

Supplementary data for the article:

Barac, N.; Skrivanj, S.; Bukumiric, Z.; Zivojinovic, D.; Manojlovic, D.; Barac, M.; Petrovic, R.; Corac, A. Distribution and Mobility of Heavy Elements in Floodplain Agricultural Soils along the Ibar River (Southern Serbia and Northern Kosovo). Chemometric Investigation of Pollutant Sources and Ecological Risk Assessment. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2016**, *23* (9), 9000–9011. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-6142-2>

**Distribution and mobility of heavy elements in floodplain agricultural soils along the Ibar River (Southern Serbia and Northern Kosovo). Chemometric investigation of pollutant sources and ecological risk assessment**

Nemanja Barać<sup>1,\*</sup>, Sandra Škrivanj<sup>2</sup>, Zoran Bukumirić<sup>3</sup>, Dragana Živojinović<sup>4</sup>, Dragan Manojlović<sup>2</sup>, Milan Barać<sup>5</sup>, Rada Petrović<sup>6</sup>, Aleksandar Ćorac<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Innovation Center, Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, University of Belgrade, Karnegijeva 4, 11120 Belgrade, Serbia;* <sup>2</sup>*Department of Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Chemistry, University of Belgrade, Studentski Trg 12–16, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia;* <sup>3</sup>*Institute of Medical Statistics and Informatics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Belgrade, dr Subotića 8 11000 Belgrade, Serbia;*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, University of Belgrade, Karnegijeva 4, 11120 Belgrade, Serbia;* <sup>5</sup>*Department of Technology and Metallurgy, Faculty of Technical Sciences, University of Priština, Kneza Miloša 7, 38220 Kosovska Mitrovica, Serbia;* <sup>6</sup>*Department of Inorganic Chemical Technology, Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, University of Belgrade, Karnegijeva 4, 11120 Belgrade, Serbia;* <sup>7</sup>*Department of Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Priština, Anri Dinana n.n. 38220, Kosovska Mitrovica, Serbia.*

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [nbarac@tmf.bg.ac.rs](mailto:nbarac@tmf.bg.ac.rs); Tel.: +381 65 6790 033; Fax: +381 11 3370 400

## **Supplementary Material B**

### **Content**

**Table B1** Pseudo total HEs concentrations ( $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$ ) in soil samples with respect to the Ibar River flows

**Table B2** Environmental risk assessment of the studied agricultural soils by Contamination Factors ( $C_f^i$ )

**Table B3** Environmental risk assessment of the studied agricultural soils by the potential ecological risk factor ( $E_f^i$ ) and potential ecological risk index ( $RI$ )

**Table B1** Pseudo total HEs concentrations ( $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$ ) in soil samples with respect to the Ibar River flows

<b>Floods</b>	<b>River Flow*</b>		<b>As</b>	<b>Cd</b>	<b>Cr</b>	<b>Cu</b>	<b>Ni</b>	<b>Pb</b>	<b>Sb</b>	<b>Zn</b>
<b>BF</b> <i>n</i> = 25	Middle (S1 – S14)	Mean± <i>SD</i>	61±38	2.4±1.6	68±31	49±26	137±64	550±560	6.8±3.7	25±106
		Median (Range)	51 (23–165)	2.4 (0.40–5.1)	64 (25–129)	43 (24–132)	135 (50–259)	246 (144–2078)	5.7 (2.8–15)	206 (134–477)
	Lower (S15 – 25)	Mean± <i>SD</i>	28±17	1.5±1.5	127±43	35±12	270±140	93±38	4.1±1.8	177±147
		Median (Range)	32 (9.4–59)	0.33 (0.13–4.1)	132 (72–189)	29 (23–64)	240 (130–546)	91 (50–157)	4.1 (< <i>LOD</i> –6.8)	137 (55–538)
<b>Mann–Whitney <i>U</i> test</b>		<i>U</i> = 3 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.01	<i>U</i> = 44 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.01	<i>U</i> = 20 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.01	<i>U</i> = 42 <i>p</i> = 0.055	<i>U</i> = 28 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.01	<i>U</i> = 1 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.001	<i>U</i> = 44 <i>p</i> = 0.075	<i>U</i> = 32 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.01	
<b>AF</b> <i>n</i> = 25	Middle (S1 – S14)	Mean± <i>SD</i>	202 ±102	6.2±3.1	81±28	64±20	154±54	557±46	12±6.6	793±374
		Median (Range)	185 (84.6–474)	5.6 (1.8–12)	85 (25–115)	57 (42–95)	158 (49–247)	402 (204–1320)	8.7 (5.1–26)	703 (351–1374)
	Lower (S15 – 25)	Mean± <i>SD</i>	36±25	1.7±1.7	131±39	35±7.0	271±154	105±46	4.2±1.5	196±109
		Median (Range)	28 (15–101)	1.2 (0.13–4.9)	126 (67–219)	36 (25–49)	222 (114–687)	82 (50–203)	3.4 (2.7–7.7)	192 (50–410)
<b>Mann–Whitney <i>U</i> test</b>		<i>U</i> = 1.0 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.001	<i>U</i> = 1.0 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.001	<i>U</i> = 15 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.001	<i>U</i> = 4.0 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.001	<i>U</i> = 22 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.01	<i>U</i> = 0.0 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.001	<i>U</i> = 9.0 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.001	<i>U</i> = 3.0 <i>p</i> ≤ 0.001	

