

## **Original Research Article**

# **Characterization of Polyphenols and Mineral Contents in Three Medicinal Weeds**

### **ABSTRACT**

**Aims:** Common weeds *Rorippa palustris* (L.) Besser, *Euphorbia rothiana* Spreng. and *Schoenoplectiella articulata* (L.) Lye are used for food, medicinal, green biofertilizer and bio-sorbent applications. In this work, their polyphenol and mineral contents have been characterized.

**Methodology:** Samples from aforementioned three plants were manually collected in Raipur city (CG, India) and processed for the analyses. Folin-Ciocalteu and aluminum chloride were used for the spectrophotometric determination of polyphenols. The mineral contents were quantified by X-ray fluorescence.

**Results:** The total concentration of 20 elements (viz. P, S, Cl, As, Se, K, Rb, Mg, Ca, Sr, Ba, Al, Ti, Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, Zn, Mo and Pb), total polyphenol and flavonoid contents in the leaves ranged from 46372 to 71501, from 47877 to 73791 and from 1950 to 9400 mg/kg, respectively. Remarkable concentrations of several nutrients (P, S, Cl, K, Mg, Ca and Fe) were observed.

**Conclusion:** The biomass from medicinal weeds *R. palustris*, *E. rothiana* and *S. articulata* featured very high K, Ca and Fe contents. Other nutrients (polyphenols, flavonoids, P, S, Cl and Mg) were identified at moderate levels. These species may hold promise as bioindicators.

22 **Keywords:** weeds; XRF; flavonoid; phenolic; mineral elements.

## 23 1. INTRODUCTION

24 Aquatic plants not only provide food and habitat for many animals such as fish and waterfowl,  
25 but also are potential bio-sorbents for the accumulation of trace elements [1], and may be used as  
26 green manure to restore soil fertility [2]. Moreover, some wetland plants have medicinal value,  
27 and are frequently used in Ayurveda and folk medicine [3].

28 *Rorippa palustris* (bog yellowcress or marsh yellowcress) grows in many types of damp, wet,  
29 and aquatic habitats. It has antiscorbutic properties; its roots are diuretic and it is used in the  
30 treatment of measles [4].

31 *Euphorbia rothiana* (white latex; in India: Chagul putputi, Merashupal chedi, and Palootti chedi)  
32 is an annual erect, glabrous, profusely branched subshrub of  $\approx 1$ -m height, widely distributed in  
33 India, Sri Lanka, China and Indonesia. The leaves of *E. rothiana* (*Rubus elipticus* Sm. and *Rubus*  
34 *racemosus* Roxb.) are chewed together to relieve symptoms of sudden sickness and giddiness  
35 thought to be caused by evil spirits. Further, its biomass is used as a medicine for cattle. Its latex  
36 is externally applied for healing sores, it is also believed to promote hair growth, and the whole  
37 plant is used for household insect repellent [5-6].

38 *Schoenoplectiella articulata* (in India: Chichora, Ciccodaka, Gaichira, Laghukaseruka, Pappati  
39 Chickha, Tan-pokli, and Tsjeli) is an aquatic annual herb distributed through Indo-China to  
40 Malaysia regions. Its tubers are effective for against diarrhea and vomiting, and its fruits and  
41 leaves in bodyache, pain and fevers. It has been reported to have anthelmintic, antibacterial,

antiemetic, antifungal, carminative, contraceptive, digestive, febrifuge and sedative properties [7].

Similar species, e.g., *Schoenoplectus lacustris* (L.) Palla, *Rorippa globosa* (Turcz.) Hayek and *Euphorbia macroclada* Boiss. have been applied in the accumulation and phytoremediation of heavy metals in contaminated soils [8-10]. The bioaccumulation of various elements (P, K, Mg, Ca, Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, Zn, Pb, Cu and Cd) in macrophytes (e.g., *Azolla pinnata* R.Br., *Pistia stratiotes* L., *Solvinia molesta* D.Mitch., *Trapa natans* L., *Persicaria maculosa* Gray and *Nelumbo nucifera* Gaertn.) has also been reported in the literature [11-22].

