22



23 24 Oil pollution dreadfully affects the some cosystem through adsorption and surface assimilation of soil 25 particles purveying of an excess carbon which might be unattainable for microbial use and the

challenge in many oil producing areas ascribable to their environmental consequences to man [3].

26 investiture of a constraint in soil nutrients [4]. During oil spillages, non-organic compounds, carcinogens, and growth inhibiting chemicals obtainable in crude oil are introduced to the 27 28 [3], and protracted exposite to acute oil contamination could result to the instigation of kidney and liver diseases, mutilation of bone marrow and intensified (Spot cancer [5]. There is a proportional 29 30 reduction in contaminant extraction and biodegradation as the interaction between particles of soil 31 and pollutants increase [6]. Biodegradation makes use of bacteria, fungi or various biological means 32 to disintegrate materials. Microorganisms possess a great ability to metabolize degradable 33 contaminants by employing them as energy source and/or converting them to non-toxic product such 34 as carbon dioxide, biomass and water. This relies on the nature and amount of hydrocarbons present

35 [7<mark>1</mark> 36

Microbial and enzymatic activities of the soil car eal succinctly quality of soil [8]. The activities of soil enzymes can be used to revea here tabolic need and nutrient availability of soil 37 38 39 microorganisms which are essential in the processing and recovery of key nutrients from detrital 40 inputs and accumulated soil organic matter [9]. Extracellular expression as proteases, 41 dehydrogenases and phosphatases are involved in the process of organic matter decomposition and cycling of key element S ch as carbon, nitrogen and pheephorus [10]. Studies have revealed that 42 enzyme activities in the soll are related to heavy metal cor alination. Almost all enzyme activities in 43 soils are significantly reduced by 10 to 50 times with the increase of the concentration of heavy metals 44 in the solid [11]. Heavy metal toxicity affects micro population size, diversity, and activity and also affects their genetic structure. It also alters the peic acid structure, disrupts cell membrane, and 45 46 causes functional disturbance thereby inhibiting the enzyme activity and oxidative phosphorylation, 47 48 causing lipid peroxidation and attering osmotic do and protein denaturation [12]. This study thus assays for the presence of som sill enzymes in crude oil polluted agricultural soil and their activities 49 50 with respect to remediation of the soil using Schwenkia americana and Spermacoce ocymoides.

51

53

72

73

74

#### 2. METHODOLOGY 52

A polluted agricultural farmland located in Ogoniland, Nigeria was identified 😡 odo community, 54 Gokana L.G.A Privers state and assessed to privation the types of contaminants involved and to determine the most appropriate technologies for its rest pon. In the sessment, the site was 55 56 57 mapped to determine its physical characteristics, size and location of contaminants as well as the 58 plant ecolog community. Thereafter, indigenous plants of the plant with the plant site were harvested and 59 taken to the Department of Plant Science and Biotechnology, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria for 60 identification. Two species (Schwenkia americana and Spermacoce ocymoides) were selected for the study owing to existing reports on their survival ability in polluted environments. Soil samples from 61 62 crude oil polluted site and agricultural soil from natural matrix within the University of Port Harcourt 63 were collected following the described method [13]. Nursery was set up using sterile soil and mature 64 and viable seeds of the selected species. Three to four weeks after germination, 4 seedlings each of 65 the plants were transplanted into an 8 kg potted homogenized polluted soil set up in triplicate 66 alongside unvegetated polluted and unpolluted control soils. Soil sampling was carried out prior to the transplant and subsequently at 4<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> week. Fresh soil samples were collected and taken 67 68 immediately to the laboratory. The activities of acid and alkaline phosphatase, dehydrogenase and 69 protease were assayed and the organic matter content of the soil was determined. 70

71 The method [14] with modification was employed for all enzyme assays and respiratory activity performed in triplicate and compared to controls while soil organic matter was determined by loss of weight on janition method [13].

