ABSTRACT

 A batch experiment was conducted to examine the effects of biochar on the behaviour of soil-borne arsenic and metals that were mobilized by three low-molecular-weight organic acids. In the presence of citric acid, oxalic acid and malic acid at a molar concentration of 0.01 M, the surface of biochar was protonated, which disfavours adsorption of the cationic metals released from the soil by organic acid-driven mobilization. In contrast, the oxyanionic As species were re-immobilized by the protonated biochar effectively. Biochar could also immobilize oxyanionic Cr species but not cationic Cr species. The addition of biochar increased the level of metals in the solution due to the release of the biochar-borne metals under attack by LMWOAs via cation exchange. Biochar could also have the potential to enhance reductive dissolution of iron and manganese oxides in the soil, leading to enhanced release of trace elements bound to these oxides. The findings obtained from this study have implications for evaluating the role of biochar in immobilizing trace elements in rhizosphere. Adsorption of cationic heavy metals on biochar in the presence of LMWOAs is unlikely to be a mechanism responsible for the impeded uptake of heavy metals by plants growing in heavy metal-contaminated soils.

- **Key words**: Biochar, organic acid, metal, arsenic, soil.
-
-
-
-
-
-

1 Introduction

 Low-molecular-weight organic acids (LMWOAs) released from plant roots play an important role in mobilization of soil-borne nutrients and trace elements in rhizosphere (Jones and Darrah, 1994). In contaminated soils where elevated level of trace elements is encountered, this enhanced bioavailability of trace elements may cause microbial toxicity and phytotoxicity (Mossa et al., 2017; Visioli et al., 2013). It is also possible that plants growing in the contaminated soils take up excessive amounts of trace elements and accumulate in the edible portion to a level that could result in health problems for human or animals that consume the plant products (Brekken and Steinnes, 2004; Fu et al., 2008; Hao et al., 2011).

 Biochar produced from biomass via pyrolysis is thought to be an excellent sorbent due to its large specific surface area (Li et al., 2017; Xu et al., 2016). Non-activated biochar materials tend to be alkaline and therefore have negatively charged surfaces (Wang and Liu, 2017). In theory, this favours adsorption of cationic metals but disfavours adsorption of anions. Mechanisms responsible for removal of cationic metals from aqueous solution by biochar are likely to include: (a) physical sorption that involves electrostatic interaction between the biochar surfaces and solution-borne 54 metals, (b) replacement of H^+ in functional groups on biochar surfaces by solution-borne metals through complexation or cation exchange, and (c) formation of precipitates through reactions between solution-borne metals and biochar-borne phosphate, carbonate or hydroxyl ions. These proposed mechanisms are valid when the alkaline nature of biochar remains unchanged such as when a biochar material is in contact with aqueous solutions having a pH value similar to the biochar. For example, in an aqueous system involving Ca^{2+} and biochar, the Ca^{2+} may be removed from the 60 solution by electrostatic attraction, adsorption to negatively charged biochar surfaces, replacing H^+ or 61 other cations in a functional group, or formation of practically insoluble $CaCO₃$, $CaPO₄$ or $Ca(OH)₂$ under alkaline conditions.

 The above mechanisms have also been proposed to take place for cationic heavy metals such as Cd^{2+} , Cu^{2+} , Co^{2+} , Pb^{2+} and Zn^{2+} (Aran et al., 2016; Cui et al., 2016; Li et al., 2017). However, environmental media containing elevated concentration of dissolved heavy metals always have acidic pH, which could markedly modify the surface conditions of biochar. This needs to be taken into account when proposing the mechanisms for heavy metal immobilization in these systems. So far, there has been no systematic research done to investigate the effects of biochar on behaviour of heavy metals and metalloids in the presence of LMWOAs. This information is important for evaluation of biochar functions in terms of heavy metal and metalloid immobilization in rhizospheric environments. The objectives of this study was to (a) characterise the softwood biochar; (b) examine the effects of the biochar on the behaviour of soil-borne cationic and anionic metals and metalloids in the presence of three common LMWOAs; and (c) observe the temporal variation in these metals and metalloids under the set reaction systems.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 The Contaminated Soil Used in the Experiment