In this work, the total polyphenols, flavonoids, and trace element (P, S, Cl, As, Se, K, Rb, Mg, Ca, Sr, Ba, Al, Ti, Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, Zn, Mo and Pb) contents in the biomass from these three weeds (*R. palustris*, *E. rothiana* and *S. articulata*) are described.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

*R. palustris* (RP), *E. rothiana* (ER) and *S. articulata* (SA), shown in **Fig. 1**, were botanically recognized [23]. Samples were collected from a municipal waste dumping area in Raipur city, CG, India (21.25°N 81.63°E) in March-June 2017. The plants biomass (including leaves, stems and fruits) was washed thrice with deionized water and sun-dried in a glass room for one week. The crushed samples were sieved out to separate particles of mesh size  $\leq 0.1$  mm, they were further dried at 50 °C overnight, and they were finally stored in a deep freezer at -4 °C till the analyses were conducted.



**Fig. 1.** (From left to right) Photographs of biomass from *Rorippa palustris*, *Euphorbia rothiana* and *Schoenoplectus articulata*.

The polyphenol content in the samples in powder form was determined by extraction in an acetone:water mixture (7:3, v/v), equilibrating 0.1 g of sample with the solvent, as indicated by Bertaud et al. [24]. For the analysis of the total polyphenol content, an aliquot of the extract was treated with Folin-Ciocalteu reagent (Sigma-Alrich, F9252) to form a blue colored polyacid [25]. A standard calibration curve was prepared by using tanning acid (Sigma-Alrich, 403040) as the reference material. The flavonoid content was determined by reacting an aliquot of the extract with aluminum chloride (Sigma-Alrich, 563919), as described in the literature [26], using quercetin (Sigma-Alrich, Q4951) as the reference material.

A Bruker Tracer 5i portable X-Ray Fluorescence (pXRF) instrument with a Rhodium tube was used for the analysis of trace elements, following the empirical calibrations described by Towett et al. [27].

All measurements were performed in triplicate, and their mean values were reported.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1. Polyphenol Contents

The chemical characteristics of the biomass of RP, ER and SA are summarized in **Table 1**. The total phenolic content (TPh) and the flavonoid content (Fla), expressed in tannic acid and quercetin equivalents, ranged from 47877 to 73791 and from 1950 to 9400 mg/kg, respectively. The mass concentration ratio of {[Fla]/[TPh]} varied from 0.04 to 0.13. The maximum concentration of polyphenols was found in ER biomass.

The polyphenol contents in the examined weeds were lower than or comparable to the phenolic contents reported by Březinová et al. [28] in other macrophytes (*Phragmites australis* Trin. ex Steud., *Phalaris arundinacea* L., *Typha latifolia* L., *Glyceria maxima* Holmb., *Scirpus sylvaticus* L., *Carex nigra* Reich. and *Juncus effusus* L.), in the 9020-28390 mg/kg interval. For comparison purposes, the concentrations of total polyphenols and flavonoids in another set of macrophytes (*A. pinnata*, *P. stratiotes*, *S. molesta*, *T. natans*, *P. maculosa* and *N. nucifera*) were found to vary from 750 to 20800 and from 2420 to 11760 mg/kg, respectively [22].