75 The assay for protease activity is based on determining the amino acids released after incuration of 76 the soil with sodium caseinate for 2 bours at 50°C using Folin-Ciocalteu reagent. Two grams of moist, 77 sieved (2 mm) soil was weighed into 25-mL centrifuge tubes designated as test and control. Aliquot 78 (5 mL) of <u>1%</u> substrate, prepared a night before and kept in a refrigerator, was added to the test 79 tubes. For the controls, only 5 mL of TRIS HCI buffer at pH 8.1 was added. The tubes were shaken for 80 2 hours at 50°C and cooled immediately in cold water. An aliquot of 2 mL 17.5% trichloroacectic acid 81 was added into test and control tubes and centrifuged at 3000 rpm for 2 minutes. The supernatant (2 82 mL) was dispensed into test tubes, and 3 mL 1.4M NaSO<sub>4</sub> was added in both the test and control tubes. The tubes were shaken thoroughly and 1 mL of dilute Folin-Ciocalteu reagent, prepared (D) 83 84 diluting three times, was added and the content of the tubes centrifuged at 200 rpm for 2 minutes,



- 142 0.01 g. Again, the crucibles with the dried soil samples were placed in a muffle furnace, set at 400 °C.
- 143 After 4 hours of ashing, they were removed from the muffle furnace, cooled in a dry atmosphere, and
- 144 reweighed to the nearest 0.01 g.
- 145 The percentage organic matter is given by: 146 % ON

$$\% OM = [(W_1 - W_2) / W_1] \times 10^{10}$$

147 where  $W_1$  = the weight of soil at 105°C;  $W_2$  = the weight of soil at 400°C.

#### 148 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

149 The protease activities of the various soil samples are presented in Table 1. Compared to baseline 150 values, the protease activities of the remediated groups reduced over time. This may be due to the inhibitory influence of the remediating plants on the soil microorganisms. It may however be due to 151 152 the limiting effect of nutrients in the pots, since they have been depleted over time, with the resultant [ reduction in microbial activity. The later argument may account for the reduction observed for the 153 154 unpolluted group. The former contention can be substantiated by the findings of [15] that plant 155 extracts of M. alternifolius and other plants inhibited the growth of certain fungi and bacteria, with M. 156 strongly inhibiting the fungi P. chrysogenum and bacteria Escherichia coli, alternifolius 157 Staphylococcus aureus and Salmonella typhi. This study also revealed a trend between organic 158 matter and enzyme and respiratory activities. Pearson's correlation coefficient (PCC, a measure of the 159 linear correlation or dependence between two variables) of -1.00, -0.98 and -0.80 (Table 7) for 160 protease activity in unpolluted control, polluted control and S. americana treated groups, respectively, 161 showed substantial negative correlations with organic matter (OM) where as the soil treated with S. 162 ocymoides showed fair positive correlation (+0.47 PCC) as shown in Table 7.

163

# 164Table 1.Protease activity (in mg tyrosine $kg^{-1}$ dry matter $h^{-1}$ ) of unpolluted control,165polluted control, Schwenkia americana and Spermacoce ocymoides.

166

\_

| Group      | Before                    | Week 4                        | Week 8                               | Week 12                    |
|------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Unpolluted | 32.9021±3.86 <sup>a</sup> | 38.6255±0.77 <sup>a*</sup>    | 20.3461±1.59 <sup>a*</sup>           | 11.9031±1.00 <sup>a*</sup> |
| Control    | $\square$                 |                               |                                      |                            |
| Polluted   | 44.4372±0.77 <sup>d</sup> | 21.9986±8.06 <sup>b*</sup>    | 13.6596±43.47 <sup>a,b*</sup>        | 2.6944±2.88 <sup>b*</sup>  |
| Control    |                           |                               |                                      |                            |
| Schwenkia  | 44.4372±0.77 <sup>b</sup> | 24.1303±3.32 <sup>b*</sup>    | 10.5389±1.18 <sup>b*</sup>           | 1.3813±0.47 <sup>b*</sup>  |
| americana  |                           |                               |                                      |                            |
| Spermacoce | 44.4372±0.77 <sup>b</sup> | 23.6187±16.81 <sup>a,b*</sup> | 6.2756±5.56 <sup>b<sup>*</sup></sup> | 2.4046±1.19 <sup>b*</sup>  |
| ocymoides  |                           |                               |                                      |                            |

167 Values are mean ± standard deviations of triplicate determinations.

Values in the same column with different letters (a,b) are significantly different at P = .05.

169 \**P* = .05 compared to the corresponding values before treatment.