BF – Before the floods; AF – After the floods; *LOD* – Limit of Detection; *n* – Number of analyzed soil samples; \*Middle flow of the Ibar River stretches from the K. Mitrovica to the Raška city *ie* between sampling sites S1 – S14; Lower flow of the Ibar River stretches from the Raška to the Kraljevo city *ie* between sampling sites S15 – S25 (see Fig. 1).

**Table B2** Environmental risk assessment of the studied agricultural soils by Contamination Factors ( $C_f^i$ )

Sampling sites	$C_f^i$ As		$C_f^i$ Cd		$C_f^i$ Cu		$C_f^i$ Pb		$C_f^i$ Sb		$C_f^i$ Zn	
	The high-magnitude flood event (May 2014)											
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
<b>S1</b>	3.4	14	8.8	14	2.0	3.2	25	16	6.5	8.8	3.2	9.1
<b>S2</b>	2.3	8.7	5.1	19	2.0	2.6	15	13	3.5	7.9	1.4	8.4
<b>S3</b>	2.1	11	8.8	16	4.4	2.6	10	14	3.6	7.8	2.3	4.6
<b>S4</b>	1.3	8.4	3.0	10	1.5	1.8	4.9	7.2	2.0	3.9	1.4	4.3
<b>S5</b>	2.6	6.2	2.1	8.0	1.3	1.4	2.7	4.1	1.9	3.1	1.6	4.8
<b>S6</b>	1.9	3.5	0.8	3.9	1.3	1.7	2.1	3.1	1.7	2.2	1.2	2.4
<b>S7</b>	6.9	20	10	24	1.7	3.1	3.1	8.0	4.0	11	2.8	9.2
<b>S8</b>	1.4	7.0	0.90	8.7	0.90	2.4	2.7	4.7	1.3	2.8	1.4	5.4
<b>S9</b>	2.2	9.2	5.7	12	1.1	2.0	2.4	3.8	2.3	4.6	1.4	4.1
<b>S10</b>	1.9	9.2	2.5	22	1.3	3.0	2.0	6.1	1.2	3.9	1.4	8.0
<b>S11</b>	2.2	4.9	6.7	8.2	1.4	1.4	1.7	3.0	2.5	3.4	1.1	2.3
<b>S12</b>	1.0	4.7	0.90	3.5	0.80	1.5	1.9	2.8	1.2	2.1	0.90	2.4
<b>S13</b>	5.0	5.9	4.4	14	1.7	1.8	9.1	4.9	3.1	3.1	2.6	5.9
<b>S14</b>	1.6	5.6	6.9	9.8	1.6	1.4	8.5	2.4	4.8	3.3	1.4	3.0
<b>S15</b>	1.4	2.6	5.1	6.3	0.90	1.3	1.9	1.7	2.3	2.4	1.1	1.4
<b>S16</b>	1.3	2.0	0.70	2.4	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.2	1.2	0.90	1.5
<b>S17</b>	0.7	0.60	0.30	0.30	1.0	0.80	0.70	0.60	1.7	1.1	0.4	0.30
<b>S18</b>	2.2	4.2	5.9	10	1.5	1.2	1.6	2.4	2.3	3.2	1.4	2.7
<b>S19</b>	0.4	1.1	0.60	0.50	0.80	1.6	0.6	1.1	1.5	1.4	0.60	1.3
<b>S20</b>	0.5	1.0	0.40	0.40	0.90	0.90	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.5	0.6	0.7
<b>S21</b>	2.5	1.2	8.2	7.5	2.1	1.3	1.4	1.8	2.9	1.4	2.4	1.7
<b>S22</b>	0.6	0.80	0.50	0.60	0.90	0.90	0.70	0.90	1.3	1.3	0.50	0.80
<b>S23</b>	0.4	0.70	0.30	0.50	0.90	1.1	0.60	0.90	0.0	1.4	0.50	0.80
<b>S24</b>	1.7	1.3	5.3	5.3	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.90	2.2	2.3	1.1	2.3
<b>S25</b>	1.4	1.2	5.2	4.6	1.4	1.3	0.90	0.80	2.1	1.9	3.6	0.90
<b>Mean</b>	2.0	5.4	4.0	8.5	1.4	1.71	4.2	4.3	2.3	3.5	1.5	3.5
<b>SD</b>	1.4	4.8	3.2	6.8	0.73	0.70	5.6	4.3	1.5	2.6	0.86	2.8
<b>Median</b>	1.7	4.7	4.4	8.0	1.3	1.4	1.9	2.8	2.1	2.8	1.4	2.4
<b>Range</b>	0.39–6.9	0.62–20	0.26–10	0.26–24	0.78–4.4	0.85–3.2	0.60–25	0.59–16	0.0–6.5	1.2–11	0.37–3.6	0.34–9.2
<b>Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test</b>	$Z = -3.8$ $p \leq 0.001$		$Z = -3.7$ $p \leq 0.001$		$Z = -1.9$ $p \leq 0.05$		$Z = -1.4$ $p = 0.154$		$Z = -2.8$ $p \leq 0.01$		$Z = -3.7$ $p \leq 0.001$	