 A multi-contaminated soil was selected for this study. The soil material used for the experiments was a composite soil sample formulated by mixing subsamples collected from the surface soil layer (0-10 cm) at various locations within a closed landfill site in the Greater Manchester, United Kingdom that was previously investigated (Mukwaturi and Lin, 2015; Qin et al., 2016). After collection, the soil 81 samples were oven-dried at 40 °C and then ground using a mortar and pestle to pass a 2 mm sieve. Samples were stored in an airtight resealable bag, prior to use in the experiments. The composite sample was then formulated and characterized. The pH, electrical conductivity (EC) and total concentration of major metals and arsenic are given in Table 1.

86 87

88

89 **Table 1 Some major physical and chemical characteristics of the soil and biochar material**

91

92 **2.2 The Biochar Material Used in the Experiment**

 The biochar (labelled as SWP 700) used for the treatment of the contaminated soils was purchased from the United Kingdom Biochar Research Centre (UKBRC). The biochar was made from 95 softwood pellets at a pyrolysis temperature of 700°C. The major physical and chemical characteristics, as provided by the manufacturer, are given in Table 1. Prior to its use in the 97 experiment, the biochar sample was oven-dried at 40° C for 48 hours and then ground using a mortar and a pestle to pass through a 2 mm sieve. The thoroughly homogenised sample was put in an airtight grip seal nylon bag prior to experiments.

101 **2.3 Design of Batch Experiment**

102 A batch experiment was conducted using a biochar dose of 1 g for 10 g of the soil. Three common 103 low-molecular-weight organic acids (citric acid, oxalic acid and malic acid) were selected for the 104 experiment. Details on the experimental design are given in Table 2. 125 mL plastic bottles were 105 used as batch reactors. After adding all the ingredients into a bottle, the reactor was shaken in a 106 rotary shaker for 1 h and then pH and EC in the solution were measured. An aliquot of 15 mL 107 supernatant was taken and stored in a centrifuge tube after filtration using a 0.22 µm nylon syringe 108 filter. The solution samples were frozen prior to analysis of various elements. After the completion 109 of sample collection, the bottles were placed in a cardboard box with appropriate cover to keep them 110 in the dark at room temperature (ranging from 1 to 11 $^{\circ}$ C during the period of the experiment). 111 Following 1-week incubation, another 15 mL of supernatant was taken after measurements of pH 112 and EC.

ᅩ	Table 2 Details on the design of the batch experiments							
	Treatment	Soil	Biochar	Water	0.01 M citric	0.01 M oxalic	0.01 M malic	
		(g)	(g)	(mL)	α acid (mL)	α acid (mL)	α acid (mL)	
	SBSB	10		50				
	$S-CS-C$	10	θ		50			
	$S-OS-O$	10	0			50		
	$S-MS-M$	10	0				50	
	SB-CSB-C	10			50			
	SB-OSB-O	10				50		
	SB-MSB-M	10					50	
	SB-COSB-CO	10			25	25		
	SB-CMSB-CM	10			25		25	
	SB-OMSB-OM	10				25	25	

113 **Table 2 Details on the design of the batch experiments**

114

115 **2.4 Analytical Methods**

116 The functional groups of biochar sample used for the study were determined using a Thermo 117 Scientific Nicolet iS10 FTIR spectrometer. Prior to analysis, the biochar was mixed with KBr (1:100 118 ratio) and then pressed into a KBr/biochar pellet. The spectra were performed within a 4,000 cm⁻¹ to

400 cm⁻¹ scan range at resolution of 4 cm⁻¹. A total of 100 scans were averaged, as this gives a better signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Smith (2011) explained that adding many scans together improves the SNR, thus 100 scans should give a better result than fewer scans. The significant peaks were then identified and the compositions of functional groups were determined by identifying the functional groups that exists at different wavelengths.

 The pH, EC and DO in the solution samples were measured using a Jenway-3510 pH meter, a Mettler Toledo EC meter and an Oxyguard Handy MK1 DO meter, respectively. Various trace elements were measured by inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry (Varian 720ES ICP-OES).

