Sr | 0.20 | 0.08 | 1.12 | 4.17x10 ⁻¹⁹ | 0.92 | 0.31 | 0.07 | 1.22 | 0.00 | 1.80 |
| Cd | 0.54 | 0.16 | 1.50 | -7.93x10 ⁻¹⁸ | 1.46 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 1.17 | 0.01 | 1.85 |
| | | | | Р | owder | | | | | |
| Pb | 0.71 | 12.27 | 1.89 | 4.03x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 1.58 | 0.90 | 7.93 | 3.29 | -1.14 | 2.57 |
| Fe | 0.74 | 5.73 | 1.96 | -6.19x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 2.45 | 0.80 | 7.00 | 2.29 | -0.88 | 1.78 |
| Zn | 0.93 | 2.10 | 3.86 | -3.65x10 ⁻¹⁷ | 3.41 | 0.61 | 5.84 | 1.63 | 0.80 | 1.37 |
| K | 0.65 | 30.03 | 1.69 | 1.81x10 ⁻¹⁶ | 2.56 | 0.56 | 34.07 | 1.52 | 3.08 | 2.18 |
| Ca | 0.13 | 26.47 | 1.08 | -2.03x10 ⁻¹⁶ | 1.07 | 0.11 | 23.37 | 1.06 | 0.66 | 1.15 |
| Mn | 0.82 | 0.25 | 2.37 | -2.16x10 ⁻¹⁸ | 0.71 | 0.63 | 0.35 | 1.66 | 0.01 | 0.54 |
| Cu | 0.82 | 0.20 | 2.38 | -1.70x10 ⁻¹⁸ | 1.94 | 0.98 | 0.09 | 8.53 | -0.001 | 3.72 |
| Sr | 0.20 | 0.08 | 1.12 | 4.17x10 ⁻¹⁹ | 0.92 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 1.37 | 0.001 | 2.03 |
| Cd | 0.97 | 0.04 | 5.97 | -7.93x10 ⁻¹⁸ | 5.79 | 0.75 | 0.07 | 2.07 | 0.001 | 3.27 |

Table 4. Performance metrics of calibration and validation models for elemental determination via portable X-ray fluorescence spectrometry vegetation in three moisture conditions in Romania. All values are in mg kg-1.

^aRMSE_{cal}, root mean squared error of calibration set ^bRPD_{cal}, residual prediction deviation of calibration set

°Bias_{cal,}, bias of calibration set

^dRMSE_{cal}, root mean squared error of validation set ^eRPD_{cal}, residual prediction deviation of validation set

^fBias_{cal,} bias of validation set



Fig. 3. PXRF predicted vs. ICP determined elemental concentrations across five vegetative sample types in Romania; determinations made on field moist samples.



Fig. 4. PXRF predicted vs. ICP determined elemental concentrations across five vegetative sample types in Romania; determinations made on oven dried, intact samples.



Fig. 5. PXRF predicted vs. ICP determined elemental concentrations across five vegetative sample types in Romania; determinations made on oven dried, powder (< 2 mm) samples.

- Correlation Plots.docx

Wet

Dry

Powder

ICP





Sr

Cu Powder Wet Ę Dr V Wet G Ъ Wet Ę Ъ Wet Wet Wet Dry Dry Dry 0.2 0.2 0.2 -0.2 Powde Powder Powder 0.4 -0.6 -0.6 ICP ICF ICF -0.8 -0.8

Fig. 6. Correlation plots showing different degrees of linear associations between **PICP** and **PXRF** measured values for three different vegetative matrix moisture conditions from Romania. The more linear the plot, the stronger the correlation.