170

171 The dehydrogenase activities of the various soil samples are presented in Table 2. Compared to 172 baseline values, the dehydrogenase activities of the remediated groups showed a significant ( $\rho < 0.05$ ) 173 rise in activity after 4 weeks but reduced at the end of remediation. The increase may have been a 174 result of an initial increase in microbial population within the first 4 weeks which afterwards reduced 175 with depletion of carbon source or available nutrients, since they have been depleted over time, with 176 the resultant reduction in microbial activity. Though there might be available nutrients in the 177 unpolluted group, the absence of carbon source may account for the insignificant activities observed. 178 [16] Reported an undesirable reduction in the dehydrogenase activity and associated that with the low 179 activities of microorganisms in polluted soil. [17] Made a clearer and more acceptable report that both 180 the microbial population, activity of the microbial population and the kind of microbe present in the soil 181 determine the enzyme activity. This trend as observed in Table 2 follows similar trends [18], [19], [20]. 182 Substantial positive correlation (+0.96 PCC) for dehydrogenase activity and OM was observed only in 183 the soil treated with S. americana. While the unpolluted control and soil treated with S. ocymoides 184 showed a fair positive correlation of +0.36 and +0.55 respectively, the polluted control soil showed a 185 substantial negatively correlation (-0.90 PCC). 186

- 100
- 187
- 188
- 189
- 190

191 **Table 2. Dehydrogenase activity (in mg TPF kg<sup>-</sup>1 d<sup>-</sup>1) of unpolluted control, polluted** 192 **control, Schwenkia americana and Spermacoce ocymoides.** 

193

| Group      | Before                   | Week 4                     | Week 12                  |
|------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Unpolluted | 1.1837±0.95 <sup>ª</sup> | 7.6737±6.72 <sup>a</sup>   | 0.6091±0.08 <sup>a</sup> |
| Control    |                          |                            |                          |
| Polluted   | 0.1528±0.21 <sup>b</sup> | 11.4075±6.66 <sup>a*</sup> | 0.6318±0.11 <sup>ª</sup> |
| Control    |                          |                            |                          |
| Schwenkia  | 0.1528±0.21 <sup>b</sup> | 5.2486±2.72 <sup>a*</sup>  | 0.9236±0.40 <sup>b</sup> |
| americana  |                          |                            |                          |
| Spermacoce | 0.1528±0.21 <sup>b</sup> | 7.4165±0.61 <sup>a*</sup>  | 0.1450±0.06 <sup>c</sup> |
| ocymoides  |                          |                            |                          |

194 Values are mean ± standard deviations of triplicate determinations.

195 Values in the same column with different letters (a,b) are significantly different at P = .05.

196 \*P = .05 compared to the corresponding values before treatment.

197

198 The acid and alkaline phosphatase activities of the various soil samples are presented in Tables 3 199 and 4. Compared to baseline values, the acid phosphatase activities (Table 3) of the remediated 200 groups reduced over time. This may be due to the inhibitory influence of the remediating plants on the 201 soil microorganisms. It may however be due to the limiting effect of nutrients in the pots, since they 202 have been depleted over time, with the resultant reduction in microbial activity. The later argument 203 may account for the reduction observed for the polluted and unpolluted groups, since the pots were 204 unvegetated. However, the increase observed at week 8 for unpolluted group may indicate a rise in 205 peak in microbial activity which may have reduced owing to the depletion in available nutrients. 206 Likewise, compared to the baseline values, alkaline phosphatase activities of the remediated groups, 207 as shown in Table 4, reduced over time albeit a recorded increase in S. ocymoites treated group at 208 week 8. The reduction may be due to the hampering influence of the remediating plants on the soil 209 microorganisms. Nonetheless, it may be due to the limiting effects of nutrients in the pots as depletion 210 may have taken place over the period of time, thus resulting to reduction in microbial activity. If the 211 later argument is true, it may therefore account for the reduction observed for unpolluted and polluted 212 groups. However, the population and/or the presence of certain microorganisms specific for alkaline 213 phosphatase secretion may have influenced the increase in activity recorded in S. ocymoides treated 214 group at week 8. This finding is supported by the report [17], that microbial population, activity and the 215 kind of microbe present in the soil determine the enzyme activity. Acid phosphatase activity showed a 216 substantial positive correlation with OM for the unpolluted control and S. americana treated soil (+0.84 217 and +0.80 PCC, respectively). However, whilst the soil treated with S. ocymoides showed a fair 218 positive correlation (+0.55PCC); the polluted control soil indicated almost no correlation (+0.05 PCC). 219 On the other hand, alkaline phosphatase activity revealed a fair positive correlation with OM for 220 unpolluted control, polluted control and soil treated with S. americana (+0.61, +0.52, and +0.36 PCC, 221 respectively), and its correlation with OM for S. ocymoides treated soil revealed a fair negative 222 correlation of -0.57.