**Table 1.** Concentration of polyphenols and trace elements in the three weeds under study, expressed in mg/kg (dw).

| Weed | <i>Rorippa palustris</i> | <i>Euphorbia rothiana</i> | <i>Schoenoplectus articulata</i> |
|------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| TPh  | 69623                    | 73791                     | 47877                            |
| Fla  | 5150                     | 9400                      | 1950                             |
| Mg   | 2286                     | 2309                      | 1550                             |
| Al   | 9319                     | 1018                      | 1123                             |
| P    | 1431                     | 2321                      | 1642                             |
| S    | 5129                     | 3142                      | 1672                             |

|    |       |       |       |
|----|-------|-------|-------|
| Cl | 2279  | 1725  | 9532  |
| K  | 13038 | 17573 | 16537 |
| Ca | 13072 | 13086 | 3727  |
| Rb | 8     | 14    | 36    |
| Ti | 143   | 227   | 308   |
| Cr | 27    | 40    | 18    |
| Mn | 680   | 421   | 1452  |
| Fe | 19632 | 29486 | 8719  |
| Co | 67    | 44    | 1     |
| Zn | 30    | 37    | 5     |
| As | 3.5   | 1     | 1.5   |
| Se | 1     | 1     | 1     |
| Sr | 108   | 46    | 29    |
| Mo | 14    | 3     | 10    |
| Ba | 60    | 2     | 2     |
| Pb | 18    | 5     | 6     |

---

93

94 **3.2. Trace Element Concentrations**

95 The total concentration of 20 elements (P, S, Cl, As, Se, K, Rb, Mg, Ca, Sr, Ba, Al, Ti, Cr, Mn,  
96 Fe, Co, Zn, Mo and Pb),  $\Sigma_{n20}$ , ranged from 46372 to 71501 mg/kg (**Table 1**). The maximum  
97 concentration corresponded to ER biomass.

The concentrations of P, K, Mg, Ca, Cr, Fe and Zn were in the 1431 to 2321, 13038 to 17573, 1550 to 2309, 3727 to 13086, 18 to 40, 8719 to 29486 and 5 to 37 mg/kg range, respectively. The maximum concentration of these elements was again observed in ER.

Contents of Cl, Rb, Ti and Mn varied from 1725 to 9532 mg/kg, from 8 to 36 mg/kg, from 143 to 308 mg/kg, and from 421 to 1452 mg/kg, respectively. Remarkable high concentrations of these elements were detected in SA biomass, suggesting their bioaccumulation as chlorine complexes.

The maximum concentration of the other elements: S, Al, As, Sr, Ba, Co, Pb and Mo was detected in RP biomass, probably due to their accumulation as sulfur compounds. The concentration of Se in the biomass of the three weeds was only detectable at trace levels (<1.0 mg/kg).

Similar bioaccumulation patterns have been reported for other macrophytes [11-22].

### 3.3. Toxicity

These weeds are used as food as well as in traditional medicine. Heavy metals were found to be bio-accumulated in the weeds. The permissible limits of As, Pb, Cr and Zn in medicinal plants are 1.0, 5.0, 2.3 and 20 mg/kg, respectively [29-30]. The concentrations of As and Pb were higher than the prescribed values in the biomass from two of the weeds (RP and SA), chromium concentration was above the prescribed limit in all weeds, and concentrations of Zn above 30 mg/kg were accumulated in RP and ER.

### 3.4. Correlation Coefficients

The correlation coefficients (r) matrix between the polyphenol contents and the studied trace elements (for average values across the three weeds) is shown in **Table 2**. The TPh and Fla

contents showed a good correlation with K, Ti, Mn and Co, probably due to formation of complexes. The elements: S, Mg, Ca, Cr, Fe, Co and Zn had also high correlation, pointing to their accumulation as sulfur compounds. Similarly, a group of elements: Al, As, Sr, Mo, Ba and Pb showed good correlation, expecting their accumulation as aluminum compounds. Elements: Cl, Rb, Ti and Mn showed good correlations, indicating their absorption as chloride complexes. Phosphorous showed good correlations with K, Cr and Fe, hinting at its role as a co-factor element.