Fe

Zn

Cd

PXRF for dry intact samples worsened slightly relative to scanning under field moist conditions while considering the validation statistics. Notably, the highest validation R^2 was produced by both Pb and Mn (0.39). Although, Zn (R²_{cal} 0.86; RMSE_{cal} 3.02), Cu (R²_{cal} 0.68; RMSE_{cal} 0.27) and Cd (R^2_{cal} 0.54; RMSE_{cal} 0.16) in dry intact samples produced reasonable calibration performance, these results were not maintained in the validation sets indicating overfitted calibration algorithms. However, drying and powdering samples allowed for stable validation prediction of Pb (R^{2}_{val} 0.90; RMSE_{val} 7.93), Fe (R^{2}_{val} 0.80; RMSE_{val} 7.00), and Cd (R^{2}_{val} 0.75; RMSE_{val} 0.07). Under the same conditions, Cu produced R^2_{val} of 0.98 and RMSE_{val} of 0.09. Validation RPD values indicated strong, stable models at 3.29, 2.29, 2.07, and 8.53, respectively (Chang et al., 2001). Furthermore, the best RPIQ values for both calibration set (5.97) and validation set (3.72) for powder data were produced by Cd and Cu, respectively. Most of the elements under moist condition showed different degrees of underestimation at higher analyte values, possibly due to lack of samples with higher ends of the property scale (Fig. 3). Notably, Sr was unable to yield reasonable correlation with PXRF data in any condition, since a large number of Sr values were near the detection limit of PXRF (<5 mg kg⁻¹), ultimately increasing the standard error of the measurements. The high agreement between ICP Cu and PXRF Cu supported the findings of Sacristán et al. (2016) who used PXRF spectra derived parameters [maximum height (Hmax) and Full Width at Half Height (FWHH)] to satisfactorily predict Cu concentration in lettuce samples. Still, based on our earlier research (Pearson et al., 2017), the applicability of PXRF spectra derived parameters for predicting elements cannot be generalized. Figure 6 represents correlation plots showing different degrees of linear associations between ICP and PXRF measured values for three different vegetative matrix conditions. As expected, except for Ca and Sr, most of the elements exhibited strong positive correlation between their powder PXRF data and ICP data, further supporting the SLR-based results.

General Field Observations

In Copşa Mică and Zlatna, the PXRF was used on-site to make some rapid assessments of various organic materials. The outer bark (rhytidome) of a deciduous tree near the Copşa Mică dispersion stack was first scanned, followed by a scan of the live periderm beneath. The selected tree (*Robinia pseudoacacia*) was ~25 y old, and subsequently planted after cessation of activities at the Copşa Mică smelter. Exploratory results revealed excessive Pb concentrations in the

rhytidome (2,061 mg kg⁻¹), while the underlying periderm contained just 9 mg kg⁻¹. This suggests substantive Pb accumulation in non-living tissue, while the live inner tissues (or bark) remains relatively low. Further, Pulford and Watson (2003) note that "partitioning of the metals within the stem can vary within a tree. Wood and bark are important sinks for biologically available metals, with additional sink tissue being formed each growing season." As evidence, Pulford et al. (2002) found consistently higher concentrations of Cu, Ni, Zn, and Cd in the rhytidome of willow clones relative to concentrations in periderm of the same clone. In some instances, the differences were modest, yet in others, rhytidome samples were orders of magnitude higher than the periderm. Scanning electron microscopy analysis (Fig. 7) reveals the pitted nature of the bark matrix, which effectively traps particulate pollution dust in the rhytidome. Microprobe (EDAX) analysis of individual grains (Fig. 7) shows the Pb content orders of magnitude higher than the vegetative matrix immediately adjacent. By comparison, Fig. 8 shows two types of matrices in a thatch sample: organic and mineral particulate. While EDAX analysis of the latter shows a strong likelihood of the particulate being ZnS, even the organic matrix features appreciable Pb and Zn across an organic surface which appears to be relatively devoid of mineral pollutants. This could either indicate a particle of mineral pollutant behind the organic structure being detected by energy penetrating beneath the organic structure, or some level of pollutant may have been integrated into the organic matrix. Leaves of the same tree were also field tested and shown to contain (moist) Pb concentrations of 20 mg kg⁻¹, indicating possible translocation from the contaminated mineral soil (>20,000 mg kg⁻¹; Paulette et al., 2015) into the leaves and bark. This was further investigated by recording PXRF values of various bark samples from both the out-facing and in-facing sides. Results show marginally lower values from the in-facing sides of thicker bark samples, while the thin samples showed no change in readings, no matter the orientation. This suggests that the depth of X-ray transmisivity is unable to detect trace elemental differences at the millimeter scale. Rather, the X-rays simply pass through each bark sample. In all likelihood, Pb is most abundant closest to the surface and diminishes deeper into the tree tissue.