2.5 QA/QC and Statistical Analysis

 The experiment was performed in triplicates. All chemical reagents used in the experiment were of analytical reagent grade. Ultrapure water (18.2 MΩ/cm) was used throughout the entire course of the experiment. Repeatability analysis shows that the mean relative standard deviation (RSD) was 0.9% for pH, 3.9% for EC, 5.0% for As, 13% for Co, 24% for Cr, 5.9% for Cu, 3.3% for Fe, 2.8% for Mn and 9.7% for Pb.

 One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Duncan's multiple range tests were used to determine the statistical significance between the treatments.

3 Results

3.1 FTIR Analysis of the Biochar

 The spectra of biochar used for the study is shown in Fig. 1. A broad O-H stretch could be observed 139 at ~3400 cm⁻¹ (Brewer, Schmidt-Rohr, Satrio and Brown, 2009). The strong peak observed at ~1640 140 cm⁻¹ was assigned to aromatic C=C and C=O functional groups (Gai et al., 2014; Jindo et al., 2014) 141 whilst the weaker peak at ~1380 cm⁻¹ was assigned aliphatic CH₃ (Özçimen and Ersoy-Meriçboyu,

142 2010). The stretch observed at \sim 1130 cm⁻¹ is associated with aliphatic C-O-C which is related to the cellulose content of the char material (Melo, Coscione, Abreu, Puga and Camargo, 2013).

 Figure 1 The Fourier-transform infrared (FTIR) spectra of Biochar SWP700 used in the experiment

3.2 pH and EC in the Solutions

 As expected, addition of the LMWOAs resulted in a decrease in pH. For each LMWOA, the pH tended to be lower in the treatment without added biochar than in the treatment with added biochar. There was a significant (P <0.05) difference between S-C and SB-C (the pair of citric acid treatments), and between S-M and SB-M (the pair of malic acid treatments). The combined acid- treatments (SB-CO, SB-CM and SB-OM) showed a value somewhere in between. There was a trend to show that pH increased after 7 days of incubation for the SB and the treatments except for SB-C and SB-CM (Table 3).

Treatment		pH		EC (μ S/cm)		
	1 hour	7 days	1 hour	7 days		
SB	4.99 ± 0.03 g	$5.70 \pm 0.03h$	$52.0 \pm 2.65a$	$76.3 \pm 10.3a$		
$S-C$	$3.62 \pm 0.05a$	$3.69 \pm 0.01a$	$812+4.84d$	857 ± 8.45 f		
$S-O$	3.71 ± 0.05	$3.99 \pm 0.01e$	1138 ± 10.1 f	571 ± 21.7 d		
$S-M$	3.90 ± 0.07 de	4.01 ± 0.01 e	$572 \pm 3.21b$	$516 \pm 4.67c$		
$SB-C$	3.89 ± 0.01 de	3.80 ± 0.00	814 ± 6.67 d	853 ± 11.1 f		
$SB-O$	3.78 ± 0.01 bc	4.17 ± 0.02 fg	$921 \pm 15.0e$	502 ± 7.51 bc		
$SB-M$	4.10 ± 0.01 f	4.15 ± 0.01 f	571 ± 6.66	503 ± 5.51 bc		
SB-CO	3.82 ± 0.03 cd	3.92 ± 0.02 d	819 ± 25.3 d	$707 \pm 8.95e$		
SB-CM	3.91 ± 0.01 de	$3.86 \pm 0.01c$	$707 \pm 10.3c$	$728 \pm 12.9e$		
SB-OM	4.00 ± 0.01 ef	4.21 ± 0.01 g	577 ± 20.9	471 ± 0.33 b		

164 **Table 3 pH and EC in the solutions after 1-h shaking and 7-day incubation for the SB and** 165 **various treatments**

166 *All values are presented as mean \pm standard error (n= 3). Means with different letters in the same 167 column are significantly different at $p < 0.05$.

168

 Electrical conductivity (EC) also increased after addition of LMWOAs. There was no significant (P >0.05) difference between S-C and SB-C, and between S-M and SB-M. But EC was significantly (P <0.05) higher in S-O than in SB-O. The EC in each of the combined acid treatments tended to be smaller than the mean value of the two relevant single acid treatments. The EC in the treatments involving oxalic acid tended to markedly decrease after 7 days of incubation (Table 3).