**Table B3** Environmental risk assessment of the studied agricultural soils by the potential ecological risk factor ( $E_r^i$ ) and potential ecological risk index ( $RI$ )

Sampling sites	Before the floods						After the floods					
	$E_r^i$ As	$E_r^i$ Cd	$E_r^i$ Cu	$E_r^i$ Pb	$E_r^i$ Zn	$RI$ (Risk Ranges*)	$E_r^i$ As	$E_r^i$ Cd	$E_r^i$ Cu	$E_r^i$ Pb	$E_r^i$ Zn	$RI$ (Risk Ranges)
S1	34	260	9.8	120	3.2	Considerable	140	<u>430</u>	156	79	9.1	Very high
S2	22	150	9.9	77	1.4	Moderate	86	<u>560</u>	13	64	8.4	Very high
S3	21	260	22	52	2.3	Considerable	110	<u>490</u>	13	72	4.6	Very high
S4	13	89	7.5	23	1.4	Low	84	310	9.0	36	4.3	Considerable
S5	26	64	6.4	14	1.6	Low	62	240	7.0	20	4.8	Considerable
S6	19	24	6.7	11	1.2	Low	35	120	8.4	16	2.4	Moderate
S7	69	310	8.3	16	2.8	Considerable	197	<u>730</u>	16	40	9.2	Very high
S8	13	26	4.5	14	1.4	Low	70	260	12	24	5.4	Considerable
S9	22	170	5.4	12	1.4	Moderate	92	<u>360</u>	10	19	4.1	Considerable
S10	19	76	6.7	10	1.4	Low	92	<u>660</u>	15	30	8.0	Very high
S11	22	202	6.8	8.6	1.1	Moderate	49	240	7.0	15	2.3	Considerable
S12	9.7	26	4.0	9.6	0.90	Low	47	110	7.5	14	2.4	Moderate
S13	50	130	8.5	46	2.6	Moderate	59	<u>420</u>	8.9	24	5.9	Considerable
S14	16	210	7.9	42	1.4	Moderate	56	290	7.2	12	3.0	Considerable
S15	14	150	4.5	9.4	1.1	Moderate	25	190	6.7	8.4	1.4	Moderate
S16	13	20	5.9	7.8	0.90	Low	20	71	6.0	8.4	1.5	Low
S17	7	7.8	4.9	3.4	0.40	Low	6.2	7.8	4.2	3.0	0.34	Low
S18	22	180	7.5	8.0	1.4	Moderate	42	298	5.8	12	2.7	Considerable
S19	3.9	17	3.9	3.0	0.6	Low	11	16	8.2	5.6	1.3	Low
S20	5.3	12	4.3	5.6	0.6	Low	9.8	12	4.8	4.9	0.72	Low
S21	24	250	11	7.1	2.4	Moderate	12	230	6.4	9.0	1.7	Moderate
S22	5.8	14	4.7	3.3	0.50	Low	8.1	17	4.3	4.6	0.77	Low
S23	3.9	9.6	4.7	3.1	0.50	Low	6.8	14	5.6	4.6	0.77	Low
S24	17	160	5.6	5.4	1.1	Moderate	13	160	6.2	4.6	2.3	Moderate
S25	14	160	6.8	4.4	3.6	Moderate	12	140	6.7	4.1	0.87	Moderate
<b>Mean</b>	20	120	7.1	21	1.5	170	54	250	8.5	21	3.5	340
<b>SD</b>	14	95	3.7	28	0.9	120	48	210	3.5	21	2.8	270
<b>Median</b>	17	130	6.7	9.6	1.4	180	47	240	7.2	14	2.4	320
<b>Range</b>	3.9–69	7.8–310	3.9–22	3.0–120	0.4–3.6	22–430	6.2–197	7.8–730	4.3–16	3.0–79	0.30–9.2	22–990

Underlined values represent a very high ecological risk ( $E_r^i \geq 320$ ); \* Risk Ranges defined by Hakanson (1980).