223

224Table 3:Acid phosphatase activity (mmol PNP kg<sup>-</sup>1 dw h<sup>-</sup>1) of unpolluted control,225polluted control, Schwenkia americana and Spermacoce ocymoides.226

| Group      | Before                   | Week 4                   | Week 8                       | Week 12                     |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Unpolluted | 1.5190±1.06 <sup>a</sup> | 1.6357±0.15 <sup>a</sup> | 7.5831±1.22 <sup>a</sup> *   | 0.0485±0.06 <sup>a</sup>    |
| Control    |                          |                          |                              |                             |
| Polluted   | 5.4736±1.74 <sup>b</sup> | 1.5739±1.00 <sup>a</sup> | 2.8370±4.61 <sup>a,b,c</sup> | 0.1502±0.04 <sup>a*</sup>   |
| Control    |                          |                          |                              |                             |
| Schwenkia  | 5.4736±1.74 <sup>b</sup> | 4.5386±1.21 <sup>b</sup> | 6.1315±1.72 <sup>c</sup>     | 0.2076±0.39 <sup>b,c*</sup> |
| americana  |                          |                          |                              |                             |
| Spermacoce | 5.4736±1.74 <sup>b</sup> | 6.5304±1.51 <sup>c</sup> | 0.1773±0.50 <sup>b</sup> *   | 0.2127±0.25 <sup>a,c*</sup> |
| ocymoides  |                          |                          |                              |                             |

227 Values are mean ± standard deviations of triplicate determinations.

228 Values in the same column with different letters (a,b) are significantly different at P = .05.

229 \*P = .05 compared to the corresponding values before treatment.

230

231Table 4:Alkaline phosphatase activity (mmol PNP kg<sup>-1</sup> dw h<sup>-1</sup>) of unpolluted control,232polluted control, Schwenkia americana and Spermacoce ocymoides.

233

| Group      | Before                   | Week 4                               | Week 8                     | Week 12                   |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Unpolluted | 3.2944±1.11 <sup>a</sup> | 0.1846±0.16 <sup>a,b*</sup>          | 3.2186±1.20 <sup>a</sup>   | 0.6330±0.43 <sup>a*</sup> |
| Control    |                          |                                      |                            |                           |
| Polluted   | 4.3601±1.06 <sup>a</sup> | 0.5912±0.26 <sup>a,c*</sup>          | 3.3636±1.05 <sup>ª</sup>   | 1.2072±0.96 <sup>a*</sup> |
| Control    |                          |                                      |                            |                           |
| Schwenkia  | 4.3601±1.06 <sup>a</sup> | 0.4942±0.07 <sup>c*</sup>            | 0.1835±0.04 <sup>b*</sup>  | 0.6294±0.31 <sup>a*</sup> |
| americana  |                          |                                      |                            |                           |
| Spermacoce | 4.3601±1.06 <sup>a</sup> | 0.2753±0.64 <sup>b<sup>*</sup></sup> | 11.4072±2.44 <sup>c*</sup> | 0.8385±0.69 <sup>a*</sup> |
| ocymoides  |                          |                                      |                            |                           |

234 Values are mean ± standard deviations of triplicate determinations.

235 Values in the same column with different letters (a,b) are significantly different at P = .05.

P = .05 compared to the corresponding values before treatment.

237 238 Assessment of oxidation of organic matter by aerobic microorganisms, known as respiration, 239 confirmed microbial activity in all the soils. According to [21], soil respiratory activities and microbial 240 abundance are sensitive to contamination with petroleum derivatives. [22] Associated decline of 241 respiratory activity similar to what is represented in Table 5 to depleted available carbon substrates. 242 Additionally, respiration declines in soils that lack nutrients and other supporting factors for microbial 243 and other biological activities [23]. While respiratory activity showed a substantial negative correlation 244 with OM for the unpolluted control (-0.96 PCC), its correlation with OM for polluted control showed 245 arguably no correlation (-0.07 PCC). Nonetheless, a fair positive correlation was recorded in S. 246 americana treated and S. ocymoides treated soils (+0.51 and +0.54 PCC, respectively).

247

#### Table 5: Respiratory activity ( $CO_2$ .C) (in mg) of unpolluted control, polluted control, Schwenkia americana and Spermacoce ocymoides.

