

Singapore Journal of Scientific Research

ISSN: 2010-006x



http://scialert.net/sjsr

Singapore Journal of Scientific Research

ISSN 2010-006x DOI: 10.3923/sjsres.2019.33.44



Research Article Bioremediation of Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil by Intercropping *Luffa aegyptiaca* with *Vernonia amygdalina*, Ameliorated with Growth Promoting Fungi

E. Ani, D.E. Olofin, O.E. Okunlola and A.F. Faniyi

Environmental Biology Unit, Department of Biological Sciences, Yaba College of Technology, Yaba, Lagos, Nigeria

Abstract

Background and Objective: The limitations of monoculture organisms in bioremediation has been highlighted. Bioremediation potentials of intercropping *Luffa aegyptiaca* with *Vernonia amygdalina* ameliorated with growth promoting fungi (*Aspergillus niger* and *Penicillium* sp.) was investigated *in vitro*. **Materials and Method:** Growth promoting fungi were isolated from the rhizosphere of *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* collected from Lagos mainland Local Government Area of Lagos State. Bioremediation potentials of the monoculture and the mixed culture of the organisms were assessed over 3 months period using two concentrations of spent engine oil (SEO) in a screen house. Randomized complete block design was used to apply 22 treatments. Confirmatory hydrocarbon utilization was done using GC-MS. **Results:** Results show that the growth of *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* were negatively affected by increasing concentration of the pollutant. Mixed culture of the organisms were also shown to be better in degrading hydrocarbon than monoculture, several compounds including; Isopropyl tetradecyl ether, 1-Chloroeicosane, pentadecane, biphenyl-chloride were only degraded by mixed culture of the plants and the fungi but not by individual organisms. Remediation of up to 90% were only attained by the consortium and not by the individual organisms involved. Accumulation of hydrocarbon by the tissues of both *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* also decreased in the presence of the rhizospheric fungi. The lowest value of 0.732 and 0.406% in *L. aegyptiaca*, *V. amygdalina*, *Aspergillus niger* and *Penicillium* sp. in remediating hydrocarbon polluted soil is highlighted in this study.

Key words: Luffa aegyptiaca, Vermonia amygdalina, bioremediation, fungi, hydrocarbons

Citation: E. Ani, D.E. Olofin, O.E. Okunlola and A.F. Faniyi, 2019. Bioremediation of hydrocarbon contaminated soil by intercropping *Luffa aegyptiaca* with *Vernonia amygdalina*, ameliorated with growth promoting fungi. J. Sci. Res., 9: 33-44.

Corresponding Author: E. Ani, Environmental Biology Unit, Department of Biological Sciences, Yaba College of Technology, Yaba, Lagos, Nigeria Tel: +234-8181926352

Copyright: © 2019 E. Ani *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the creative commons attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Competing Interest: The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

Data Availability: All relevant data are within the paper and its supporting information files.

INTRODUCTION

Industrialization, petroleum exploration and exploitation, the ever increasing human population among others has inevitably resulted in an unprecedented negative effect on the biosphere. Large amounts of hazardous wastes (including petroleum hydrocarbon) is being released into all phases of the environment daily, largely from anthropogenic sources¹. The hazards posed by petroleum hydrocarbon to human and the ecosystems at large has been well documented^{2,3}. The development of methods to remediate soils contaminated with toxic pollutants and other organic residues has been an area of intense research interest for some times now⁴. Various physical, chemical and biological processes have been employed in remediation of contaminated soil with each posing some challenges¹. Due to the expensive and disruptive, although faster, the engineering based remedial technologies⁵, there is an increased interest on biological remediation that is eco-friendly, less expensive and has been shown to be efficient. Several organisms (including plants) have been documented to be capable of remediating polluted soil⁶⁻⁸.

