



Targets of Aluminium Toxicity in Plants

Priyanka Arora^{1*}, Arun Kumar³, Geeta Singh², Shilpy Singh³, Archana Tiwari¹

¹School of Sciences, Noida International University, India

²Division of Microbiology, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India

³Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Meerut, U.P., India, 250110.

*Corresponding author- drpriyankaarora146@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Aluminium is the third most copious element in soil. In the soil at neutral or alkaline pH, aluminium remains in insoluble form but as the pH drops down to the acidic level, the aluminium ions get rapidly solubilized and hence in this form, can be uptaken by plants and plants start showing aluminium toxicity symptoms. As reported, the plants show stunted root growth and thereby limiting production of crops. This review addresses the significant symptoms of aluminium toxicity mainly focusing on root growth inhibition, imbalance of nutrition and oxidative stress.

Keywords: Aluminium, nutrient uptake, plants, root growth, soil, reactive oxygen species

Received 19.04.2019

Revised 18.06.2019

Accepted 23.06. 2019

INTRODUCTION

In several parts of the world, crop production is facing major constraints due to soil acidity and their associated mineral activity [15]. Majority of the tropic soils become acidic due to continuous weathering and consequently many soluble nutrients like potassium, calcium, etc. are leached from the upper layer of soil through rain water accumulating aluminium, hydrogen, etc. at the leached surface.

Aluminium is one of the major element in earth crust and at normal pH, it exists in insoluble form exerting no harm to plants but as the soil becomes acidic, aluminium becomes soluble thereby inhibiting growth and development of roots in plants. Aluminium is known to inhibit the growth of roots even at micromolar concentrations in several plant species [20]. In soil, aluminium reacts with soluble phosphorus converting it into insoluble aluminium phosphate thereby rendering it unavailable to plants.

Farmers are trying new ways of rice cultivation to conserve water and resist climate changes. As a part of this practice rice farmers have begun to turn wet paddies to dry paddies but in this attempt, they are facing aluminium toxicity issues [16]. Earlier during indigenous rice cultivation practice, the harmful effects of aluminium concentration present in soil were diluted as rice paddies were flooded but in dry paddies, aluminium toxicity level remains the same affecting cultivation of rice. High levels of redeemable aluminium are tolerated by many crops such tea, pineapple, etc but still this toxicity remains a major constraint for production of a majority of crops. The aluminium tolerance level of species varies not only among species but it also varies for genotypes within species. Fertilizers and liming can be used as a source of remediation to reduce toxicity effect of aluminium but they are not much effective and in many cases, economical constraints also jeopardize the use of these strategies for mitigating toxicity [13]. Owing to this, there is an urgent need to decipher the possible mechanism of tolerance which can be used by these species to deal with aluminium toxicity and moreover to identify the most tolerant genotype of cereal species which can grow even in acidic soil thereby increasing the cereal production in the world. In addition to this, a better economic solution for aluminium toxicity could be obtained by developing new cultivars having increased aluminium tolerance capacity.

ALUMINIUM TOXICITY

Root Growth

During the last century inhibition of root growth has been reported as a major consequence of aluminium toxicity [8] for a number of species [10]. As a result, this inhibition of root growth acts as a potential measure of aluminium toxicity. The cell division and elongation together contribute in root growth but during last decades cell cycle (de) regulation by aluminium toxicity has been focused [18]. In wheat [9], beans, maize [7] and barley [4], a decrease in mitotic activity have been reported in conditions of aluminium toxicity. Besides this, some authors still fortified that cell elongation inhibition primarily leads to inhibition of growth of roots [5]. The roots exposed to aluminium toxicity show an increase in diameter of roots indicating cytoskeleton as a target of aluminium phytotoxicity [2]. Root cap was earlier thought to play an important role in aluminium toxicity [1]. But later on, studies revealed that there was no effect of root cap removal on root growth inhibition under aluminium phytotoxicity. In fact, meristem was suggested as a primary region of aluminium toxicity [15].

NUTRITIONAL IMBALANCE

In several plant species, aluminium exposure has been found to induce nutritional unbalance. Based on aluminium accretion, differences in nutritional imbalance have been found in various families of pteridophytes [14]. Aluminium toxicity has been found to impair the growth of both macronutrients (viz. Mg and Ca) and micronutrients (viz. Mn and Zn) in maize [11, 13]. In wheat, a decline in K and Mg nutrient and an incline in Ca, Si content was found in sensitive and tolerant cultivars respectively [18]. A high accumulation of Ca was found under aluminium exposure conditions in sensitive rye genotypes as compared to tolerant rye genotypes [18]. In rice plants, a decrease in P, Ca and Mg uptake was found [11]. Moreover, aluminium exposure led to a decrease in Ca, Mg, Fe, Mn and Zn content in tomato cultivars [19]. Among and within plant species, a variation in uptake and accumulation of nutrients, as well as its translocation, has been evident. So, it is complex to generalize an accurate model for nutritional imbalance caused by aluminium toxicity.

OXIDATIVE STRESS

Aluminium toxicity has been reported to induce changes in cell wall properties as well as oxidative stress. Disturbance occurring in cellular redox homeostasis results in oxidative stress. Cellular contents such as proteins, nucleic acids, enzymes, and lipids are oxidized by reactive oxygen species (ROS) which eventually lead to cell death. During the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS), metals work as catalyst inducing oxidative damage to plants. As aluminium is not a transition metal, it cannot catalyze redox reactions but its exposure induces oxidative stress in plants [3]. As a defending mechanism to ROS plants cells produces certain antioxidative enzymes namely ascorbate peroxidase (APX), glutathione-S-transferase (GST), catalase (CAT), superoxide dismutase (SOD), guaiacol peroxidase (GPOX), dehydroascorbate reductase (DHAR) and also some non enzymatic oxidants as α -tocopherol, ascorbate (AsA), carotenoids, glutathione (GSH) as a aid to detoxify ROS. Maize roots have been to show an increase of SOD and APX activities [3] and in addition to this it has also been reported that aluminium exposure induces the change in gene expression in maize plants [12] conferring resistance to oxidative stress.