Barks that possess lichens showed considerably higher Pb concentrations than their lichenfree counterparts due to some lichen's propensity to hyperaccumulate metals. For example, Sarrett et al. (1998) found lichen *Diploschistes muscorum* to be an effective hyperaccumulator of Pb, whilst *Xanthoria parietina* effectively tolerated high Pb levels. Since many of the trees were



Fig. 7. A) EDAX microprobe analysis of particulate matter (suspected aeolian smelter pollution; red +), B) EDAX microprobe analysis of organic, vegetative bark matrix (green +) featuring much lower levels of particulate smelter pollution, and C) scanning electron micrograph showing the vesicular nature of the bark, its propensity to trap particulate smelter pollution, and microprobe scan locations. The featured bark sample was obtained from a tree located 500 m north of the dispersion smokestack; 75 m north of the Târnava Mare River in Copşa Mică, Romania.







Fig. 8. A) EDAX microprobe analysis of organic, vegetative thatch matrix (green \Box) featuring moderate levels of smelter pollution, B) EDAX microprobe analysis of particulate matter (suspected aeolian smelter pollution, specifically ZnS; red \Box), and C) scanning electron micrograph showing the organic nature of the thatch, laminar coatings and particulate expressions of smelter pollution, and microprobe scan locations. The featured thatch sample was obtained from a tree located 500 m north of the dispersion smokestack; 75 m north of the Târnava Mare River in Copşa Mică, Romania.

established after the cessation of works at the smelting plant, the question remains as to how the epiphytic lichens were exposed to such high elemental concentrations. Evaluating epilithic lichen colonization in smelter impacted waste, Rola et al. (2016) suggests that the main source of elemental input to lichen thalli is atmospheric deposition as lichens have no roots; biomineralization and surface complexation are other sources of potential elemental input. In our study, it was noteworthy that lichens were more prolific on dead wood bark relative to live tree bark, though the two types of samples were not independently collected.

Grasses typically showed undetectable or low trace element concentrations compared to all other vegetation samples. As such, the grasses currently growing in Zlatna and Copşa Mică will be ineffective phytoremediators. This is unfortunate, since the mowing and removal of hyperaccumulator grasses has proven both a cost effective and practical remediation strategy. However, other studies have shown the potential of certain grass species for remediation. Golda and Korzeniowska (2016) reported variable success in root/shoot accumulation of Cd amended soil growing *Poa pratensis*, *Lolium perenne*, and *Festuca rubra*. Chen et al. (2004) investigated metal laden soils and found *Vetiveria zizanioides* could re-adsorb 98%, 54%, 41%, and 88% of the initially applied Pb, Cu, Zn, and Cd, respectively. However in our study, removal of leaf-litter from wooded areas could provide a strong alternative, particularly in Copşa Mică.

A sample of cow dung in a field near the Copşa Mică smelter contained 4 mg kg⁻¹ Pb in the excrement, which was typical of grasses in Copşa Mică. Another confounding discovery was that of a bracket fungi found on *Robinia pseudoacacia* in a highly contaminated zone of the Copşa Mică forest; the fungi was completely devoid of Pb. The surrounding thatch contained ~665 mg kg⁻¹ Pb, yet the bracket fungi effectively acted as a biological filter to prevent the uptake of Pb into its tissues.

CONCLUSIONS

This research evaluated the efficacy of PXRF spectrometer for determining elemental concentration in vegetation relative to more expensive and time consuming approaches (e.g., acid digestion followed by quantification via ICP). Organic material samples from smelter impacted areas of Romania were evaluated, inclusive of thatch, deciduous leaves, grasses, tree bark, and herbaceous plants. Samples were scanned in three conditions: as received from the field (moist), oven dry (70°C), and dried and powdered to pass a 2 mm sieve. Performance