174 **3.3 Fe and Mn in the Solutions**

 Figure 2 shows the concentration of Fe and Mn in the solutions after 1-h shaking and 7-day incubation for SB and various treatments. As expected, addition of LMWOAs increased the concentration of all the three metals in the solutions. For each of these two metals, the concentration in the solution was significantly lower in the treatment without added biochar than in the treatment 179 with added biochar except for S-O vs SB-O for Fe, which shows no significant (P >0.05) difference. There was a drop in the concentration of both metals after 7 days of incubation for the single oxalic acid treatments regardless of whether the biochar was added or not. This was particularly evident for Fe, showing approximately 40% reduction in soluble Fe in the solution.

 Figure 2 Graphs showing (a) iron and (b) manganese in various solutions after 1-h shaking and 7-day incubation for SB and various treatments (at a biochar dose of 1g). Means with different letters above the bars for the same sampling occasion differ significantly at P <0.05.

 3.4 Arsenic and Chromium

 After 1 h of shaking, As in the solution was significantly lower in the treatment without added biochar than in the treatment with added biochar except for the malic acid treatments, which show no significant (P >0.05) difference between S-M and SB-M. After 7 days of incubation, solution-borne As increased for the citric and malic acid treatments regardless of biochar addition. However, the oxalic acid treatments consistently showed the opposite. It is interesting to note that after 7 days of incubation, the As in the solution was higher in the treatment without added biochar than that in the

treatment with added biochar for all the three organic acids (Fig. 3a).

 Figure 3 Graphs showing (a) arsenic and (b) chromium in various solutions after 1-h shaking and 7-day incubation for SB and various treatments (at a biochar dose of 1g). Means with different letters above the bars for the same sampling occasion differ significantly at P <0.05.

204 For Cr, there was no significant $(P > 0.05)$ difference between SB and the treatments after 1 h of shaking. After 7 days of incubation, all the treatments had higher Cr in the solutions, as compared to SB. Mixed results were observed for different organic acid treatments; for citric acid treatment, Cr was higher in S-C than in SB-C; for oxalic acid treatments, there was no significant difference in

 solution Cr between S-O and SB-O; and for malic acid treatments, solution Cr was lower in S-M than in SB-M (Fig. 3b).

3.5 Copper, Lead and Zinc in the Solutions

211 The concentration of these three heavy metals in the solution was significantly $(P < 0.05)$ lower in the SB than in the treatments. For Cu, there was no significant (P >0.05) difference in solution-borne Cu between S-C and SB-C, and between S-M and SB-M. Although statistical analysis shows that 214 solution-borne Cu was significantly $(P \le 0.05)$ lower in S-O than in SB-O, the difference between both treatments was very small. The "no significant difference" status remained after 7 days of incubation for S-C vs SB-C and S-M vs SB-M. But, for the oxalic acid treatments, the solution-borne Cu was significantly higher in S-O than in SB-O. For Pb, there was no significant difference in the solution-borne Pb between S-C and SB-C, and between S-M and SB-M. For the oxalic acid treatments, solution-borne Pb was significantly (P <0.05) higher in S-O than in SB-O. After 7 days 220 of incubation, there was no significant $(P > 0.05)$ difference in the solution-borne Pb for any of the 221 same organic acid treatment pairs. The solution-borne Zn was always significantly ($P < 0.05$) higher in the added biochar treatments than in their no-biochar counterparts after 1 h of shaking. However, after 7 days of incubation, no significant (P >0.05) difference was observed for C-AO vs T-AO (Table 4).