250

| Group      | Before                   | Week 12                  |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Unpolluted | 1.4400±0.01 <sup>a</sup> | 0.800±0.37 <sup>a*</sup> |
| Control    |                          |                          |
| Polluted   | 1.9200±0.01 <sup>b</sup> | 0.24±0.12 <sup>a*</sup>  |
| Control    |                          |                          |
| Schwenkia  | 1.9200±0.01 <sup>b</sup> | 0.40±0.37 <sup>b*</sup>  |
| americana  |                          |                          |
| Spermacoce | 1.9200±0.01 <sup>b</sup> | 0.28±0.18 <sup>c*</sup>  |
| ocymoides  |                          |                          |

251 Values are mean ± standard deviations of triplicate determinations.

252 Values in the same column with different letters (a,b) are significantly different at P = .05.

253 \*P = .05 compared to the corresponding values before treatment.

As shown in Table 6, the soil organic matter in the remediated and polluted control groups, when compared with the baseline values, reduced over time. Organic matter is the major source of plant nutrients [24] and its mineralization depends on the interaction be soil [4]. [25] Reported that the decomposition of organic matter is rargely a biological process that occurs naturally and determined by soil organisms, the physical environment and the quality of the organic matter. The reduction in organic matter in the groups may therefore be associated with its utilization by the microorganisms to release nutrients for use by plants and microorganisms.

262

254

263Table 6:Organic matter (in %) of unpolluted control, polluted control, Schwenkia264americana and Spermacoce ocymoides.

265

| Group      | Before                   | Week 8                    | Week 12                   |
|------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Unpolluted | 2.4900±0.01 <sup>a</sup> | 2.4700±0.22 <sup>a</sup>  | 2.2267±0.19 <sup>a</sup>  |
| Control    |                          |                           |                           |
| Polluted   | 4.800±0.10 <sup>b</sup>  | 4.0200±0.09 <sup>b*</sup> | 3.7767±0.14 <sup>b*</sup> |

| Control    |                         |                           |                           |
|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Schwenkia  | 4.800±0.10 <sup>b</sup> | 3.8467±0.24 <sup>b*</sup> | 3.7267±0.11 <sup>b*</sup> |
| americana  |                         |                           |                           |
| Spermacoce | 4.800±0.10 <sup>b</sup> | 3.8067±0.25 <sup>b*</sup> | 3.5767±031 <sup>b*</sup>  |
| ocvmoides  |                         |                           |                           |

266 Values are mean ± standard deviations of triplicate determinations.

Values in the same column with different letters (a,b) are significantly different at P = .05.

268 \*P = .05 compared to the corresponding values before treatment.

 269

 270
 Table 7:
 Pearson's correlation coefficient (PCC) of observed enzyme activities versus

 271
 organic matter (OM)

272

| Enzyme Activity         | Unpolluted control | Polluted control | S. americana | S. ocymoides |
|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Protease                | -1.00*             | -0.98            | -0.80        | +0.47        |
| Dehydrogenase           | +0.36              | -0.90            | +0.96        | +0.55        |
| Acid phosphatase        | +0.84              | +0.05            | +0.80        | +0.55        |
| Alkaline<br>phosphatase | +0.61              | +0.52            | +0.36        | -0.57        |
| Respiratory             | -0.96              | -0.07            | +0.51        | +0.54        |

273 274

### 275 4. CONCLUSION

276

Crude oil spillage presents del prious effects on the environment. Both microbial activities of the soil can reflect sensitively the quarties f soil, and soil enzyme activities can directly reflect the metabolic need and nutrient availability of soil microorganisms which are important key nutrients' processing and recovery from detrital inputs and accumulated soil organic matter. Microorganisms secrete degradative enzymes which can counter the effect poised by the spillage thus effecting amelioration of the pollutants' effects in the polluted soil. The extracellular enzymes; protease, dehydrogenase, acid and alkaline phosphatase activities are shown to vary with crude oil pollution relative to time thus indicating ameliorative effects.

285

298

## 286 **REFERENCES** 287

- Kinika RW, Odokuma IO. Seasonal Influences on the Physicochemical and Microbiology Of Soils In Industrial Areas In Port Harcourt Area. Nature and Science. 2016;14(1).
- Mohammadi-Sichani MM., Assadi MM, Farazmand A, Kianirad M, Ahadi AM, Ghahderijani
   HH. Bioremediation of soil contaminated crude oil by Agaricomycetes. Journal of
   Environmental Health science and Engineering. 2017;15:8.
- Ebuehi OAT, Abibo IB, Shekwolo PD, Sigismund KI, Adoki A, Okoro IC. Remediation of crude
   oil contaminated soil by enhanced natural attenuation technique. Journal of Applied Sciences
   and Environmental Management. 2005;9(1):103-106.
- Okolo JC, Amadi EN, Odu CTI. Effects of Soil Treatments Containing Poultry Manure on Crude Oil Degradation in a Sandy Loam Soil. Applied Ecology and Environmental Research. 2005;3(1):47-53.
- Abioye OP, Agamuthu P, Abdul Aziz AR. Biodegradation of used motor oil in soil using organic waste amendments. Biotechnology Research International. 2012.
- William SD, Ladd DE, Farmer JJ. Fate and transport of petroleum hydrocarbons in soil and ground water at Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, Tennessee and Kentucky, 2002-2003. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report, 2005-5104. 2006. 29 p.