metrics of PXRF models relative to ICP atomic emission spectroscopy were developed to asses optimal scanning conditions. In most instances, the highest elemental concentrations (Zn, Pb, Cd, Fe) were found in bark and thatch samples, which suggests concentration of metals in recalcitrant organics which are not actively growing, or in fact may be degrading. In contrast to the pattern of highest elemental concentrations occurring in thatch and bark, K and Cl showed the highest mean PXRF powder concentrations in grass and herbaceous samples, which was expected since they are mobile elements. Validation statistics show that PXRF could be used for the determination of Zn (R² 0.86; RPD 2.72) and Cu (R² 0.77; RPD 2.12) even under field moist conditions, while dried and powdered samples allowed for stronger validation prediction of Pb (R² 0.90; RPD 3.29), Fe (R² 0.80; RPD 2.29), Cd (R² 0.75; RPD 2.07) and Cu (R² 0.98; RPD of 8.53). In sum, PXRF was shown to be a useful approach for quickly assessing multiple elements in vegetation. Scanning electron microscopy analysis further explained the pitted nature of the bark matrix, which effectively trapped particulate pollution dust in the rhytidome. Future PXRF/vegetation research work should focus upon quantification of additional elements and investigating its usefulness in evaluating phytoremediation effectiveness and assessment of plant essential elements.

ACKNOLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge support from the BL Allen Endowment in Pedology at Texas Tech University and the contributions of Bo Zhao in conducting this research.

REFERENCES

- Ali, H., Khan, E., Sajad, M.A., 2013. Phytoremediation of heavy metals Concepts and applications. Chemosphere 91, 869-881.
- Agenția Regională pentru Protecția Mediului (ARPM) Sibiu., 2011. Raport anual privind stadiul realizării măsurilor din programul integrat de gestionarea calității aerului județul Sibiu, zona Copșa Mică-Mediaș, martie 2011.
- ASSA GRUP S.R.L., 2009. Plan urbanistic general ORAȘUL COPȘA MICĂ. Volumul I. Memoriul general. Available online at: http://www.copsamica.ro/fileadmin/copsa/Files/Afisier/PUG_COPSA_MICA.pdf (verified 21 Jul. 2017).
- Barceló, J., Poschenrieder, C., 2003. Phytoremediation: principles and perspectives. Contrib. Sci. 2, 333-344.
- Barker, A.V., Pilbeam, D.J., 2007. Handbook of plant nutrition. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Bettinelli, M., Beone, G.M., Spezia, S., Baffi, C., 2000. Determination of heavy metals in soils and sediments by microwave-assisted digestion and inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry analysis. Analytica Chimica Acta 424, 289–296.
- Brooks, R.R., Chambers, M.F., Nicks, L.J., Robinson, B.H., 1998. Phytomining. Trends in Plant Science 3, 359-362.
- Chakraborty, S., Li, B., Deb, S., Paul, S., Weindorf, D.C., Das, B.S., 2017a. Predicting soil arsenic pools by visible near infrared diffuse reflectance spectroscopy. Geoderma 296, 30-37.
- Chakraborty, S., Weindorf, D.C., Deb, S., Li, B., Paul, S., Choudhury, A., Ray, D.P., 2017b.Rapid assessment of regional soil arsenic pollution risk via diffuse reflectance spectroscopy.Geoderma 289, 72–81.
- Chang, C., Laird, D.A., Mausbach, M.J., Hurburgh, C.R., 2001. Near infrared reflectance spectroscopy: Principal components regression analysis of soil properties. Soil Science Society of America Journal 65, 480–490.