CONCLUSION

Aluminium absorbs in acidic soil and rapidly taken up by plants impairing its root growth and development. Consequently, the nutrient and water uptake by roots is also affected leading to decreased crop production. Also, aluminium in soil reacts with soluble phosphorus leading to the formation of insoluble complexes making it unavailable to plants. The lime application can also raise soil pH but is not a remedy in the subsoil layer. Apart from this, different studies performed on aluminium toxicity involve the different composition of media, concentration of aluminium and time of exposure of aluminium to concerned species. The aluminium tolerance level of species varies not only among species but it also varies for genotypes within species. This kind of noncoordinated experimental data hinders during interpretation of overall responses. So, in order to cope up with this, uniform experimental protocols should be formulated so that plant responses to aluminium exposure and the mechanism of aluminium tolerance in plants could be more precisely deciphered.

REFERENCES

1. Bennet RJ and Breen CM, (1991). The aluminium signal: new dimensions to mechanisms of aluminium tolerance, *Plant and Soil*, 134, 153–166.

2. Blancaflor EB, Jones DL and Gilroy S, (1998). Alterations in the cytoskeleton accompany aluminum-induced growth inhibition and morphological changes in primary roots of maize, *Plant Physiology*, 118, 159–172.
3. Boscolo PRS, Menossi M and Jorge RA, (2003). Aluminum-induced oxidative stress in maize, *Phytochemistry*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 181–189.
4. Budikova S and Durcekova K, (2004). Aluminium accumulation in roots of Al-sensitive barley cultivar changes root cell structure and induces callose synthesis, *Biologia*, 59, 215–220.
5. Ciamporova M, (2002). Morphological and structural responses of plant roots to aluminium at organ, tissue, and cellular levels, *Biologia Plantarum*, 45(2), 161–171.
6. Mendonca RJ, Cambraia J, De Oliveira JA and Oliva MA, (2003). Aluminum effects on the uptake and utilization of macronutrients in two rice cultivars, *Pesquisa Agropecuaria Brasileira*, 38, 843–848.
7. Doncheva S, Amenos MC, Poschenrieder C and Barcelo J, (2005). Root cell patterning: a primary target for aluminium toxicity in maize, *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 56(414), 1213–1220.
8. Eisenmenger WS, (1935). Toxicity of aluminum on seedlings and action of certain ions in the elimination of the toxic effects, *Plant Physiology*, 10(1), 1–25.
9. Li Y, Yang GX, Luo LT, (2008). Aluminium sensitivity and tolerance in model and elite wheat varieties, *Cereal Research Communications*, 36(2), 257–267.
10. Ma Q, Rengel Z and Kuo J, (2002). Aluminium toxicity in rye (*Secale cereale*): root growth and dynamics of cytoplasmic Ca²⁺ in intact root tips, *Annals of Botany*, 89 (2), 241–244.
11. Mariano ED and Keltjens WG, (2005). Long-term effects of aluminum exposure on nutrient uptake by maize genotypes differing in aluminum resistance, *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 28, 323–333.
12. Maron LG, Kirst M, C Mao, Milner MJ, Menossi M and Kochian LV, (2008). Transcriptional profiling of aluminum toxicity and tolerance responses in maize roots, *New Phytologist*, vol. 179, no. 1, pp. 116–128.
13. Marschner B, Henke U and Wessolek G, (1995). Effects of meliorative additives on the adsorption and binding forms of heavy-metals in contaminated topsoil from a former sewage farm, *Zeitschrift für Pflanzenernährung und Bodenkunde*, vol. 158, 9–14.
14. Olivares E, Pena E, Marcano E, (2009). Aluminum accumulation and its relationship with mineral plant nutrients in 12 pteridophytes from Venezuela, *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, 65, 132–141.
15. Pariasca-Tanaka J, Satoh K, Rose T, Mauleon R, Wissuwa M. (2009). Stress response versus stress tolerance: a transcriptome analysis of two rice lines contrasting in tolerance to phosphorus deficiency, *Rice* 2, 167–185.
16. Shackford S, Breeder works to alleviate aluminium toxicity in rice, (2012), http://www.news_ornell.edu/stories/_May12/RiceUpdate.htm.
17. Silva S, Pinto-Carnide O, Martins-Lopes P, Matos M, Guedes-Pinto H, and Santos C, (2010). Differential aluminium changes on nutrient accumulation and root differentiation in an Al- sensitive vs. tolerant wheat, *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, 68, 91–98.
18. Silva S, Santos C, Matos M and Pinto-Carnide O, (2011). Al toxicity mechanisms in tolerant and sensitive rye genotypes, *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, 75, 89–97.
19. Simon L, Smalley TJ, Benton Jones J and Lasseigne FT, (1994). Aluminum toxicity in tomato 1. Growth and mineral-nutrition, *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 17, 293–306.
20. Wissuwa M, (2005). Combining a modeling with a genetic approach in establishing associations between genetic and physiological effects in relation to phosphorus uptake. *Plant Soil* 269, 57–68.

CITATION OF THIS ARTICLE

P Arora, A Kumar, G Singh, S Singh, A Tiwari. Targets of Aluminium Toxicity in Plants. *Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci.*, Vol 8 [10] September 2019: 07-09