Element	Treatment	1 hour	7 days
Copper (mg/L)	SB	$0.03 \pm 0.01a$	$0.15 \pm 0.00a$
	$S-C$	0.23 ± 0.00 bc	$0.33 \pm 0.00d$
	$S-O$	0.72 ± 0.00 f	0.49 ± 0.00 g
	$S-M$	0.18 ± 0.00	0.26 ± 0.00
	$SB-C$	$0.29 \pm 0.06c$	$0.32 \pm 0.00d$
	$SB-O$	0.73 ± 0.02 g	0.45 ± 0.01 f
	$SB-M$	0.18 ± 0.01	$0.24 \pm 0.00b$
	SB-CO	$0.52 \pm 0.01e$	0.44 ± 0.01 f
	SB-CM	0.19 ± 0.00	$0.30 \pm 0.01c$
	SB-OM	$0.43 \pm 0.01d$	$0.37 \pm 0.00e$
Lead (mg/L)	SB	$0.03 \pm 0.03a$	$0.11 \pm 0.02a$
	$S-C$	$0.18 \pm 0.01c$	$0.32 \pm 0.01d$
	$S-O$	0.44 ± 0.03 g	0.18 ± 0.00
	$S-M$	0.09 ± 0.00	0.16 ± 0.01
	$SB-C$	0.23 ± 0.03 cd	$0.32 \pm 0.01d$
	$SB-O$	0.37 ± 0.01 f	0.19 ± 0.00
	$SB-M$	$0.10\pm0.01b$	0.17 ± 0.01
	SB-CO	$0.29 \pm 0.02e$	$0.24 \pm 0.01c$
	SB-CM	0.25 ± 0.01 de	$0.40 \pm 0.03e$
	SB-OM	$0.11 \pm 0.00b$	0.15 ± 0.01
Zinc (mg/L)	SB	$0.02 \pm 0.00a$	$0.05 \pm 0.00a$
	S-C	$0.75 \pm 0.02c$	$0.56 \pm 0.01e$
	$S-O$	0.92 ± 0.00 f	$0.44 \pm 0.00c$
	$S-M$	0.66 ± 0.01	$0.45 \pm 0.00c$
	$SB-C$	0.91 ± 0.03 f	0.64 ± 0.00 f
	$SB-O$	1.06 ± 0.01 g	$0.44 \pm 0.00c$
	$SB-M$	0.78 ± 0.02 cd	$0.50 \pm 0.01d$
	SB-CO	0.91 ± 0.01 f	$0.56 \pm 0.01e$
	SB-CM	$0.87 \pm 0.01e$	0.66 ± 0.03 f
	SB-OM	$0.82 \pm 0.01d$	0.40 ± 0.00

229 **Table 4 Copper, lead and zinc in the solutions after 1-h shaking and 7-day incubation for SB** 230 **and various treatments with a dosage level of biochar at 1 g of biochar:10 g of soil**

231 *All values are presented as mean \pm standard error (n= 3). Means with different letters in the same 232 column for the same metal are significantly different at $p < 0.05$.

233

234 **3.6 Barium, Cobalt, Nickel, Strontium**

235 Like most of other elements, solution-borne Ba, Co, Ni and Sr were all lower in SB than in the 236 treatments. While solution-borne Ba tended to be higher in the biochar treatments than in their 237 counterparts, no significant (P > 0.05) difference was observed except that Ba was significantly (P 238 <0.05) lower in S-C than in SB-C, and significantly (P <0.05) higher in S-O than in SB-O after 7 239 days of incubation (Supplementary Table S1).

240 For Co, there was not significant (P >0.05) difference between any pair of the biochar vs no-biochar 241 treatments. After 7 days of incubation, there was no significant $(P > 0.05)$ difference in solution Co for any of biochar vs no-biochar treatment pairs (*i.e.* S-C vs SB-C, S-O vs SB-O, and S-M vs SB-M). 243 There was literally no significant $(P > 0.05)$ difference in solution-borne Ni between biochar and no- biochar treatments for any LMWOA types. Solution-borne Sr was significantly lower in the no- biochar treatments than in their biochar treatment counterparts except for S-O vs SB-O. For Ba and Co in the oxalic acid treatments, there was an increase in the concentration after 7 days of incubation 247 while the opposite was observed for Ni and Sr (Supplementary Table S1).

3.7 Potassium, Calcium and Magnesium

249 The solution-borne K was also significantly $(P \le 0.05)$ lower in the no-biochar treatments than their biochar treatment counterparts except for S-O vs SB-O. There is a clear trend that the solution-borne Ca was consistently lower (significant at P <0.05) in the no-biochar treatments than their biochar treatment counterparts for all the LMWOA types (Supplementary Table S2).

