

**HEALTH RISK ANALYSIS OF HEAVY METALS (Cr, Fe, Hg & Ni) IN
EDIBLE VEGETABLES IN YALA URBAN AREA OF CROSS RIVER
STATE, NIGERIA.**

ABSTRACT

Aim: The aim of the study was to determine concentration of heavy metals in the soil and edible vegetables planted consumed Yala Urban Area of Cross River State, Nigeria, ascertained the level of metals contamination and the possible health risk or implication. **Sampling:** Forty eight (48) soil and edible vegetable samples (6 of each kind of the 8 vegetables) were collected randomly from Yala Urban Area of Cross River State. The eight vegetables considered for the study were *Amaranthus spp.*, *Corchorus olitorius*, *Murraya koenigii*, *Ocimum grattissimum*, *Solanum melongena*, *Talinum triangulare*, *Telferia occidentalis* and *Vernonia amygdalina*. They were collected between January and March for dry season, and July and September for rainy season of the year. **Methodology:** The samples were digested and analyzed for the Cr, Fe, Hg and Ni (heavy metals) concentration using Flame Atomic Absorption Spectrometer (AAS) in the Chemistry Laboratory, University of Calabar. **Results:** The results showed that the mean concentration of the metals in the soil in mgkg^{-1} ranged from (0.063 - 0.108) and (0.049 - 0.104) in rainy and dry seasons respectively

23 for Cr, and (0.026 - 0.124) and (0.013 - 0.119) in rainy and dry season
24 respectively for Fe. The mean concentration accumulated by the vegetables
25 ranged from (0.037- 0.063) and (0.029 - 0.066) in rainy and dry season
26 respectively for Cr and (0.012- 0.071) and (0.008- 0.086) in rainy and dry
27 season respectively. Hg and Ni were neither detected in the soil nor in the
28 vegetables. The trend of the metals in both the soil and vegetable was in the
29 order: Cr > Fe> Hg> Ni. The Target Hazard Quotients were all less than 1,
30 indicating no health risk. **Conclusion:** These results suggest that there is no
31 significant difference between the amount of metals in the soil or that
32 accumulated by the vegetables in rainy and dry seasons of the year. Also the
33 amount of metals accumulated by most of the vegetables was directly
34 proportional to the amount present in the soil where they are planted. These
35 results indicate that the concentration of Cr, Fe, Hg and Ni in the soil and
36 vegetables were still low and within the permissible limits of WHO/FAO. Thus,
37 the consumption of the vegetables in the area may not pose any risk at the
38 moment.

39 **Keywords:** Health risk analysis, Heavy metals, Consumption, Vegetables,
40 Yala.

41 **Introduction**

42 A heavy metal has a specific gravity of 5.0 or greater and is usually
43 poisonous [1]. The term heavy metal however, is often widely applied to

44 include other potentially toxic elements even if they do not meet up with the apt
45 chemical definition [1]. It has also been described as a member of a loosely
46 defined subset of elements that exhibit metallic properties (Wikipedia free
47 encyclopedia). Examples of these elements are transition metals, some
48 metalloids, lanthanides and actinides. Chromium (Cr), Iron (Fe), Mercury (Hg)
49 and Nickel (Ni) belong to this group of elements. Based on their toxic or
50 poisonous effect at high doses and their contamination of food plants and
51 animals when present in the soil or water environments, they have recently
52 attracted the attention of many researchers worldwide as food safety and quality
53 is a matter of public interest. Hence, several researchers have been carried out
54 on heavy metals by researchers like Chang [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8] etc. most of
55 which were within the acceptable limits in their various localities to ascertain
56 their food and environment quality/safety. Heavy metals are the major
57 contaminating agents of our food and a problem of our environment [9].

58 In addition, Khan [10] opined that the consumption of contaminated
59 vegetables constitutes an important route for animal and human exposure to
60 heavy metals. Halwell [11] earlier stated that the nutritional value of vegetables
61 depends on the growing method and the quality of the soil because when
62 vegetables are grown in contaminated soils, like those polluted with heavy
63 metals; their nutritional value will be reduced as pollutants from the soil will be
64 accumulated by the vegetables. Thus, vegetables should not be planted on soils

65 contaminated with hazardous waste like heavy metals because they are
66 nutritionally and medicinally valuable. Besides, the health of humans can be
67 affected negatively when they consume these vegetables and accumulate these
68 poisonous substances in high doses [24]. Consequently, the aim of this study is
69 to determine the concentration of some heavy metals (Cr, Fe, Hg and Ni) in the
70 soil and edible vegetables in the study area (Yala) and ascertain the soil and
71 vegetable quality with respect to heavy metal pollution.