- Chen, Y., Shen, Z., Li, X., 2004. The use of vetiver grass (*Vetiveria zizanioides*) in the phytoremediation of soils contaminated with heavy metals. Applied Geochemistry 19, 1553-1565.
- Courbot, M., Willems, G., Motte, P., Arvidsson, S., Roosens, N., Saumitou-Laprade, P., Verbruggen, N., 2007. A major quantitative trait locus for cadmium tolerance in *Arabidopsis halleri* Colocalizes with *HMA4*, a gene encoding a heavy metal ATPase. Plant Physiology 144, 1052-1065.
- Craciun, A.R., Meyer, C.L., Chen, J., Roosens, N., De Groodt, R., Hilson, P., Verbruggen, N., 2012. Variation in *HMA4* gene copy number and expression among *Noccaea caerulescens* populations presenting different levels of Cd tolerance and accumulation. Journal of Experimental Botany 63, 4179-4189.
- Direcția Silvică Sibiu. 2008. Reconstrucția ecologică de la Copșa Mică. Design and print, Honterus, Sibiu.
- Epstein, E., Bloom, A.J., 2005. Mineral nutrition of plants: Principles and perspectives. 2nd ed. Sinauer Associates Publishers, Sunderland, MA. 400 pp.
- Florea, N., Munteanu, I., 2012. The Romanian system of soil taxonomy. Sitech, Craiova, Romania.
- Gavlak, R.G., Horneck, D.A., Miller, R.O., 2005. Soil, plant, and water reference methods for the Western region. WREP-125, 3rd ed. p. 167-169.
- Golda, S., Korzeniowska, J., 2016. Comparison of phytoremediation potential of three grass species in soil contaminated with cadmium. Environmental Protection and Natural Resources 27, 8-14.
- Halimaa, P., Blande, D., Aarts, M.G., Tuomainen, M., Tervahauta, A., Kärenlampi, S. 2014.Comparative transcriptome analysis of the metal hyperaccumulator *Noccaea caerulescens*.Frontiers in Plant Science 5(213), 1-7.
- Hanikenne, M., Talke, I.N., Haydon, M.J., Lanz, C., Nolte, A., Motte, P., Kroymann, J., Weigel, D., Kramer, U., 2008. Evolution of metal hyperaccumulation required *cis*-regulatory changes and triplication of *HMA4*. Nature 453, 391-395.

- Hanlon, E.A., 1998. Elemental determination by atomic absorption spectrophotometry. *In:* Kalra,Y.P. (Ed.). Handbook of reference methods for plant analysis. CRC Press. Boca Raton, FL.287 pp.
- Harford, A., 2013. Copşa Mică: Europe's most polluted town. Available online at: http://www.lensbeyond.com/photos/romania/3/copsa-mica-most-polluted-town-europe (verified 2 Aug. 2017).
- Iordache, V., 2009. Raport de cercetare etapa 2 la proiectul 31043/2007 METAGRO, Universitatea din Bucuresti. Available online at: http://metagro.cesec.ro/pdf/Raport52175_Et2_CreditAng_2009_stiintifica.pdf (verified 22 Jul. 2017).
- Isaac, R.A., Johnson, W.C., 1998. Elemental determination by inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy. *In:* Kalra, Y.P. (Ed.). Handbook of reference methods for plant analysis. CRC Press. Boca Raton, FL. 287 pp.
- Kabata-Pendias, A., 2011. Trace elements in soil and plants. 4th ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Koch, J., Chakraborty, S., Li, B., Moore-Kucera, J., van Deventer, P., Daniell, A., Faul, C., Man, T., Pearson, D., Duda, B., Weindorf, C.A., Weindorf, D.C., 2017. Proximal sensor analysis of mine tailings in South Africa: An exploratory study. Journal of Geochemical Exploration 181, 45-57.
- Krüger, C., Carius, A., 2001. Environmental policy and law in Romania. Towards EU Accession.Books on Demand, Norderstedt, Germany. 101 pp.
- Krupa, Z., Siedlecka, A., Skórzynska-Polit, E., Maksymiec, W., 2002. Heavy metal interactions with plant nutrients. *In:* Prasad, M.N.V., Strzalka, K. (eds.). Physiology and biochemistry of metal toxicity and tolerance in plants. Kluwer Academic Publishers, The Netherlands. p. 287-301.
- Lazăr, A.G., 2011. Munții Trascău. Studiu geoecologic. Teză de doctorat, Universitatea Babes-Bolyai, Facultatea de Geografie regională.

