### **NUMERICAL DATA**

# Phytoremediation of Endosulfan Sulfate-Contaminated Soil by Single and Mixed Plant Cultivations. (2018)

Table 1: Concentrations of endosulfan sulfatein shoot and root of sweet corn, cucumber, and cowpea grown in endosulfan sulphate contaminated soil for 25 days

Plant tissues	Amount accumulation				
	(µg/plant shoot or µg/plant root)				
Sweet corn shoot					
SC	BD				
SC + CU	4.4±0.0a				
SC + CP	BD				
Cucumber shoot					
CU	14.3±8.1a				
CU + SC	10.5±4.0a				
CU + CP	BD				
Cowpea shoot					
СР	18.1±1.1a				
CP + SC	BD				
CP + CU	20.3±2.2a				
Sweet corn root					
SC	BD				
SC + CU	0.2±0.0c				
SC + CP	16.3±5.5bc				
Cucumber root					
CU	17.0±5.9abc				
CU + SC	34.4±11.0a				
CU + CP	BD				
Cowpea root					
СР	22.6±3.1ab				
CP + SC	17.1±5.5abc				
CP + CU	8.1±3.7bc				

Different lower case letters denote significant difference (P<0.05) between the same plant on the same day SC sweet corn, CU cucumber, CP cowpea, NA not available because the plant died, BD below detection limit at  $0.2 \,\mu \text{g/plant}$ .

**Source:** https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11270-014-1886-0

### **Endosulfan Plant Uptake Suppression Effect on Char Amendment in Oriental Radish. (2018)**

Table 1: BCF concentration and TF of endosulfan in oriental radish at harvest

	Root				Aerial part				TF	BC F <sup>a</sup>
	α	β	Su	То	ραιτ	β	Sulfa	Tota		<u>r</u>
	L C	۲	lfa	tal	<u> </u>	۲	te	1		
			te							
Untre	0.021	0.026	0.16	0.21	0.001	0.00	0.031	0.03	0.16	0.02
at			5	2		2		4	0	5
PAC	0.005	0.008	0.05	0.07	0.001	0.00	0.023	0.02	0.37	0.00
			7	0		2		6	1	6
POC	0.001	0.001	0.01	0.01	0.001	0.00	0.004	0.00	0.41	0.00
			0	2		1		5	7	2
GOC	0.021	0.028	0.24	0.29	0.002	0.00	0.043	0.04	0.15	0.02
			6	5		1		6	6	8
RHC	0.018	0.021	0.14	0.18	0.001	0.00	0.035	0.03	0.20	0.02
			3	2		2		8	9	1

PAC powdered activated carbon, POC powdered oak char, GOC granulated oak char, RHC rice husk char, TF translocation factor from root to aerial part of the radish. BCF was calculated with total endosulfan residue in the root of radish.

To survey the BCF for the radish in farm level, two sites contaminated with endosulfan (2.274 and 51.00 mg kg-1) were selected at Gochang in South Korea. In this study, the BCF of endosulfans in the root was 0.015 and 0.071, respectively. The BCF of endosulfan sulfate was of the range 0.069–0.097. These BCFs for the radish were similar to the previous reports (Hwang et al. 2016).

**Source:** https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11270-017-3677-x

## **Endosulfan Degradation by Selected Strains of Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria** (2017)

Table 1: PGP activities of the selected strains at varying concentrations of endosulfan