72 Yala urban area is characterized with low land, plains and hills. The soil
73 is well drain sandy loam in texture, which makes it suitable for agriculture. It
74 has population of over 50 thousand people. Besides, the **people are engaged** in
75 subsistence and commercial farming, growing rice, cassava, yam, cocoa in large
76 quantities as well as vegetables for consumption as food and medicine. This
77 often results in the use of insecticides, herbicides and other agrochemicals. By
78 its location, it is a major link to the eastern and northern part of the country and
79 most times experience heavy vehicular traffic. In addition, its major urban
80 centre; Okpoma and the adjoining Okuku where Cross River University of
81 Technology mini-campus is located have business centres, State and Local
82 Government institutions among other urban features. Moreover, the inhabitants
83 of the area practice rotational waste dump sites around their premises and later
84 plant vegetables in old waste dump sites with a view to tap the compost manure
85 for good yield even though wastes were disposed there indiscriminately. All

86 these characteristics/features together with erosion during the rainy season make
87 heavy metal contamination of the area inevitable. Hence, there is need to
88 ascertain the edible vegetables and soil quality with respect to heavy metals
89 pollution, and also evaluate the possible health risk associated their
90 consumption.

91 **Materials and Methods**

92 **Sampling and sample pre-treatment:** forty eight soil samples and
93 vegetables (with 6 of each vegetable) were collected randomly at
94 different locations within Yala urban area at a distance of about 1km
95 apart. The soil samples were collected at the root level of the vegetables
96 at the depth of about 12 to 15 cm, using a hand trowel. At the same time,
97 a handful of the edible vegetables were collected and wrapped separately
98 with identification labels, and taken to the laboratory for further analysis.
99 The edible vegetables considered for this study include: *Amaranthus spp*
100 (Green vegetable), *Corchorus olitorius* (Ewedu), *Murraya koeningii*
101 (Curry leaf), *Ocimum grattissimum* (scent leaf), *Solanum melongena*
102 (egg plant leaf), *Telfairia occidentalis* (pumpkin), *Talinum triangulare*
103 (water leaf) and *Vernonia amygdalina* (Bitter leaf). They are commonly
104 used for food and medicinal purposes in the area. The samples were
105 collected between January and March for the dry season and between
106 July and September for the rainy season of the year. The vegetable
107 samples were washed with distilled water and oven-dried at 80-85 °c for
108 about 2 hours. Each dried sample was ground into powder, sieved with a
109 0.3 mm sieve and stored in a labeled plastic jar with cap. The soil
110 sampled was also oven-dried, ground into powder and homogenized

111 using pestle and mortar, sieved and stored in labeled plastic jars
112 separately.

113 **Digestion of samples:** vegetable samples were digested following the
114 procedure of one of the methods of the Association of Official Analytical
115 Chemists (AOAC) as reported by Sobukola [12] thus: 1.0 g of each sample was
116 put in a beaker and placed in a fume cupboard, 20 mL of concentrated (HCl), 10
117 mL of concentrated HNO₃ and 5 mL of H₂SO₄ were added. After digestion was
118 complete, the beaker was heated in a fume cupboard for about 30 minutes. The
119 digested sample was removed and allowed to cool.

120 De-ionized water was added to the digest and made up to 100 mL in a
121 volumetric flask. The solution was stirred and filtered to obtain the supernatant
122 liquid ready for heavy metals analysis. Similarly the soil samples were digested
123 following the procedure of one of the methods of the Association of Official
124 Analytical Chemists (AOAC) as reported by Akan [13] thus: 2.0 g of each soil
125 sample powder was weighed into an acid washed beaker. 20 mL of aqua regia
126 (mixture of HCl and HNO₃, in the ratio 3:1) was added to the sample in the
127 beaker. The beaker was covered with a clean dry watch glass and heated at 90%
128 for about 2 hours; the beaker was removed, allowed to cool, washed together
129 with the watch glass using de-ionized water into a volumetric flask and made-up
130 to 100 mL solution. The solution was filtered and supernatant liquid solution
131 was used for heavy metal analysis.