Luffa aegyptiaca (Mill) is a member of Cucurbitaceae and is commonly called sponge gourd, loofa, vegetable sponge, bath sponge or dish cloth gourd⁹. There are about nine species in the genus Luffa including: Luffa acutangula, L. cylindrica, L. aegyptiaca, L. operculata, L. graveolens and L. echinata¹⁰. Luffa cylindrica is the most widely published and cultivated and is found mostly in South America^{9,11,12}. Luffa aegyptiaca (Mill) is found mostly in tropical Africa including Nigeria and some parts of India^{13,14}. In Nigeria, *Luffa* is commonly found growing in dump sites and in polluted environments. Generally, Luffa aegyptiaca can be used in virtually all areas including medicine, industry (as a packing medium in an attached growth system), agriculture and so on^{9,11}. Vermonia amygdalina, (commonly called bitter leaf) is a small shrub that grows in tropical Africa. Vernonea amygdalina is a woody-shrub with an average height about 8 m. The herb is an indigenous African plant, which grows in most parts of sub-Saharan Africa. It is reported to be effective in treatment of fever, pain, malaria, diarrhoea, gastroenteritis, hepatitis, dysentery, diabetes mellitus among others¹⁵. This study focuses on bioremediation potentials of intercropping Vernonia amygdalina and Luffa aegyptiaca ameliorated with growth promoting fungi.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample collection: This study was conducted between June and September, 2018. Mature and dried *L. aegyptiaca*

seeds, *V. amygdalina* stem and sandy loam soil were collected from Yaba College of Technology staff quarters. Growth promoting fungi (*Aspergillus niger* and *Penicillium* sp.) were isolated from the rhizosphere of *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* collected from Lagos mainland Local Government Area of Lagos State following the method of Reyes and Mitchell¹⁶. Spent engine oil was collected from author mechanic workshops in Shomolu Local Government.

Fungi identification: Fungi grown on plates were identified using morphological and microscopic features¹⁷⁻¹⁹.

Physic chemical analysis of soil and spent engine oil: Physico-chemical characteristics of the experimental soil and spent engine oil used was analyzed following the methods of Ani *et al.*²⁰.

Bioremediation study: Bioremediation potentials of L. aegyptiaca, V. amygdalina with the associated growth promoting fungi (Aspergillus niger and Penicillium sp.) was assessed in a screen house in Botanical Garden of Yaba College of Technology, Yaba, Lagos, Nigeria (6'31"N, 3'40"E). Five kilogram of sieved and dried sandy-loam soil was weighed into an experimental bucket (7 L) with a weighing balance. Spent engine oil (100 and 200 mL) were each introduced independently into some of the buckets and mixed thoroughly and allowed to homogenize for 24 h. Randomized complete block design was used to apply 22 treatments including (T₁): *L. aegyptiaca* (LA) only, (T₂): *V. amygdalina* (VA) only, (T₃): 100 mL spent engine oil (SEO) only, (T₄): 200 mL spent engine oil only, T₅: LA+100 mL SEO, T₆: LA+200 mL SEO, T₇: VA+100 mL SEO, T₈: VA+200 mL SEO, T₉: Aspergillus niger (AN)+100 mL SEO, T₁₀: AN+200 mL SEO, T₁₁: *Penicillium* sp. (PS)+100 mL SEO, T₁₂: PS+200 mL SEO, T₁₃: LA+AN, T₁₄: LA+PS, T₁₅: LA+AN+100 mL SEO, T₁₆: LA+AN+200 mL SEO, T₁₇: LA+PS+100 mL SEO, T₁₈: LA+PS+200 mL SEO, T₁₉: VA+AN, T₂₀: VA+PS, T₂₁: VA+AN+100 and T₂₂: VA+PS+200 mL SEO. Viable seeds of L. aegyptiaca and healthy stems of V. amygdalina were planted 24 h after introduction of the SEO at a depth of 3 cm at 5 seeds/hole and later thinned to two. Viability of the seeds was tested before planting following the method of Ani et al.20. Growth promoting fungi were introduced with sterilized sawdust 48 h after planting. Trays were placed under each buckets treated with SEO to retain the SEO that might have wash down from the soil through the perforated buckets during watering and are poured back into the bucket. Each experiment was set up in 3 replications.