253 Like Ca, solution-borne Mg was also consistently lower (significant at $P \le 0.05$) in the no-biochar treatments than their biochar treatment counterparts for all the LMWOA types (Supplementary Table S2).

 Unlike most of other elements in the oxalic acid treatments which showed marked decrease from the 257 $1st$ h to the $7th$ day, there was only a very slight decrease in Ca and Mg, and for K, there was even a 258 marked increase from the 1st h to the $7th$ day (Supplementary Table S2).

4 Discussion

 The pH of the soil used in the experiment had a pH of 4.63, which is sufficiently high to keep the iron and manganese oxides and the trace elements bound to them practically insoluble. This is

 confirmed by the previous work showing that water-extractable Fe, Mn, As, Cr, Co, Cu and Pb were under detection limits (Mukwaturi and Lin, 2015; Qin et al., 2016). Addition of LMWOAs significantly solubilized oxides of iron and manganese in the soil (Fig. 2). This was accompanied by 265 the release of trace elements (As, Ba, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Ni, Pb, Sr and Zn) that were likely to be bound to these oxides, as shown in previous work (Onireti and Lin, 2016; Onireti et al., 2017).

 The pH of 0.01 M citric acid, oxalic acid and malic acid solution was 2.5, 2.1 and 2.6, respectively. After getting in contact with the soil during the 1-h shaking operation, the pH in the solutions rose to >3.5, indicating consumption of H⁺ by reactions with soil components, including protonation of variably charged soil colloids such as clays and humic substances. Biochar materials have large surface area with variably charged sites (Mukherjee et al., 2011). Therefore, protonation of the variably charged sites could also take place on the biochar surfaces. The higher pH in each organic acid treatment with added biochar, relative to that in its no-added biochar counterpart, may be attributed to this effect though acid neutralization by the alkaline materials contained in the biochar might also be important. The protonation of biochar surfaces was likely to drive the change of the biochar surfaces from a negatively charged-dominated status to a neutral- or positively charged- dominated status (Qian et al., 2016; Shi et al., 2017; Mia et al., 2018). As such, the biochar surfaces were no longer attractive to the cationic heavy metals and this explains why the heavy metals mobilized by LMWOAs were not removed from the solution in the presence of the biochar. The different behaviour of arsenic after 7 days of incubation is attributable to its oxyanion nature. The 281 negatively charged arsenate $(AsO₄³)$ or arsenite $(AsO₃³)$ can be adsorbed by the positively charged site on the biochar surfaces. For example:

$$
283 \qquad \text{[Biochar]}^{3+} + \text{AsO}_4^{3-} \rightarrow \text{[Biochar]}^{3+} - \text{AsO}_4^{3-} \tag{1}
$$

 The reason that the effect of biochar to immobilize As was not observed at the time after 1 h of shaking is that, probably at this point, the protonation of biochar surfaces was still incomplete. This can be supported by the fact that the solution pH continued to increase after the 1-h shaking.

287 Solution-borne Cr may be in either a cation (Cr^{3+}) or part of an oxyanion $(Cr_2O_7^{2-}$ or $CrO_4^{2-})$. Under the investigated systems, immobilization of chromium by the protonated biochar could only take place when the chromium was in anionic forms. For example

$$
290 \qquad \text{[Biochar]}^{2+} + \text{CrO}_4^{2-} \rightarrow \text{[Biochar]}^{2+} - \text{CrO}_4^{2-} \tag{2}
$$

 Following interaction with the added LMWOAs, soil-borne Cr(III) might be released due to acidification. For example:

$$
293 \t Cr(OH)3 + 3H+ \to Cr3+ + 3H2O
$$
 (3)

 Cr(VI) in chromate or dichromate adsorbed on iron oxides could also be liberated due to reductive 295 iron dissolution. However, part of the soluble Cr(VI) could then be reduced to form Cr^{3+} in the presence of LMWOAs (Sun et al., 2009; Wrobel et al., 2015), depending on the reducing capacity of the organic acid. The relatively higher Cr in no-added biochar system than in the biochar-treated system for citric acid treatments indicates that part of the Cr was adsorbed by the biochar. In contrast, no Cr was removed by the biochar in the presence of oxalic acid and malic acid. This suggests that citric acid had a weaker capacity to reduce Cr(VI), as compared to oxalic and malic acids under the set experimental conditions in this study. Chen et al. (2013) also observed a weaker Cr(VI)-reducing capacity of citric acid, as compared to malic acid and tartaric acid.