Strains number	Treat ments	Solubilizatio n Index <sup>a</sup>	P-liberated in broth	Change in pH	IAA (µg mL <sup>-1</sup> )	Siderop hore	H C N	NH <sub>3</sub>
			assay (µg mL <sup>-l</sup> ) <sup>b</sup>			zone size (mm)		
PRB08	Contr ol	$3.2 \pm 0.15^{a}$	$174.3 \pm 1.5^{a}$	3.1 ± 0.17	$67.0 \pm 1.0^{a}$	$11 \pm 1.5^{a}$	+	+
	1X	$3.0 \pm 0.05^{ab}$	$170.0 \pm 1.0^{b}$	3.1 ± 0.15	65.3 ± 2.0 <sup>ab</sup>	$11 \pm 1.5^{a}$	+	+
	2X	$2.9 \pm 0.05^{b}$	$167.3 \pm 1.5^{\text{b}}$	3.2 ± 0.11	61.3 ± 1.5 <sup>b</sup>	$11 \pm 1.7^{a}$	+	+
PRB44	Contr ol	$3.0 \pm 0.15^{a}$	$167.0 \pm 2.0^{a}$	3.1 ± 0.10	66.3 ± 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	$10 \pm 2.0^{a}$	+	+
	1X	$2.8 \pm 0.10^{a}$	165.3 ± 1.5 <sup>ab</sup>	3.1 ± 0.15	62.6 ± 2.5 <sup>ab</sup>	$9 \pm 0.5^{a}$	+	+
	2X	$2.7 \pm 0.20^{a}$	$162.6 \pm 1.5^{b}$	3.1 ± 0.05	59.3 ± 0.5b	$9 \pm 1.0^{a}$	+	+
PRB77	Contr ol	$2.9 \pm 0.10^{a}$	$185.6 \pm 2.5^{a}$	2.7 ± 0.30	67.6 ± 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	$13 \pm 0.5^{a}$	+	+
	1X	$3.1 \pm 0.10^{a}$	181.3 ± 1.5 <sup>ab</sup>	2.7 ± 0.36	68.6 ± 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	$13 \pm 0.5^{a}$	+	+
	2X	$3.0 \pm 0.05^{a}$	$177.3 \pm 1.6^{b}$	2.9 ± 0.20	64.3 ± 2.5 <sup>a</sup>	$12 \pm 0.5^{a}$	+	+
PRB90	Contr ol	$2.8 \pm 0.15^{a}$	$153.0 \pm 2.0^{a}$	3.2 ± 0.05	57.3 ± 2.0 <sup>a</sup>	$10 \pm 1.0^{a}$	+	+
	1X	$2.6 \pm 0.10^{a}$	$150.3 \pm 3.2^{a}$	3.2 ± 0.10	55.3 ± 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	$8 \pm 0.5^{a}$	+	+
	2X	$2.5 \pm 0.20^{a}$	$147.3 \pm 3.2^{a}$	3.3 ± 0.05	52.6 ± 2.0 <sup>a</sup>	$7 \pm 1.0^{a}$	+	+
PRB101	Contr ol	$3.3 \pm 0.10^{a}$	$189.3 \pm 3.5^{a}$	2.7 ± 0.20	74.0 ± 2.6 <sup>a</sup>	$13 \pm 1.5^{a}$	+	+
	1X	$3.3 \pm 0.15^{a}$	$186.6 \pm 3.0^{a}$	2.8 ± 0.15	71.3 ± 2.5 <sup>ab</sup>	$13 \pm 0.5^{a}$	+	+
	2X	$3.2 \pm 0.15^{a}$	$183.0 \pm 1.0^{a}$	3.0 ± 0.05	67.3 ± 1.5 <sup>b</sup>	$13 \pm 1.0^{a}$	+	+

Values represent Mean  $\pm$  SD (n = 3). Different subscript letters represent significant differences along the column of individual strains in the solubilization indexes, P-liberated in broth assay, IAA and Siderophore zone size at p  $\leq$  0.05 according to Tukey's test X recommended field dose, IAA indole-3-acetic acid, HCN hydrogen cyanide, NH3 ammonia a Solubilization index = Total diameter (colony diameter + halo zone)/colony diameter b Amount of P liberated in NBRIP broth after 6 days of incubation with pesticide amendment

#### **Source:**

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316853194\_Endosulfan\_Degradation\_by\_Selected\_Strains\_of\_Plant\_Growth\_Promoting\_Rhizobacteria

### Recovery of lindane and $\alpha\text{-}$ and $\beta\text{-}$ endosulfan from soil samples spiked at three levels (2016)

	Lindane		α- endosulfan			β- endosulfan		
Amount added	Amount	% Recovery	Amount	Amount	% Recovery	Amount added	Amount found	% Recovery
ngg <sup>-1</sup>	ngg <sup>-1</sup>	recevery	ngg <sup>-1</sup>	ngg <sup>-1</sup>	recevery	ngg <sup>-1</sup>	ngg <sup>-1</sup>	Receivery
3.01	2.50	83	2.48	2.10	85	2.53	2.20	87
6.32	5.00	80	5.00	4.20	84	5.04	4.40	87
9.32	9.04	97	9.00	8.93	99	9.83	9.77	99

**Source:** M.f. zaranyika, P. Mugari (2016), Soil persistence, plant and non-target insect uptake of endosulfan and lindane applied to soya bean and maize in field trials in zimbabwe, Chemistry Department, University of Zimbabwe