**Table 2.** Correlation coefficients among the total polyphenol (TPh), flavonoid (Fla) and trace element content present in the biomass from *R. palustris*, *E. rothiana* and *S. articulata*.

|           | Mg    | Al    | P     | S     | Cl    | K     | Ca    | Rb    | Ti    | Cr    | Mn    | Fe    | Co   | Zn   | As   | Sr   | Mo | Ba | Pb | TPh | Fla |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| <b>Mg</b> | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Al</b> | 0.47  | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>P</b>  | 0.32  | -0.69 | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>S</b>  | 0.80  | 0.90  | -0.31 | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Cl</b> | -1.00 | -0.43 | -0.35 | -0.78 | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>K</b>  | -0.27 | -0.98 | 0.83  | -0.79 | 0.24  | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Ca</b> | 1.00  | 0.49  | 0.29  | 0.82  | -1.00 | -0.30 | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Rb</b> | -0.97 | -0.66 | -0.09 | -0.92 | 0.96  | 0.49  | -0.98 | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Ti</b> | -0.85 | -0.87 | 0.24  | -1.00 | 0.83  | 0.74  | -0.86 | 0.95  | 1.00  |       |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Cr</b> | 0.82  | -0.12 | 0.80  | 0.33  | -0.84 | 0.32  | 0.81  | -0.67 | -0.40 | 1.00  |       |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Mn</b> | -0.98 | -0.27 | -0.51 | -0.66 | 0.98  | 0.06  | -0.97 | 0.90  | 0.71  | -0.93 | 1.00  |       |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Fe</b> | 0.89  | 0.02  | 0.71  | 0.45  | -0.91 | 0.19  | 0.88  | -0.77 | -0.52 | 0.99  | -0.97 | 1.00  |      |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Co</b> | 0.93  | 0.76  | -0.06 | 0.97  | -0.92 | -0.61 | 0.94  | -0.99 | -0.98 | 0.56  | -0.83 | 0.66  | 1.00 |      |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Zn</b> | 0.98  | 0.30  | 0.48  | 0.68  | -0.99 | -0.09 | 0.98  | -0.92 | -0.74 | 0.91  | -1.00 | 0.96  | 0.85 | 1.00 |      |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>As</b> | 0.30  | 0.98  | -0.81 | 0.81  | -0.27 | -1.00 | 0.33  | -0.51 | -0.76 | -0.29 | -0.09 | -0.16 | 0.63 | 0.12 | 1.00 |      |    |    |    |     |     |
| <b>Sr</b> | 0.65  | 0.98  | -0.52 | 0.97  | -0.62 | -0.91 | 0.67  | -0.80 | -0.95 | 0.10  | -0.47 | 0.23  | 0.88 | 0.50 | 0.92 | 1.00 |    |    |    |     |     |



|            |       |       |       |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |       |       |      |       |       |       |      |      |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| <b>Mo</b>  | -0.18 | 0.78  | -0.99 | 0.44 | 0.22  | -0.90 | -0.16 | -0.05 | -0.37 | -0.71 | 0.39  | -0.61 | 0.19 | -0.36 | 0.88  | 0.63 | 1.00  |       |       |      |      |
| <b>Ba</b>  | 0.48  | 1.00  | -0.68 | 0.91 | -0.44 | -0.98 | 0.50  | -0.67 | -0.87 | -0.10 | -0.28 | 0.03  | 0.77 | 0.31  | 0.98  | 0.98 | 0.78  | 1.00  |       |      |      |
| <b>Pb</b>  | 0.41  | 1.00  | -0.73 | 0.87 | -0.38 | -0.99 | 0.44  | -0.61 | -0.84 | -0.17 | -0.21 | -0.04 | 0.72 | 0.24  | 0.99  | 0.96 | 0.82  | 1.00  | 1.00  |      |      |
| <b>TPh</b> | 0.99  | 0.35  | 0.43  | 0.72 | -1.00 | -0.15 | 0.99  | -0.94 | -0.77 | 0.89  | -1.00 | 0.94  | 0.88 | 1.00  | 0.18  | 0.55 | -0.30 | 0.36  | 0.30  | 1.00 |      |
| <b>Fla</b> | 0.84  | -0.09 | 0.78  | 0.35 | -0.86 | 0.30  | 0.82  | -0.69 | -0.42 | 1.00  | -0.94 | 0.99  | 0.58 | 0.92  | -0.27 | 0.12 | -0.69 | -0.08 | -0.15 | 0.90 | 1.00 |