Data collection: The effect of spent engine oil on the leaf, leaf area and internode length, were assessed at 7 days' interval for 24 weeks. The total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) was measured monthly using the GC-MS method. Leaf area (LA) and percentage bioremediation by the test organisms were determined²⁰:

Remediation due to
natural attenuation (%) =
$$\frac{\text{Initial} - \text{Final without organism}}{\text{Initial}} \times \frac{100}{1}$$

Remediation by organisms = $\frac{\text{Initial} - \text{Final with organism}}{\text{Initial}} \times \frac{100}{1}$
Actual remediation by organism = Remediation by organism (%)-
Natural attenuation (%)

Confirmatory test for bioremediation using GC-MS: Confirmatory hydrocarbon utilization by both the plants and the growth promoting fungi was determined using gas chromatography mass spectroscopy (GC-MS) ran at day 0 and at 24 weeks of the experiment for the soil samples while the GC-MS of the plant samples was done at 24 weeks only.

Statistical analysis: Result were analyzed statistically using student general linear model (GLM) which incorporates the univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the pair wise test comparison at (p<0.05).

RESULTS

Physicochemical characteristics of the soil and spent engine

oil: The physico-chemical properties of the soil and spent engine oil used for remediation experiments are presented in Table 1 and 2, respectively. Physico-chemical properties of the soil show that the soil is neutral with a pH of 7.0, indicating optimal microbial activity and bioavailability of mineral elements such as nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium for plant uptake. The nitrate (3.86 mg kg⁻¹), nitrite (1.31 mg kg⁻¹), organic matter (4.95%), available phosphate (6.37 mg kg⁻¹) etc., are generally suitable for plant growth (Table 1). Physico-chemical properties of the spent engine oil used for the experiment is presented in Table 2.

Effect of spent engine oil, *A. niger* and *Penicillium* sp. on the growth of *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina*: The effect of spent engine oil, *A. niger* and *Penicillium* sp. on the growth of *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* is presented on Table 3. Generally, the growth of *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* was negatively affected by increasing concentration of the pollutant. Leaf area and internode length of *L. aegyptiaca* in 100 mL SEO were 4.14 ± 1.02 and 3.28 ± 0.22 , respectively as

·	
Parameters	Values
Conductivity (mS cm ⁻¹)	2.73
TDS (mg L^{-1})	356.5
TSS (mg L^{-1})	123
TS (mg L^{-1})	1645
Salinity (psu)	1.4
Resistivity (Ωcm)	3330.05
рН	7.0
Temperature (°C)	25
Phosphate (mg kg ⁻¹)	6.37
Nitrate (mg kg ⁻¹)	3.86
Nitrite (mg kg ⁻¹)	1.31
ГОС (%)	8.89
ГОМ (%)	4.95
(mag) (DO	257

TDS: Total dissolved solid, TSS: Total suspended solid, TS: Total solids, TOC: Total organic content, TOM: Total organic matter, COD: Chemical oxygen demand

Table 2: Physicochemical characteristics of spent engine oil used

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Parameters	Values
рН	5.6
Density at 25°C	0.9325
Viscosity at 100°C	14.925
viscosity at 40°C	113.27
Flash point (°C)	194
Moisture (%)	0.2

Table 3: Morphological characteristics of *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* in SEO contaminated soil