132 **Element Analysis:** the soil and vegetable samples were analyzed for Cr,
133 Fe, Hg and Ni using a VGP 210 BUCK Scientific Model of flame Atomic
134 Absorption Spectrometer (AAS) at the following wavelengths: Cr (357.0 nm),
135 Fe (248.0 nm), Hg (253.7 nm) and Ni (232.0 nm).

136 **Calculations:** the Target Hazard Quotient which is the ratio of the body intake
137 dose of a pollutant to the reference dose was calculated thus:

$$THQ = \frac{DIV \times Cm}{RfD \times B}$$

138 Where DIV is the daily intake of vegetable in kg/day, Cm is the concentration
139 of pollutant (heavy metal) in the vegetable in mgkg^{-1} , B is the average body
140 weight of humans in kg, while RfD is the oral reference dose of the pollutant
141 permissible and it is fixed by United States Environmental Protection Agency
142 (US-EPA). **Note:** B is assumed by US-EPA to be 70kg for adult males and 60kg
143 for adult females. For this study, 65kg (the average of 70kg and 60kg) was used
144 for all adults, while the DIV was assumed to be 100g (0.1kg/day) per day. In
145 some countries or places, up to 150 or 200g per day has been assumed
146 especially for vegetarians. From the formula, THQ is a dimensionless parameter
147 or ratio. According to US-EPA through Integrated Risk Information System-
148 database IRIS [14], if THQ is less than 1 ($THQ < 1$), it shows that there is no
149 potential health risk associated with the pollutant. But if $THQ > 1$, there is a
150 health risk associated with the pollutant (heavy metal) at that moment. The RfD
151 values for Cr, Fe, Hg and Ni from IRIS are 0.0003, 0.007, 0.001 and 0.01 mgkg^{-1}
152 respectively [14].

153 **Statistical Analysis:** The data collected was analyzed using SPSS version 20.
154 The data were expressed in terms of descriptive statistics and figures were
155 presented with mean values of triplicates. Significance test was also computed
156 using paired t-test at $P < 0.05$ for dry and rainy season data in order to check
157 whether there was any significant difference.

158 **Results:** The mean heavy metal concentration in mgkg^{-1} (dry weight) in the soil
159 and vegetables during the rainy and dry season have been presented in Tables 1
160 and 2 respectively, while the Target Hazard Quotients of the vegetables have
161 been presented in Tables 4 and 5 for the both seasons. WHO/FAO permissible
162 limits for the metals in soil, vegetables and medicinal plants are presented in
163 Table 3.

165 **Table 1:** Mean concentration of **Cr, Fe, Hg and Ni** in mgkg^{-1} (dry weight) in the
 166 soil and vegetables during the rainy season in **Yala**.

Vegetable	Cr	Fe	Hg	Ni
<i>Amarathus spp</i>	0.042±0.003	0.022±0.005	ND	ND
Soil	0.069±0.011	0.033±0.004	ND	ND
<i>Corchorus olitorius</i>	0.052±0.008	0.038±0.010	ND	ND
Soil	0.069±0.017	0.075±0.019	ND	ND
<i>Murraya koenigii</i>	0.054±0.004	0.017±0.003	ND	ND
Soil	0.063±0.014	0.027±0.004	ND	ND
<i>Ocimumgratissimum</i>	0.040±0.006	0.029±0.011	ND	ND
Soil	0.071±0.012	0.056±0.014	ND	ND
<i>Solanum melongena</i>	0.050±0.009	0.019±0.003	ND	ND
Soil	0.064±0.004	0.026±0.004	ND	ND
<i>Talinum triangulare</i>	0.037±0.007	0.071±0.019	ND	ND
Soil	0.084±0.027	0.124±0.014	ND	ND
<i>Telferia occidentalis</i>	0.063±0.022	0.029±0.011	ND	ND
Soil	0.108±0.004	0.056±0.012	ND	ND
<i>Vernoniaamygdalina</i>	0.072±0.012	0.012±0.002	ND	ND
Soil	0.105±0.036	0.026±0.004	ND	ND

167 Values reported in mean ± SD format with N=3, ND – Not Detected.

168 **Table 2:** Mean concentration of Cr, Fe, Hg and Ni in mgkg⁻¹ (dry weight) in the
 169 soil and vegetables during the dry season in Yala.