 The consistent trend that the concentration of solution-borne metals was higher in the treatment with added biochar than in its no-added biochar counterpart suggests release of these metals from the biochar surfaces under attack by LMWOAs via cation exchange. For example:

$$
306 \quad \text{[Biochar]}^{2-} - \text{Zn}^{2+} + 2\text{H}^+ \to \text{[Biochar]}^{2-} - 2\text{H}^+ + \text{Zn}^{2+} \tag{4}
$$

$$
307 \qquad \text{[Biochar]}^{2-}\text{Ca}^{2+} + 2\text{H}^+ \to \text{[Biochar]}^{2-}\text{2H}^+ + \text{Ca}^{2+} \tag{5}
$$

 For redox-sensitive metals such as iron and manganese, it is also likely that the added biochar materials promoted the reductive dissolution of these metals (Xu et al., 2016). This can also have effects on enhancing the release of metals and metalloids bound to the oxides of iron and manganese.

 The findings obtained from this study have implications for evaluating the role of biochar in immobilizing trace elements in rhizosphere. Several reports suggested that biochar could reduce bioavailability and uptake of heavy metals by plants (e.g. Al-Wabel et al., 2015; Almaroai et al., 2014; Bian et al., 2014; Herath et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2015). This work suggests that adsorption of cationic heavy metals on biochar in the presence of LMWOAs is unlikely to be a mechanism responsible for the impeded uptake of heavy metals by plants growing in heavy metal-contaminated soils. To support this hypothesis, further work including plant growth experiment is required to obtain insights into the biochemical processes for explaining the observed phenomena.

 This work was conducted to provide first-hand information for evaluating the technical and economic feasibility of using biochar as a remediating agent. It is realized that the application rate of biochar was relatively high. However, for highly valued, heavily contaminated urban soils such as those encountered in Manchester that pose a significant health risk to the residents in the contaminated areas, it may be acceptable for remedial actions at relatively high costs.

5 Conclusion

 In the presence of citric acid, oxalic acid and malic acid at a molar concentration of 0.01 M, the surface of biochar was protonated, which disfavours adsorption of the cationic metals released from the soil by organic acid-driven mobilization. In contrast, the oxyanionic As species were re-

 immobilized by the protonated biochar effectively. Biochar could also immobilize oxyanionic Cr species but not cationic Cr species. The addition of biochar increased the level of metals in the solution due to the release of the biochar-borne metals under attack by LMWOAs via cation exchange. Biochar could also have the potential to enhance reductive dissolution of iron and manganese oxides in the soil, leading to enhanced release of trace elements bound to these oxides.

References

 Al-Wabel, M.I., Usman, A.R., El-Naggar, A.H., Aly, A.A., Ibrahim, H.M., Elmaghraby, S., Al- Omran, A., 2015. Conocarpus biochar as a soil amendment for reducing heavy metal availability and uptake by maize plants. Saudi journal of biological sciences 22, 503-511.

 Almaroai, Y.A., Usman, A.R.A., Ahmad, M., Moon, D.H., Cho, J.-S., Joo, Y.K., Jeon, C., Lee, S.S., Ok, Y.S., 2014. Effects of biochar, cow bone, and eggshell on Pb availability to maize in contaminated soil irrigated with saline water. Environmental Earth Sciences 71, 1289-1296.

 Aran, D., Antelo, J., Fiol, S., Macias, F., 2016. Influence of feedstock on the copper removal capacity of waste-derived biochars. Bioresour Technol 212, 199-206.

 Bian, R., Joseph, S., Cui, L., Pan, G., Li, L., Liu, X., Zhang, A., Rutlidge, H., Wong, S., Chia, C., 2014. A three-year experiment confirms continuous immobilization of cadmium and lead in contaminated paddy field with biochar amendment. Journal of Hazardous Materials 272, 121-128.