CON	laminaleu son			
Samples	Length	Width	Leaf area	Internode
T ₁ A	2.47±0.37ª	2.19±0.20 ^{ab}	4.14±1.02 ^{ab}	3.28±0.22 ^{bc}
T ₁ B	2.09 ± 0.20^{a}	1.71±0.17ª	2.49±0.30ª	1.59±0.19ª
T_1A_1	5.67±0.62ª	3.30±0.92ª	13.77±4.27ª	1.80±0.91ª
T_1B_1	3.27±1.77ª	2.40 ± 0.64^{a}	7.83±4.80ª	3.20 ± 0.70^{a}
T ₁ C	4.35±0.77 ^{bc}	2.67 ± 0.19^{abc}	9.59±2.11 ^{bc}	2.33±0.40 ^{ab}
T_2A	5.40±1.81ª	10.97±4.84ª	3.37±0.73ª	6.10±0.53ª
T ₂ B	3.67±0.85ª	16.10±3.91ª	2.17±0.93ª	5.73±1.89ª
T_2A_1	5.79±0.75°	3.21±0.36 ^{bc}	15.23±2.71°	2.23 ± 0.28^{ab}
T_2B_1	5.97±0.27°	2.87 ± 0.25^{abc}	12.95±1.72°	1.19±0.22ª
T_2C	6.10±0.67°	4.06 ± 0.54 ^{cd}	21.09±4.05 ^d	3.07±0.27 ^{bc}
T ₃ A	3.43 ± 0.66^{ab}	2.87 ± 0.58^{abc}	5.42±2.15 ^{ab}	3.39±0.60 ^{bc}
T₃B	5.47±0.75°	5.18±0.79 ^d	2.91±0.50ª	2.49±0.48 ^{ab}
T_3A_1	4.14±0.64ª	10.59±2.41ª	6.29±1.29 ^{ab}	4.21±0.77℃
T_3B_1	3.41 ± 0.46^{ab}	$3.13 \pm 0.64^{\text{abc}}$	4.63±1.19ª	5.57±0.48ª
T₃C	4.28±0.41ª	10.96±2.52ª	9.69±2.68ª	4.04±0.83ª
F-statistics	$F_{8,126} = 7.140$	$F_{8,126} = 4.786$	$F_{8,126} = 9.227$	$F_{8,126} = 4.911$
	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001

Samples with different superscript are significantly different from each other at 5%, T₁A: *Luffa augyptiaca* in 100 mL SEO, T₁A₁: *Luffa augyptiaca* in 100 mL+fungi, T₁B: *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL, T₁B₁: *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₁C: *Luffa augyptiaca* without pollutant, T₂A: *Vernonia amygdalina* in 100 mL, T₂A₁: *Vernonia amygdalina* in 100 mL, T₂A₁: *Vernonia amygdalina* in 200 mL, T₂B₁: *Luffa augyptiaca augyptiaca* in 100 mL, T₂A₁: *Vernonia amygdalina* in 200 mL, T₂C: *Vernonia amygdalina* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 100 mL+fungi, T₃B₁: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 100 mL+fungi, T₃B₁: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, T₃B: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, *T*₃C: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL, T₃C: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, *T*₃C: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL, T₃C: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, *T*₃C: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, *T*₃C: *Vernonia amygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, *T*₃C: *Vernonia mygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca* in 200 mL+fungi, *T*₃C: *Vernonia mygdalina* and *Luffa augyptiaca t t t*

	Pollutar	Pollutant concentration (mL)/treatments/results (%)										
	100						200					
Months	 TL	TL ₁	TV	TV ₁	TLV	TLV ₁	 TL ₂	TL _{2a}	TV ₂	TV _{2a}	TLV ₂	TLV _{2a}
1	8.7	36.9	20.0	25.3	5.7.0	23.8	18.1	32.9	47.9	56.3	38.0	42.7
2	17.0	65.8	19.0	55.4	73.6	74.1	51.1	56.1	41.8	72.7	51.1	36.6
3	71.4	79.6	80.1	85.0	88.0	90.0	57.7	60.4	55.8	81.8	63.7	78.3

Table 4: Percentage remediation of SEO polluted soil by *Luffa aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina/A. niger* and *Penicillium* sp. using TPH analysis

TL: Luffa augyptiaca in 100 mL SEO, TL₁: Luffa augyptiaca in 100 mL+fungi, TL₂: Luffa augyptiaca in 200 mL, TL_{2a}: Luffa augyptiaca in 200 mL+fungi, TV: Vernonia amygdalina in 100 mL, TV₁: Vernonia amygdalina in 100 mL+fungi, TV₂: Vernonia amygdalina in 200 mL, TL_{2a}: Luffa augyptiaca in 200 mL+fungi, TLV: Vernonia amygdalina in 200 mL+fungi, TLV: Vernonia amygdalina in 200 mL, TL_{2a}: Vernonia amygdalina in 200 mL+fungi, TLV: Vernonia amygdalina and Luffa augyptiaca in 100 mL+fungi, TLV: Vernonia amygdalina and Luffa augyptiaca in 100 mL+fungi, TLV₂: Vernonia amygdalina and Luffa augyptiaca in 200 mL+fungi, TLV₂: Vernonia amygdalina and Luffa augyptiaca in 200 mL+fungi, TLV₂: Vernonia amygdalina and Luffa augyptiaca in 200 mL+fungi