Vegetable	Cr	Fe	Hg	Ni
<i>Amarathus spp</i>	0.035±0.005	0.019±0.001	ND	ND
Soil	0.066±0.013	0.030±0.002	ND	ND
<i>Corchorus olitorius</i>	0.048±0.008	0.036±0.010	ND	ND
Soil	0.070±0.019	0.072±0.019	ND	ND
<i>Murraya koenigii</i>	0.049±0.002	0.015±0.004	ND	ND
Soil	0.058±0.014	0.024±0.005	ND	ND
<i>Ocimum grattissimum</i>	0.037±0.005	0.025±0.009	ND	ND
Soil	0.066±0.011	0.052±0.007	ND	ND
<i>Solanum melongena</i>	0.046±0.008	0.015±0.004	ND	ND
Soil	0.060±0.012	0.027±0.003	ND	ND
<i>Talinum triangulare</i>	0.034±0.006	0.086±0.014	ND	ND
Soil	0.079±0.021	0.119±0.012	ND	ND
<i>Telferia occidentalis</i>	0.029±0.011	0.059±0.020	ND	ND
Soil	0.049±0.003	0.099±0.015	ND	ND
<i>Vernonia amygdalina</i>	0.066±0.011	0.008±0.002	ND	ND
Soil	0.104±0.026	0.013±0.005	ND	ND

170 ND- Not Detected, Values in mean ± SD format with N=3

171

172

173 **Table 3: WHO permissible limits of heavy metals in soil, vegetables and**
174 **medicinal plants in mgkg⁻¹.**

Metal	Soil	Vegetables	Med. plants
Cr	100	0.1-0.2	1.5
Fe	100	7.0	20
Hg	1.0	0.03	-
Ni	35	0.1	10

175 **Source: [15, 16 & 17]**

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184 **Table 4:** Target Hazard Quotients (THQ) of heavy metals in edible vegetables
185 in Yala Urban area of Northern Cross River State in rainy season.

Vegetables	Cr	Fe	Hg	Ni
<i>Amaranthus spp.</i>	0.215	0.005	ND	ND
<i>Corchorus olitorius</i>	0.267	0.008	ND	ND
<i>Solanum melongen</i>	0.277	0.004	ND	ND
<i>Murraya koenigii</i>	0.205	0.006	ND	ND
<i>Ocimumgrattissimum</i>	0.256	0.004	ND	ND
<i>Talinum triangulare</i>	0.190	0.016	ND	ND
<i>Telfairia occidentalis</i>	0.323	0.006	ND	ND
<i>Vernoniaamygdalina</i>	0.369	0.003	ND	ND

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196 **Table 5:** Target Hazard Quotients (THQ) of heavy metals in edible vegetables
197 in Yala Urban area of Northern Cross River State in dry season

Vegetable	Cr	Fe	Hg	Ni
<i>Amaranthus spp.</i>	0.180	0.004	ND	ND
<i>Corchorus olitorius</i>	0.246	0.008	ND	ND
<i>Murraya koenigii</i>	0.251	0.003	ND	ND
<i>Ocimum grattissimum</i>	0.190	0.006	ND	ND
<i>Solanum melongena</i>	0.236	0.003	ND	ND
<i>Talinum triangulare</i>	0.174	0.019	ND	ND
<i>Telfairia occidentalis</i>	0.149	0.013	ND	ND
<i>Vernonia amygdalina</i>	0.339	0.003	ND	ND

198

199 **Discussions:** The results in Tables 1 and 2 showed that the mean concentration
200 of the metals in the soil in mgkg⁻¹ ranged from (0.063-0.108) and (0.049-0.104)
201 in rainy and dry seasons respectively for Cr, and (0.026-0.124) and (0.013-
202 0.119) in rainy and dry season respectively for Fe. The mean concentration
203 accumulated by the vegetables ranged from (0.037-0.063) and (0.029-0.066) in
204 rainy and dry season respectively for Cr, and (0.012-0.071) and (0.008-0.086) in