128

## 129 4. CONCLUSIONS

130 The polyphenols and mineral contents of three weeds that grow in wetlands in India (*Euphorbia*  
131 *rothiana*, *Rorippa palustris* and *Schoenoplectus articulata*) were characterized. Total polyphenol  
132 and flavonoid contents ranged from 47877 to 73791 and from 1950 to 9400 mg/kg, respectively,  
133 lower than (or comparable to) those reported for other macrophytes. Although the three species  
134 were found to feature high contents of nutrients along with Cl and Al, the concentrations of  
135 heavy metals beyond safety limits advice against their use for food purposes. Nonetheless, these  
136 species may hold promise to control water and soil alkalinity, hardness and metal toxicity. The  
137 biomass from *R. palustris* for Ca, Mg, Al, S, Co, As and Pb; that of *E. rothiana* for P, K, Cr, Fe  
138 and Zn; and the *S. articulata* for Cl, Rb, Ti and Mn can be used as a bioindicator for their  
139 contamination detection, respectively.

## 140 CONSENT

141 Not applicable.

## 142 ETHICAL APPROVAL

143 Not applicable.

144

## References

1. Jain A, Roshnibala S, Kanjilal PB, Singh RS, Singh HB. Aquatic/semi-aquatic plants used in herbal remedies in the wetlands of Manipur. *Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge*. 2007;6(2):345–351. <http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/941>.
2. Kamal M, Ghaly AE, Mahmoud N, Côté R. Phytoaccumulation of heavy metals by aquatic plants. *Environment International*. 2004;29(8):1029–1039. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-4120\(03\)00091-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-4120(03)00091-6).
3. Chukwuka KS, Omotaya OE. Soil Fertility Restoration Potentials of Tithonia Green Manure and Water Hyacinth Compost on a Nutrient Depleted Soil in South Western Nigeria Using *Zea mays* L. as Test Crop. *Research Journal of Soil Biology*. 2009;1(1):20–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3923/rjsb.2009.20.30>.
4. Marzouk MM, Hussein SR, Elkhateeb A, Farid MM, Ibrahim LF, Abdel-Hameed ESS. Phenolic profiling of *Rorippa palustris* (L.) Besser (Brassicaceae) by LC-ESI-MS: Chemosystematic significance and cytotoxic activity. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Disease*. 2016;6(8):633–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2222-1808\(16\)61100-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2222-1808(16)61100-3).
5. Deepak P, Gopal GV. Nilgiris: A Medicinal Reservoir. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. 2014;3(8):73–79. [http://www.thepharmajournal.com/vol3Issue8/Issue\\_oct\\_2014/8.1.pdf](http://www.thepharmajournal.com/vol3Issue8/Issue_oct_2014/8.1.pdf).
6. Rani KRV, Prakash SEL, Geetha K, Dhandapani B, Dhanabal K. Evaluation of pharmacognostic, phytochemical and antimicrobial activity of *Euphorbia rothiana*. *Pharmacognosy Journal*. 2009;1(1):22–24. [http://www.phcogfirst.com/sites/default/files/PJ\\_1\\_1\\_Evaluation%20of%20Pharmacognostic.....pdf](http://www.phcogfirst.com/sites/default/files/PJ_1_1_Evaluation%20of%20Pharmacognostic.....pdf).