Table 5: Percentage remediation of SEO polluted soil by *Aspergillus niger* and *Penicillium* sp. (Fungi) using TPH analysis

	Pollutant concentration (mL)/treatments/results (%)								
	100			200					
Months	Ta	Tp	T _{ap1}	T _{a2}	T _{p2}	T _{ap2}			
1	16.5	23.2	45.6	26.9	31.8	37.2			
2	53.4	65.3	71.0	45.9	36.7	51.1			
3	79.2	71.4	87.3	69.1	67.4	80.6			

 $T_{a^{*}}$ Aspergillus niger in 100 mL, T_{p} : Pernicilium sp. in 100 mL, T_{ap1} : Aspergillus niger and Pernicilium sp. in 100 mL, TA_{2} : Aspergillus niger in 200 mL, T_{p2} : Pernicilium sp. in 200 mL, T_{ap2} : Aspergillus niger and Pernicilium sp. in 200 mL, T_{ap2} : Aspergillus niger and Pernicilium sp. in 200 mL

against 2.49±0.30 and 1.59±0.19 in 200 mL, respectively. On introduction of fungi (A. niger and Penicillium sp.), leaf area increased to 13.77±4.27 and 7.83±4.80in 100 and 200 mL spent engine oil, respectively. The leaf area and internode length for V. amygdalina were 3.37 ± 0.73 and 6.10 ± 0.53 , respectively in 100 mL but 2.17 ± 0.93 and 5.73 ± 1.89 in 200 mL SEO indicating that V. amygdalina may be more tolerant to SEO pollution than *L. aegyptiaca*. On introduction of fungi, the leaf area and internode length for V. amygdalina were 15.23±2.71, 2.23±0.28 and 12.95±1.72, 1.19±0.22 in 100 and 200 mL spent engine oil, respectively. This implies that the leaf areas were favoured by the introduction of fungi but did not translate to increase in height for *V. amygdalina*. On intercropping *L. aegyptiaca* with *V. amygdalina* without fungi, the mean leaf area and internode length were 5.42±2.15, 3.39±0.60 and 2.91±0.50, 2.49±0.48 in 100 mL and 200 mL spent engine oil, respectively. When L. aegyptiaca with V. amygdalina were intercropped and the growth promoting fungi introduced, the leaf area and internode length in 100 mL SEO were 6.29 ± 1.29 , 4.21 ± 0.77 and 4.63±1.19, 5.57±0.48 in 200 mL SEO, respectively. From this result, fungi (A. niger and Penicillium sp.) were shown to enhance the survival and growth of L. aegyptiaca and *V. amyqdalina* in hydrocarbon polluted soil (Table 3).

Confirmatory hydrocarbon utilization: The confirmatory hydrocarbon utilization using TPH analysis is presented in

Table 4 and 5 while the GC-MS of the soil and plants tissues are presented in Fig. 1-6. Remediation ability of Luffa aegyptiaca in 100 mL SEO contaminated soil at 3 months was 71.4% but increased to 79.6% on introduction of fungi (Aspergillus niger and Penicillium sp.). Comparatively, Vernonia amygdalina in 100 mL SEO contaminated soil was 88 and 80.1% with and without the fungi, respectively. When *L. aegyptiaca* is intercropped with *V. amygdalina* in 100 mL SEO contaminated soil, remediation percentage was 90 and 88%, respectively with and without the fungi. In 200 mL SEO contaminated soil, remediation by L. aegyptiaca and V. amygdalina were 57.7 and 55.8%, respectively without fungi but increased to 60.4 and 81.8% on introduction of fungi (Table 4). Independently, remediation by Aspergillus niger in 100 and 200 mL SEO contaminated soil were 69.2 and 59.1%, respectively as against 61.4 and 47.4% respectively by Penicillium sp. Percentage remediation by consortium of A. niger and Penicillium sp. in 100 and 200 mL SEO contaminated soil were 77.1 and 70.6, respectively (Table 5). The confirmatory hydrocarbon utilization study of SEO contaminated soil using GC-MS is presented in Fig. 1-4 while the hydrocarbon compounds detected within *L. aegyptiaca* after the experiment are presented in Fig. 5-6. From the results, both L. aegyptiaca, V. amygdalina, A. niger and Penicillium sp. were able to remediate SEO contaminated soil but at different rates. Intercropping *L. aegyptiaca* with V. amygdalina ameliorated with rhizospheric fungi however, gave the best result. Several compounds including, Isopropyl tetradecyl ether, 1-Chloroeicosane, pentadecane, 2,6,10,14-tetramethyl, behenyl chloride among others which were only degradable by combined effort of the plants and the fungi but not by individual organisms. Remediation of up to 90% and above were only attained by the consortium and not by the individual organisms involved. Accumulation of hydrocarbon by the tissues of both L. aegyptiaca and V. amygdalina decreased in the presence of the rhizospheric fungi. The lowest value of 0.732 and 0.406% in L. aegyptiaca and V. amygdalina tissues, respectively were found in the presence of the fungi (Fig. 5-6).