205 rainy and dry season respectively. Hg and Ni were neither detected in the soil
206 nor in the vegetables in both seasons. The results also indicate that there is no
207 significant difference between the concentration of metals in the soil and that
208 accumulated by the vegetables in the rainy and dry season of the year. The
209 availability of heavy metals in the soil for plants accumulation depends on
210 several factors like P^H , soil texture, the chemical form of the metal etc. It has
211 been proven by several researchers that the solubility of the cationic forms of
212 the metals in the soil solution increases as the soil P^H decreases, and they
213 become readily available for plants to accumulate [18, 19, 20, & 21]. Thus,
214 acidic soils favour the accumulation of metals by vegetables than neutral or
215 alkaline soils. The accumulation of Cr and Fe by plants is also higher in acidic
216 soils due to their availability in such soils among other factors [22]. An earlier
217 research in the study area by Free Library [23] has shown that the soil is quite
218 acidic and porous with a pH range of 4 to 6. However, the concentration of Cr
219 and Fe in the soil and that already accumulated by the edible vegetables is still
220 very low and within the permissible limits of WHO/FAO as shown in Table 3.
221 Besides, Hg and Ni were not detected in the soil or the vegetables. Therefore
222 efforts has to be made by relevant government agencies to maintain this low
223 concentration of the metals in the study area through public awareness of the
224 effects of pollution and a periodic environmental monitoring and assessment of
225 the metals concentration in the area.

226 **Target hazard quotients:** The results in Tables 3 and 4 reveals the Target
227 Hazard Quotients (THQ) of the heavy metals in the edible vegetables in the
228 study area (Yala) for the rainy and seasons respectively. These results indicate
229 that the THQ values for Cr and Fe which were detected in the vegetables are far
230 less than 1 for all vegetables in both seasons, especially Fe. This implies that the
231 heavy metals concentration in the edible vegetables is not posing any risk and
232 there is no potential health risk associated with their consumption for now.
233 According to US-EPA/IRIS [14], it is only THQ values greater than 1 that
234 shows there is potential health risk associated with the consumption of food or
235 vegetables contaminated with a certain pollutant or heavy metal. Thus, the THQ
236 values also agreed with the fact that the mean concentrations of these metals in
237 the vegetables are still low and within the permissible limits of WHO/FAO.

238 **CONCLUSION**

239 The results of this study have shown that there is some level of Cr and Fe
240 in the soil, which have been accumulated by the edible vegetables in the area.
241 The concentrations of Hg and Ni were not detected in the area and seem
242 negligible at the moment. The level of the metals present in the soil and
243 vegetable are still very low and within the permissible limits of WHO/FAO.
244 Thus, the concentration of these metals in the edible vegetables may not pose
245 any health risk at the moment.

247

REFERENCES

248

249 1. Hardy, D.H., Myers, J. & Strokes, J. Heavy metals in North Carolina soils:
250 Occurrence and significance. North Carolina, USA, Agronomy Division,
251 Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Service, 2008.

252

253 2. Chang, C.Y., Yu, H. Y., Chen, J. J., Li, F. B., Zaary, H. H., & Liu, C. P.
254 Accumulation of heavy metals contamination in leafy vegetables from
255 selected agricultural soils and associated potential health risk in the Pearl
256 River delta, South China. Environmental monitoring and assessment,
257 2014; 186(3):1547-1560.

258

259 3. Buteh, D.S., Chindo, I.Y., Ekanem, E.O., & Williams, E.M. Impact
260 Assessment of Contamination pattern of solid waste dumpsites soil: A
261 comparative study of Bauchi metropolis. World Journal of Analytical
262 Chemistry, 2013; 1(4):59-62.

263

264 4. Harmanescu, M., Alda, L.M., Bordean, D.M., Gogosa, I. & Gergen, I.
265 Heavy metals health risk assessment for population via consumption of
266 vegetables grown in old mining area; a case study of Banat County,
267 Romania. Chemistry Central Journal, 2011; 5:64; doi: 18:1186/1752-
268 153x-5-64.

269

270 5. Suruchi, S. & Khanna, P. Assessment of heavy metals contamination
271 in different vegetables grown in and around urban areas. Research
272 Journal of Environment and Toxicology, 2011; 5:162-179.