- 166 7. Roy DK, Sinha BK, Singh B. Less known uses of *Schoenoplectus articulatus* (L.) Palla of  
 167 lower Assam. Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge. 2010;9(3):599–600.  
 168 [https://www.niscair.res.in/Sciencecommunication/ResearchJournals/rejour/ijtk/Fulltextsearch/2010/July%202010/IJTK-Vol%209\(3\)-July%202010-pp%20599-600.htm](https://www.niscair.res.in/Sciencecommunication/ResearchJournals/rejour/ijtk/Fulltextsearch/2010/July%202010/IJTK-Vol%209(3)-July%202010-pp%20599-600.htm).  
 169
- 170 8. Hunashal RD, Bagewadi RM, Satyanarayana D. Physico-chemical and pharmacological  
 171 characteristics of *Euphorbia rothiana* seed oil. Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical  
 172 Research. 2011;3(5):124–129. <http://www.jocpr.com/articles/physicochemical-and-pharmacological-characteristics-ofeuphorbia-rothiana-seed-oil.pdf>.  
 173
- 174 9. Duman F, Cicek M, Sezen G. Seasonal changes of metal accumulation and distribution in  
 175 common club rush (*Schoenoplectus lacustris*) and common reed (*Phragmites australis*)  
 176 Ecotoxicology. 2007;16(6):457–463. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-007-0150-4>.
- 177 10. Girdhar M, Sharma NR, Rehman H, Kumar A, Mohan A. Comparative assessment for  
 178 hyperaccumulatory and phytoremediation capability of three wild weeds. 3 Biotech.  
 179 2014;4(6):579–589. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-014-0194-0>.
- 180 11. Girdhar M, Sharma NR, Rehman H, Kumar A, Mohan A. Comparative assessment for  
 181 hyperaccumulatory and phytoremediation capability of three wild weeds. 3 Biotech.  
 182 2014;4(6):579–589. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-014-0194-0>.
- 183 12. Nematian MA, Kazemeini F. Accumulation of Pb, Zn, Cu and Fe in plants and  
 184 hyperaccumulator choice in Galali iron mine area, Iran. International Journal of Agriculture  
 185 and Crop Sciences. 2013;5(4):426–432. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f099/1c015a613dc9536b77c06c048191d6b52fbf.pdf>.  
 186

13. Hameed I, Dastagir G, Hussain F. Nutritional and elemental analyses of some selected medicinal plants of the family polygonaceae. Pakistan Journal of Botany. 2008;40(6):2493–2502. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260387195\\_Nutritional\\_and\\_elemental\\_analyses\\_of\\_some\\_selected\\_medicinal\\_plants\\_of\\_the\\_family\\_Polygonaceae](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260387195_Nutritional_and_elemental_analyses_of_some_selected_medicinal_plants_of_the_family_Polygonaceae).
14. Lee KS, Kwon YJ, Lee KY. Analysis of chemical composition, vitamin, mineral and antioxidative effect of the Lotus leaf. Journal of the Korean Society of Food Science and Nutrition. 2008;37(12):1622–1626. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3746/jkfn.2008.37.12.1622>.
15. Pascal L, Angela ML, Jaime EM, Jeimmy S, Carlos AB, Wolfgang BS, Andre B. Nutritional value of aquatic ferns (*Azolla filiculoides* Lam. and *Salvinia molesta* Mitchell) in pigs. Animal Feed Science and Technology. 2009;149(1-2):135–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2008.04.013>.
16. Qin L, Zhenli LH, Donald AG, Peter JS, Xiaoe Y. Uptake and distribution of metals by water lettuce (*Pistia stratiotes* L.). Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 2011;18(6):978–986. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-011-0453-0>.
17. Babu M, Dwivedi DH, Lata R. Distribution of heavy metals in edible aquatic plant: water chestnut (*Trapa natans* var. *bispinosa* Roxb.). International Journal of Plant Sciences. 2011;6(2):270–273. [http://www.researchjournal.co.in/online/IJPS/IJPS%206\(2\)/6\\_A-270-273.pdf](http://www.researchjournal.co.in/online/IJPS/IJPS%206(2)/6_A-270-273.pdf).
18. Zhang J, Wang N, Zhang F. Analysis of Accumulating Ability of Heavy Metals in Lotus (*Nelumbo nucifera*) Improved by Ion Implantation. Plasma Science and Technology. 2012;14(5):424–426. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1009-0630/14/5/21>.