Fig. 1(a-d): Chromatogram of the pollutant only, (a) 200 mL (b) 100 mL at 24 h and (c, d) after 3 months



Fig. 2(a-d): Chromatogram of 200 mL SEO contaminated soil of, (a) *L. aegyptiaca*, (b) *V. amygdalina* (c) *Aspergillus niger* and (d) *Penicillum* sp., after 3 months



Fig. 3(a-d): Chromatogram of 100 mL SEO contaminated soil of, (a) *L. aegyptiaca*, (b) *V. amygdalina* (c) *Aspergillus niger* and (d) *Penicillum* sp., after 3 months



Fig. 4(a-d): Chromatogram of (a) *L. aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina* in 200 mL, (b) *L. aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina* in 100 mL, (c) *L. aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina/Aspergillus niger/Penicillum* sp., in 200 mL and (d) *L. aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina/Aspergillus niger/Penicillum* sp., in 100 mL



Fig. 5(a-d): Chromatogram of plant tissue (a, b) *L. aegyptiaca* in 100 mL and 200 mL and (c, d) *V. amygdalina* in 100 mL and 200 mL SEO contaminated soil after 3 months



Fig. 6(a-d): Chromatogram of plant tissues (a) *L. aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina* in 100 mL, (b) *L. aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina* in 200 mL
(c) *L. aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina/Aspergillus niger/Penicillum* sp., in 100 mL and (d) *L. aegyptiaca/V. amygdalina/Aspergillus niger/Penicillum* sp., in 200 mL

DISCUSSION

In this study, results show that the growth of *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* were negatively affected by increasing concentration of the pollutant. Mixed culture of the organisms was also shown to be better in degrading hydrocarbon than monoculture. Accumulation of hydrocarbon by the tissues of both *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* also decreased in the presence of the rhizospheric fungi. The pH of the soil for this study was 7.0 which is in agreement with Boonchan et al.21, who reported optimum pH for bioremediation as between 6.0 and 8.9. The observed physico-chemical parameters for soil and SEO used followed the submissions of Oyedele and Amoo²². Spent engine oil is commonly disposed into drainage channels, open vacant plots and farmlands in Nigeria, especially by auto-mechanics²³. Improperly disposal of spent engine oil renders polluted soils unfit for use. It alters soil microbial properties, decreases oxygen content and nutrient availability. Increased awareness of the negative consequences of petroleum hydrocarbon pollutants to living organisms and the environment at large has resulted into increased efforts into finding ways of mitigating/controlling hydrocarbon pollution²⁴. The high costs and limited efficiency of other methods of remediation has made biological remediation of polluted soil a better/best alternative. The ability of *L. aegyptiaca*, *V. amygdalina*, Aspergillus niger and Penicillium sp., to utilize and biodegrade spent engine oil contaminated soil was assessed in vitro. Results show that both the plants and the fungi were able to biodegrade spent engine oil contaminated soil but with differing abilities. The ability of fungi to degrade petroleum hydrocarbon has been documented by Rohrbacher and St-Arnaud²⁵, Adekunle *et al.*²⁶ and Mohsenzadeh²⁷.