- Li, Y.M., Chaney, R., Brewer, E., Roseberg, R., Angle, J.S., Baker, A., Reeves, R., Nelkin, J., 2003. Development of a technology for commercial phtoextraction of nickel: Economic and technical considerations. Plant and Soil 249, 107-115.
- Lochlainn, S.O., Bowen, H.C., Fray, R.G., Hammond, J.P., King, G.J., White, J., Graham, S., Broadley, R., 2011. Tandem quadruplication of *HMA4* in the zinc (Zn) and cadmium (Cd) hyperaccumulator *Noccaea caerulecens*. Plos One 6 (e17814):1-9.
- Marschner, H., 1995. Mineral nutrition of higher plants. Academic Press, London, UK.
- McLaren, T.I., Guppy, C.N., Tighe, M.K., 2011. A rapid and nondestructive plant nutrient analysis using portable X-ray fluorescence. Soil Science Society of America Journal 76, 1446-1453.
- Micó, C., Recatalá, L., Peris, M., Sánchez, J., 2006. Assessing heavy metal sources in agricultural soils of an European Mediterranean area by multivariate analysis. Chemosphere 65, 863-872.
- Millis, P.R., Ramsey, M.H., John, E.A., 2004. Heterogeneity of cadmium concentration in soil a source of uncertainty in plant uptake and its implications for human health risk assessment. Science of the Total Environment 326, 49-53.
- Mines and Communities. 2006. Blacksmith Institute and Green Cross Switzerland Report 2006 -World's Worst Polluted Places. Available online at: http://www.minesandcommunities.org/article.php?a=845 (verified 1 Aug. 2017).
- Miranda, E.R., Pattanagul, W., Madore, M.A., 2002. Phloem transport of solutes in crop plants.
 In: Pessarakli, M. (ed.). Handbook of plant and crop physiology, 2nd Ed. Dekker, New York.
 p. 449-465.
- Morărescu, C., 2014. Model de evaluare a progresului programului de intervenție în diminuarea riscurilor associate expunerii la metale grele (Pb, Cd) în zona Copșa Mică. Teză de doctorat. Universitatea Babeş Bolyai, Cluj Napoca, Facultatea de Știința și Ingineria Mediului.
- Paltridge, N.G., Palmer, L.J., Milham, P.J., Guild, G.E., Stangoulis, J.C.R., 2012a. Energydispersive X-ray fluorescence analysis of zinc and iron concentration in rice and pearl millet grain. Plant and Soil 361, 251-260.

- Paltridge, N.G., Milham, P.J., Ortiz-Monasterio, J.I., Velu, G., Yasmin, Z., Palmer, L.J., Guild, G.E., Stangoulis, J.C.R., 2012b. Energy-dispersive X-ray fluorescence spectrometry as a tool for zinc, iron, and selenium analysis in whole grain wheat. Plant and Soil 361, 261:269.
- Paulette, L., Man, T., Weindorf, D.C., Person, T., 2015. Rapid assessment of soil and contaminant variability via portable X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy: Copşa Mică, Romania. Geoderma 243-244, 130-140.
- Paulette, L., Oroian, I., Rusu, M., Todoran, A., 2007. Main ways of degradation and pedomeliorative technologies of heavy metal polluted soils. *In*: Volume Lucrari Științifice Seria A, L Agronomie, 330-336. ISSN, Bucharest, p. 1222-5339.
- Pearson, D., Chakraborty, S., Duda, B., Li, B., Weindorf, D.C., Deb, S., Brevik, E., Ray, D.P., 2017. Water analysis via portable X-ray fluorescence spectrometry. Journal of Hydrology 544, 172-179.
- Pollard, A.J., Reeves, R.D., Baker, A.J.M. 2014. Facultative hyperaccumulation of heavy metals and metalloids. Plant Science 217-218, 8-17.
- Podar, D., Ramsey, M.H., Hutchings, M.J., 2004. The effect of cadmium, zinc and substrate heterogeneity on yield, shoot metal concentration and metal uptake by *Brassica juncea*: Implications for human health risk assessment and phytoremediation. New Phytologist 163, 313-324.
- Podar, D., Ramsey, H.M., 2005. Effect of alkaline pH and associated Zn on the concentration and total uptake of Cd by lettuce: comparison with predictions from the CLEA model. Science of the Total Environment 347, 53-63.
- Popa, M., 2005. Metode și tehnici moderne de determinare a poluării mediului cu metale grele Analize și studii de caz în zona Zlatna, Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj-Napoca, p. 11-20.
- Pulford, I.D., Watson, C., 2003. Phytoremediation of heavy metal-contaminated land by trees -a review. Environment International 29, 529-540.
- Pulford, I.D., Riddell-Black, D., Stewart, C., 2002. Heavy metal uptake by willow clones from sewage sludge-treated soil: The potential for phytoremediation. International Journal of Phytoremediation 4(1), 59-72.