- 208 19. Petrović D, Jančić D, Furdek M, Mikac N, Krivokapić S. Aquatic plant *Trapa natans* L. as  
 209 bioindicator of trace metal contamination in a freshwater lake (Skadar Lake, Montenegro).  
 210 *Acta Botanica Croatica*. 2016;75(2):236–243. <https://doi.org/10.1515/botcro-2016-0031>.
- 211 20. Anitha KC, Rajeshwari YB, Prasanna SB, Shilpa SJ. Nutritive evaluation of azolla as  
 212 livestock feed. *Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural Sciences*. 2016;4(6):670–  
 213 674. [http://dx.doi.org/10.18006/2016.4\(Issue6\).670.674](http://dx.doi.org/10.18006/2016.4(Issue6).670.674).
- 214 21. Verma A, Karki D, Meghwal S. Heavy metal extraction potential of various plant of  
 215 *Nelumbo nucifera*, An aquatic macrophyte in tropical freshwater systems. *International*  
 216 *Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*. 2018;5(4):786–790.  
 217 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329117000>.
- 218 22. Sahu YK, Deb MK, Patel KS, Martín-Ramos P, Towett EK, Tarkowska-Kukuryk M.  
 219 Bioaccumulation of nutrients and toxic elements with macrophytes. *Journal of Toxic,*  
 220 *Hazardous and Radio Active Waste*. 2019; (In press).
- 221 23. Bowden WB, Glime JM, Riis T. *Methods in stream ecology, Ecosystem Structure*, Chapter  
 222 13 - Macrophytes and Bryophytes, 2017, p. 243–271. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-416558-8.00013-5)  
 223 [416558-8.00013-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-416558-8.00013-5).
- 224 24. Bertaud F, Tapin-Lingua S, Pizzi A, Navarrete P, Petit-Conil M. Characterisation of  
 225 industrial barks for their tannin contents for further green-wood based adhesives  
 226 applications. *InTech Fibres COST FP0901-Hamburg*. 2010.
- 227 25. Singleton VL, Orthofer R, Lamuela-Raventos RM. Analysis of total phenols and other  
 228 oxidation substances by means of Folin-Ciocalteu reagent. *Methods in Enzymology*.  
 229 1999;299:152–178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879\(99\)99017-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879(99)99017-1).

- 230 26. Chang, CC, Yang MH, Wen HM, Chern JC. Estimation of total flavonoid content in  
231 propolis by complementary colorimetric methods. *Journal of Food and Drug Analysis*.  
232 2002;10(3):178–182. <https://www.fda.gov.tw/en/publishjfdalistContent.aspx?id=27>.
- 233 27. Towett EK, Shepherd KD, Drake BL. Plant elemental composition and portable X-ray  
234 fluorescence (pXRF) spectroscopy: quantification under different analytical parameters. *X-*  
235 *Ray Spectrometry*. 2016;45:117–124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/xrs.2678>.
- 236 28. Březinová TD, Vymazal J. Phenolic Compounds in Wetland Macrophytes. *Plant Science*.  
237 2018;49(1):1–8. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sab-2018-0001>.
- 238 29. FAO/WHO. Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme Codex Committee on  
239 Contaminants in Foods Food. CF/5 INF/1. 2011. [http://www.fao.org/tempref/codex/](http://www.fao.org/tempref/codex/Meetings/CCCF/CCCF5/cf05_INF.pdf)  
240 [Meetings/CCCF/CCCF5/cf05\\_INF.pdf](http://www.fao.org/tempref/codex/Meetings/CCCF/CCCF5/cf05_INF.pdf).
- 241 30. WHO. Quality control methods for medicinal plant materials. World Health Organization.  
242 1998. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/41986>.