In this study, both L. aegyptiaca, V. Amygdalina, Aspergillus niger and Penicillium sp., significantly enhanced the dissipation of PAHs in the soil however, intercropping both L. aegyptiaca with V. Amygdalina, ameliorated with Aspergillus niger and Penicillium sp., achieved the highest result. The TPH reduced significantly by up to 90% for TLV₁ (Luffa and vernonia intercropped ameliorated with fungi). This surpassed results of similar researches by Adelowo et al.28 and Akinde and Obire²⁹, who achieved less than 80% TPH degradation. Generally, the growth of *L. aegyptiaca* was negatively affected by increasing concentration of the pollutant. Results from morphological study show that the leaf areas were favoured by the introduction of fungi but did not translate to increase in height for V. amygdalina. The effect of used motor oil on *L. aegyptiaca* and *V. amygdalina* were observed as reduction in leaf area and internode length.

SIGNIFICANT STATEMENT

This study discovers the potency of consortium of *L. aegyptiaca*, *V. amygdalina*, *Aspergillus niger* and *Penicillium* sp., in bioremediation of hydrocarbon polluted soil. This study provides potentially cheaper, easy to apply and more effective means of remediating hydrocarbon polluted soil. Thus, remediation of hydrocarbon polluted soil, especially in less technologically developed countries may be arrived at.

CONCLUSION

Bioremediation has been shown to be a better alternative to other remediation techniques. Intercropping *L. aegyptiaca* with *V. amygdalina* ameliorated with *A. niger* and *Penicillium* sp., significantly enhanced the rate of spent engine oil degradation in soil up to 90% compared with monoculture. Thus, intercropping *Luffa aegyptiaca* and *Vermonia amygdalina* has shown promising potential in bioremediation of PAH-contaminated soil.

REFERENCES

- Ali, H., E. Khan and M.A. Sajad, 2013. Phytoremediation of heavy metals-concepts and applications. Chemosphere, 91: 869-881.
- Liu, G., J. Niu, W. Guo, X. An and L. Zhao, 2016. Ecological and health risk-based characterization of agricultural soils contaminated with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the vicinity of a chemical plant in China. Chemosphere, 163: 461-470.
- Shahzad, A., S. Saddiqui and A. Bano, 2016. The response of maize (*Zea mays* L.) plant assisted with bacterial consortium and fertilizer under oily sludge. Int. J. Phytoremed., 18: 521-526.
- James, C.A. and S.E. Strand, 2009. Phytoremediation of small organic contaminants using transgenic plants. Curr. Opin. Biotechnol., 20: 237-241.
- Dixit, R., D. Malaviya, K. Pandiyan, U. Singh and A. Sahu *et al.*, 2015. Bioremediation of heavy metals from soil and aquatic environment: An overview of principles and criteria of fundamental processes. Sustainability, 7: 2189-2212.
- Hussain, I., M. Puschenreiter, S. Gerhard, P. Schoftner and S. Yousaf *et al.*, 2018. Rhizoremediation of petroleum hydrocarbon-contaminated soils: Improvement opportunities and field applications. Environ. Exp. Bot., 147: 202-219.
- Truu, J., M. Truu, M. Espenberg, H. Nolvak and J. Juhanson, 2015. Phytoremediation and plant-assisted bioremediation in soil and treatment wetlands: A review. Open Biotechnol. J., 9: 85-92.