 Brekken, A., Steinnes, E., 2004. Seasonal concentrations of cadmium and zinc in native pasture plants: consequences for grazing animals. Sci Total Environ 326, 181-195.

 Brewer, C. E., Schmidt‐Rohr, K., Satrio, J. A., & Brown, R. C. (2009). Characterization of biochar from fast pyrolysis and gasification systems. Environmental Progress & Sustainable Energy, 28(3), 386-396.

 Chen, N., Lan, Y., Wang, B., Mao, J., 2013. Reduction of Cr (VI) by organic acids in the presence of Al (III). J. Hazard. Mater., 260, 150-156.

- Cui, X., Fang, S., Yao, Y., Li, T., Ni, Q., Yang, X., He, Z., 2016. Potential mechanisms of cadmium removal from aqueous solution by Canna indica derived biochar. Sci Total Environ 562, 517-525.
- Fu, J., Zhou, Q., Liu, J., Liu, W., Wang, T., Zhang, Q., Jiang, G., 2008. High levels of heavy metals in rice (Oryza sativa L.) from a typical E-waste recycling area in southeast China and its potential risk to human health. Chemosphere 71, 1269-1275.
-
- Gai, X., Wang, H., Liu, J., Zhai, L., Liu, S., Ren, T., Liu, H., 2014. Effects of feedstock and pyrolysis temperature on biochar adsorption of ammonium and nitrate. PloS one 9.
-
- Hao, X., Zhou, D., Wang, Y., Shi, F., Jiang, P., 2011. Accumulation of Cu, Zn, Pb, and Cd in edible parts of four commonly grown crops in two contaminated soils. Int J Phytoremediation 13, 289-301.
-
- Herath, I., Kumarathilaka, P., Navaratne, A., Rajakaruna, N., Vithanage, M., 2015. Immobilization and phytotoxicity reduction of heavy metals in serpentine soil using biochar. Journal of Soils and Sediments 15, 126-138.
-
- Jindo, K., Mizumoto, H., Sawada, Y., Sanchez-Monedero, M.A., Sonoki, T., 2014. Physical and chemical characterization of biochars derived from different agricultural residues. Biogeosciences 11, 6613-6621.
-
- Jones, D.L., Darrah, P.R., 1994. Role of root derived organic acids in the mobilization of nutrients from the rhizosphere. Plant and soil 166, 247-257.
-
- Kim, H.-S., Kim, K.-R., Kim, H.-J., Yoon, J.-H., Yang, J.E., Ok, Y.S., Owens, G., Kim, K.-H., 2015. Effect of biochar on heavy metal immobilization and uptake by lettuce (Lactuca sativa L.) in agricultural soil. Environmental Earth Sciences 74, 1249-1259.
-
- Li, H., Dong, X., da Silva, E.B., de Oliveira, L.M., Chen, Y., Ma, L.Q., 2017. Mechanisms of metal sorption by biochars: Biochar characteristics and modifications. Chemosphere 178, 466-478.
- Melo, L. C., Coscione, A. R., Abreu, C. A., Puga, A. P., & Camargo, O. A. (2013). Influence of pyrolysis temperature on cadmium and zinc sorption capacity of sugar cane straw–derived biochar. BioResources, 8(4), 4992-5004.

 Wang, Y., Liu, R., 2017. Comparison of characteristics of twenty-one types of biochar and their ability to remove multi-heavy metals and methylene blue in solution. Fuel Processing Technology 160, 55-63.

-
- Wrobel, K., Corrales Escobosa, A.R., Gonzalez Ibarra, A.A., Mendez Garcia, M., Yanez Barrientos,
- E., Wrobel, K., 2015. Mechanistic insight into chromium(VI) reduction by oxalic acid in the presence of manganese(II). J Hazard Mater 300, 144-152.
-
- Xu, S., Adhikari, D., Huang, R., Zhang, H., Tang, Y., Roden, E., Yang, Y., 2016. Biochar-Facilitated Microbial Reduction of Hematite. Environmental Science & Technology 50, 2389-2395.