- RECARE Project., 2013. Copşa Mică, Romania. Available online at: http://www.recarehub.eu/case-studies/copsa-mica-romania (verified 2 Aug. 2017).
- Roberts, L.C., Hug, S.J., Dittmar, J., Voegelin, A., Saha, G.C., Ali, M.A., Badruzzaman, A.B.M., Kretzschmar, R., 2007. Spatial distribution and temporal variability of arsenic in irrigated rice fields in Bangladesh. 1. Irrigation water. Environmental Science and Technology 41, 5960-5966.
- Rola, K., Osyczka, P., Kafel, A., 2016. Different heavy metal accumulation strategies of epilithic lichens colonizing artificial post-smelting wastes. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 70, 418-428.
- Roşu, A., 1973. Physical geography of Romania. Pedagogical and didactical Publisher, Bucharest.
- Sacristán, D., Viscarra Rossel, R.A., Recatalá, L., 2016. Proximal sensing of Cu in soil and lettuce using portable X-ray fluorescence spectrometry. Geoderma 265, 6–11.
- Sarret, G., Manceau, A., Cuny, D., Van Haluwyn, C., Déruelle, S., Hazemann, J.L., Soldo, Y., Eybert-Bérard, L., Menthonnex, J.J., 1998. Mechanisms of lichen resistance to metallic pollution. Environmental Science & Technology 32, 3325-3330.
- Shukman, D., 2007. The most polluted town in Europe. BBC News Channel. Available online at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/6268741.stm (verified 2 Aug. 2017).
- Soil Survey Staff., 2014. Keys to Soil Taxonomy. 12th ed. USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, Washington, DC.
- Srivastava, M., Ma, L.Q., Santos, J.A.G., 2006. Three new arsenic hyperaccumulating ferns. Science of the Total Environment 364, 24-31.
- Thompson, J., 1991. East Europe's dark dawn. National Geographic 179(6), 36-63.
- Tomašević, M., Vukmirović, Z., Rajšić, S., Tasić, M., Stevanović, B., 2005. Characterization of trace metal particles deposited on some deciduous tree leaves in an urban area. Chemosphere 61(6), 753-760.

- US EPA., 2007. Method 6200: Field portable X-ray fluorescence spectrometry for the determination of elemental concentrations in soil and sediment. US Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, DC.
- Watson, M.E., 1998. Analytical instruments for the determination of elements in plant tissue. *In:* Kalra, Y.P. (ed.). Handbook of reference methods for plant analysis. CRC Press. Boca Raton, FL. 287 pp.
- Weindorf, D.C., Paulette, L., Man, T., 2013. In-situ assessment of metal contamination via portable X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy: Zlatna, Romania. Environmental Pollution 182, 92–100.
- Weindorf, D.C., Bakr, N., Zhu, Y., 2014. Advances in portable X-ray fluorescence (PXRF) for environmental, pedological, and agronomic applications. Advances in Agronomy 128, 1-45.
- Wuana, R.A., Okieimen, F.E., 2011. Heavy metals in contaminated soils: A review of sources, chemistry, risks, and best available strategies for remediation. ISRN Ecology 2011, 1-20.
- Xiong, Z.T., 1997. Lead uptake and effects on seed germination and plant growth in a Pb hyperaccumulator *Brassica pekinensis* Rupr. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 60, 285-291.
- Zhang, M., Senoura, T., Yang, X., Nishizawa, N.K., 2011. Functional analysis of metal tolerance proteins isolated from Zn/Cd hyperaccumulating ecotype and non-hyperaccumulating ecotype of *Sedum alfredii* Hance. FEBS Letters 585, 2604–2609.