- 8. Afzal, M., Q.M. Khan and A. Sessitsch, 2014. Endophytic bacteria: Prospects and applications for the phytoremediation of organic pollutants. Chemosphere, 117: 232-242.
- 9. Partap, S., A. Kumar, N.K. Sharma and K.K. Jha, 2012. *Luffa cylindrica*. An important medicinal plant. Int. J. Agric. Sci., 2: 127-134.
- Prakash, K., A. Pandey, J. Radhamani and I.S. Bisht, 2013. Morphological variability in cultivated and wild species of *Luffa* (Cucurbitaceae) from India. Genet. Resour. Crop Evol., 60: 2319-2329.
- 11. Aboh, M.I., S.E. Okhale and K. Ibrahim, 2012. Preliminary studies on *Luffa cylindrica*. Comparative phytochemical and antimicrobial screening of the fresh and dried aerial parts. Afr. J. Microbiol. Res., 6: 3088-3091.
- 12. Oboh, I.O. and E.O. Aluyor, 2009. *Luffa cylindrica*-an emerging cash crop. Afr. J. Agric. Res., 4: 684-688.
- Ajuru, M.G. and F.W. Nmom, 2017. A review on the economic uses of species of cucurbitaceae and their sustainability in Nigeria. Am. J. Plant Biol., 2: 17-24.
- 14. Okusanya, O.T., 1983. The mineral nutrition of *Luffa aegyptiaca*. Can. J. Bot., 61: 2124-2132.
- Zakaria, Y., N.Z. Azlan, N.F.N. Hassan and H. Muhammad, 2016. Phytochemicals and acute oral toxicity studies of the aqueous extract of *Vernonia amygdalina* from state of Malaysia. J. Med. Plants Stud., 4: 1-5.
- 16. Reyes, A.A. and J.E. Mitchell, 1962. Growth response of several isolates of *Fusarium* in rhizospheres of host and non-host plants. Phytopathology, 52: 1196-1200.
- Kidd, S., C.L. Halliday, H. Alexiou and D.H. Ellis, 2016. Descriptions of Medical Fungi. 3rd Edn., Newstyle Printing, Australia, ISBN-13: 9780646951294, Pages: 264.
- Barnet, H.L. and B.B. Hunter, 1998. Illustrated Genera of Imperfect Fungi. 4th Edn., American Phytopathological Society Press, St. Paul, USA., ISBN-13: 978-0890541920, Pages: 240.
- Domsch, K.H., W. Gams and T.H. Anderson, 1980. Compendium of Soil Fungi. Vol. 1-2, Acadamic Press, New York, USA., Pages: 1156.

- 20. Ani, E., A.A. Adekunle, A.B. Kadiri and K.L. Njoku, 2018. Effect of *Macrophomina phaseolina*, organic manure and spent engine oil on *Luffa aegyptica* (Mill). Bayero J. Pure Applied Sci., 11: 138-142.
- Boonchan, S., M.L. Britz and G.A. Stanley, 2000. Degradation and mineralization of high-molecular-weight polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons by defined fungal-bacterial cocultures. Applied Environ. Microbiol., 66: 1007-1019.
- 22. Oyedele, A.O. and I.A. Amoo, 2014. Remediation of crude oil polluted soil using cow dung manure in relations to the growth of maize (*Zea mays* L.). Can. Open Agric. Soil Sci. J., 1: 1-16.
- 23. Stephen, E. and U.J.J. Ijah, 2011. Comparison of *Glycine max* and *Sida acuta* in the phytoremediation of waste lubricating oil polluted soil. Nat. Sci., 9: 190-193.
- Bisht, S., P. Pandey, B. Bhargava, S. Sharma, V. Kumar and K.D. Sharma, 2015. Bioremediation of Polyaromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) using rhizosphere technology. Braz. J. Microbiol., 46: 7-21.
- 25. Rohrbacher, F. and M. St-Arnaud, 2016. Root exudation: The ecological driver of hydrocarbon rhizoremediation. Agronomy, Vol. 6, No. 1. 10.3390/agronomy6010019.
- 26. Adekunle, A.A., E. Ani and U.C. Kanife, 2015. Biodegradation of petroleum oils by fungi isolated from oil palm fruit and mechanic village. Ife J. Sci., 17: 613-625.
- 27. Mohsenzadeh, F., 2014. Study of bioremediation possibility of engine-oil polluted soils by *Ranunculus arvensis* L. and its root associated fungi. Environ. Sci.: Indian J., 9: 438-444.
- Adelowo, O.O., S.O. Alagbe and A.A. Ayandele, 2006. Time-dependent stability of used engine oil degradation by cultures of *Pseudomonas fragi* and *Achromobacter aerogenes*. Afr. J. Biotechnol., 5: 2476-2479.
- 29. Akinde, S.B. and O. Obire, 2008. Aerobic heterotrophic bacteria and petroleum-utilizing bacteria from cow dung and poultry manure. World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol., 24: 1999-2002.