327

331

334

337

352

355

358

362

- 3117.Koshlaf M, Ball AS. Soil bioremediation approaches for petroleum hydrocarbon polluted312environments. Aims Microbiology. 2017;3(1):25-49.
- Lee DH, Zo YG, Kim SJ. Nonradioactive methods to study genetic profies of natural bacterial communities by PCR-single-strand-conformation polymorphism. Applied and Environmental Microbiology. 1996;62(9):3112-3120.
- Yang M, Yang D, Yu X. Soil microbial communities and enzyme activities in sea-buckthorn (Hippophae rhamnoides) plantation at different ages. PloS one. 2018;13(1):e0190959.
- Yuan BC, Yue DX. Soil microbial and enzymatic activities across a chronosequence of
   Chinese pine plantation of China. Pedoshpere. 2012;22:1-12.
- 11. Chander K, Brookes, PC, Harding SA. Microbial biomass dynamics following addition of metal-enriched sewage sludge to a sandy loam. Soil Biology and Biochemistry. 1995;27(11):1409-1421.
- Ayangbenro AS, Babalola OO. A new strategy for heavy metal polluted environments: A
   review of microbial biosorbents. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
   Health. 2017;14(94):1-6.
- Motsara MR, Roy RN. Guide to laboratory establishment for plant nutrient analysis. Rome:
   Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; 2008.
- Alef K, Nannipieri P. β-Glucosidase activity. In: Methods in Applied Soil Microbiology and
   Biochemistry. London (UK): Academic Press, Harcourt Brace & Coy Publishers; 1995.
- Adeniyi TA, Adeonipekun PA, Omotayo, EA. Investigating the phytochemicals and antimicrobial properties of three sedge (Cyperaceae) species. Notulae Scientia Biologicae. 2014;6(3):276-281.
- 342 16. Zhuang P, McBride MB, Xia H, Li N, Li Z. Health risk from heavy metals via consumption of food crops in the vicinity of Dabaoshan mine, South China. Science of the total environment. 2009;407(5):1551-1561.
  345
- Nath R, Samanta R. Soil pH, microbial population, nitrate reductase and alkaline phosphatase
  activities of different environment of Dibrugarh district, Assam. Advances in Applied Science
  Research. 2012;3(3):1772-1775.
- Frankenberger Jr WT, Johanson JB. Effect of pH on enzyme stability in soils. Soil Biology and
   Biochemistry. 1982;14(5):433-437.
- van der Waarde JJ, Dijkhuis EJ, Henssen MJ, Keuning S. Enzyme assays as indicators for
   biodegradation. In Contaminated Soil'95. Dordrecht: Springer; 1995.
- 356 20. Margesin R, Schinner F. Bioremediation of diesel-oilcontaminated alpine soil at low temperatures. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. (1999);47:462-468.
- Wolińska A, Kuźniar A, Szafranek-Nakonieczna A, Jastrzębska N, Roguska E, Stępniewska
  Z. Biological activity of autochthonic bacterial community in oil-contaminated soil. Water, Air,
  Soil Pollution. 2016;227(5):130.
- 363 22. Stotzky G, Norman AG. Factors limiting microbial activities in soil: III. Supplementary
   364 substrate additions. Canadian Journal of Microbiology. 1964;10(2):143-149.
   365
- United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources (USDA-NRCS). Soil
   Phosphorus. Soil Quality kit-Guides for Educators. Accessed 20 April 2018. Available: http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/internetingFSE/pdf.
- 369

| 371 content of soils? Ecol. Environ. Conser. 2008;14(4):731-736. | 370 | 24. | Njoku KL, Akinola MO, Oboh BO. Does crude oil affect pH, moisture and organic matter |
|--|-----|-----|--|
|  | 371 |     | content of soils? Ecol. Environ. Conser. 2008;14(4):731-736.                         |

372
373 25. Brussard L. Interrelationships between biological activities, soil properties and soil management. In Soil resilience and sustainable land use; 1994.