273

274 6. Zhuang, P., McBride, M.B., Xia, H., Li, N. & Li, Z. Health risk from
275 heavy metals via consumption of food crops in the vicinity of Daboashan
276 mine, South China. Science of the Total Environment, 2009;
277 407(5):1551-1561.

278

- 279 7. Sanayei, U., Ismail, N. & Talebi, S.M. Determination of heavy metals in
280 Zayandeh Road River, Isfahan-Iran. World Applied Science Journal,
281 2009; 6(9):1209-1214.
- 282 8. Yakubu, A., Tanko, U.M. & Dangoggo, S.M. The impact of man's activities
283 on the heavy metals level in soils in Wuse District, Abuja, Nigeria. De
284 Chemica Sinica, 2011; 2(6):181-184.
- 285 9. Abdollatiff, G., Aralan, A. M. Ahmad, M. T., Hoseni, A. M. & Karimaian, N.
286 Solubility test in some phosphate rocks and their potential for direct
287 application in soil. World Applied Science Journal, 2009; 6(2):182-192.
- 288 10. Khan, S. Cao, Q. Y. Z., Huang, Y. Z. & Zhu, Y. G. Health risk of heavy
289 metals in contaminated soil and food crops, irrigated with waste water in
290 Beijing, China. Environmental pollution, 2009; 124(3): 686-693.
- 291 11. Halwell, B. *Critical Issue Report: still no free lunch*. The organic center,
292 2007; Accessed July, 2014. Available at: www.organi-center.org
- 293 12. Sobukola, O. P., Adeniran, O. P., Odedara, A. A. & Kajihansa, O. E. Heavy
294 metals level of some fruit and leafy vegetables from selected markets in
295 Lagos, Nigeria. African Journal of Food Science, 2010; 4(2):389-393.
- 296 13. Akan, J.C., Abdulrahaman, F. I., Sodipo, O. A. & Lange, A. G.
297 Physicochemical parameter in soil and vegetable samples from Gongalon
298 agricultural site, Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria. Journal of American
299 Science, 2010; 12:78-88.
- 300 14. IRIS. Integrated Risk Information System –database. US Environmental
301 Protection Agency (USEPA), 2011.
- 302 15. World Health Organization. Permissible limits of heavy metals in soil and
303 plants. Geneva, Switzerland, 1996.
- 304 16. World Health Organization. Quality control methods for medicinal plants.
305 Geneva, Switzerland, 1998.
- 306 17. World Health Organization. Permissible limits of heavy metals in
307 vegetables. Geneva, Switzerland, 2005.
- 308 18. Gray, C.W., McLaren, R.G., Roberts, A.H. & Condron, L.M. Sorption and
309 desorption of cadmium from some New Zealand soils; Effect of pH and
310 contact time. Australian Journal of Soil Research, 1998; 36: 199-216.
- 311 19. Salam, A.K. & Helmke, P.A. The pH dependence of free ionic activities and
312 total dissolved concentrations of copper and cadmium in soil solution.
313 Geoderma, 1998; 83: 281-291.

- 314 20. Chlopecka, A., Bacon, J.R., Wilson, M.J. & Kay, J. Forms of cadmium, lead
315 and zinc in contaminated soils in South west Poland. *Journal of*
316 *Environmental Quality*, 1996; 25:69-79.
- 317 21. Singh, B.R., Narwai, R.P., Jeng, A.S. & Ahmas, A. Crop uptake and
318 extractability of cadmium in soils naturally high in metals at different pH
319 levels. *Communications of Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, 1995; 26:
320 2133-2142.
- 321 22. Ngole, V.M. Using soil heavy metal enrichment and mobility to determine
322 potential uptake vegetables. *Plant soil environment*, 2011; 57:75-80.
- 323 23. Free Library. *Mineralogy and geochemical properties of some upland soils*
324 *from different sedimentary formations in south-eastern Nigeria*, 2014;
325 Accessed July, 2015. Available at: www.thefreelibrary.com
- 326 24. Ape, Michael Anomie "Health Risk Evaluation of Heavy Metals via
327 Consumption of Contaminated Vegetable in Bekwara, Cross River State,
328 Nigeria, Cross River State, Nigeria". *IOSR Journal of Nursing and*
329 *Health Science (IOSR-JNHS)* , vol. 7, no.2 , 2018, pp. 28-32.

330

331