

AQUATIC SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

Aquat Sci Eng 2021; 36(2): 66-71 • DOI: https://doi.org/10.26650/ASE2020768078

Original Article

Assessment of Spatial – Temporal Variations in Freshwater Pollution by Means of Water Quality Index: A Case Study of Hasanağa Stream Basin (Edirne, Turkey)

Cem Tokatlı¹

Cite this article as: Tokatli, C. (2021). Assessment of spatial – temporal variations in freshwater pollution by means of water quality index: A case study of Hasanağa stream basin (Edirne, Turkey). Aquatic Sciences and Engineering, 36(2), 66-71.

ABSTRACT

In this research, spatial – temporal variations of water quality in the fluvial components of the Hasanağa Stream Basin were evaluated by using the Water Quality Index. Surface water samples were taken from seven stations selected on the basin in the winter seasons of 2019 and 2020. Eleven variables including dissolved oxygen, oxygen saturation, pH, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, salinity, turbidity, nitrate, nitrite, phosphate and sulphate were measured in freshwater samples. The Water Quality Index (WQI) and Cluster Analysis (CA) were applied to the detected data in order to determine the differences among the spatial – temporal contamination levels and classify the investigated locations according to their similar water quality characteristics. According to the detected data, the water of the Hasanağa Stream Basin has 1. - 2. Class quality in 2019 and 2. - 3. in 2020, in general. According to the results of WQI, although it was determined that the water quality decreased significantly in 2020, the basin was found to be of "A Grade – Excellent" water quality (<50) in both 2019 and 2020. According to the results of the CA, 3 statistical clusters were formed and they were named as "less polluted zone", "moderate polluted zone" and "more polluted zone".

Keywords: Hasanağa stream basin, water quality index, cluster analysis

ORCID IDs of the author: C.T. 0000-0003-2080-7920

¹Trakya University, Ipsala Vocational School, Department of Laboratory Technology, Edirne, Turkey

Submitted: 11.07.2020

Revision Requested: 30.10.2020

Last Revision Received: 03.11.2020

Accepted: 04.11.2020

Online Published: 27.01.2021

Correspondence: Cem Tokatlı E-mail: tokatlicem@gmail.com

©Copyright 2021 The Author(s) Available online at https://dergipark.org.tr/ase

INTRODUCTION

Contamination of freshwater resources is a significant environmental problem, because of the increasing world population, the developments of industry and no environmental awareness in society. It is known that one of the main points in the effective management of freshwater resources is the monitoring of the quality of aquatic environments (Arslan et al., 2011; Tokatlı et al., 2014; 2016; Köse et al., 2014; 2016).

Water quality assessment indices are known to be an effective tool in evaluating the quality of water ecosystems. The Water Quality Index (WQI) has achieved increasing significance in the management of freshwater resources and it is one of the most commonly used freshwater quality indices and it is calculated from the perspective of the suitability of water for human consumption (Tyagi et al., 2013; Akter et al., 2016; Sutadian et al., 2016; Mukatea et al., 2019; Ustaoğlu and Tepe, 2019; Varol, 2020; Tokatlı and Ustauğlu, 2020). Describing the suitability of freshwater resources for domestic use especially in terms of the WQI is one of the most convenient ways to describe the current qualities of water ecosystems. The WQI also enables the modifications of policies by various environmental agencies (Akoteyon et al., 2011; Tokatlı and Ustauoğu, 2020; Ustaoğlu and Aydın, 2020; Tokatlı, 2020a).

Multi-statistical methods have been used to evaluate and characterise freshwater resourc-

es and they help in the interpretation of complex data matrices and for them to be better understood. Cluster Analysis (CA) is known as one of the most convenient multivariate statistical methods. It assembles the objects based on the similar characteristics they possess (Akın et al., 2011; Varol et al., 2012; Belkhiri and Narany, 2015; Köse et al., 2018; Atıcı et al., 2018; Çiçek et al., 2019; Tokatlı, 2020b).

The Meriç–Ergene River Basin is the main watershed of the Thrace Region of Turkey. The Hasanağa Stream Basin is located in the Edirne Province of Turkey and it is one of the sub–basins of the Tunca River that is one of the main parts of the Meriç–Ergene River Basin. As in many aquatic ecosystems, the Hasanağa Stream Basin is adversely affected by agricultural and domestic discharges. The aim of this study was to determine the spatial and temporal variations of the water quality in this significant watershed by using the WQI.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample collection

In this study, surface water samples were collected from seven stations located on the Hasanağa Stream Basin (3 of them were on the Sinanköy Stream, 3 of them were on the Korucuköy Stream and 1 of them was on the Hasanağa Stream) in the winter seasons of 2019 and 2020. The coordinate information of the locations is given in Table 1 and a map of the study area and the seven selected stations of the basin are given in Figure 1.

Physical – Chemical and Statistical Analysis

Dissolved oxygen (DO), oxygen saturation (OS), pH, electrical conductivity (EC), total dissolved solids (TDS) and salinity variables were determined by using a multi – parameter device (Hach Lange – HQ40D) in the field studies; the turbidity variable was determined by using a turbidimeter device (Hach Lange – 2100Q) in the field studies; nitrate (NO₃), nitrite (NO₂), phosphate (PO₄) and sulphate (SO₄) variables were determined by using a spectrophotometer device (Hach Lange – DR890) and by using a spectrophotometer device (Hach Lange – DR3900) in the laboratory studies.

Cluster Analysis (CA) and Similarity – Distance Index (SDI) (in terms of Bray Curtis) were applied to the detected data in order to the define the spatial differences of contamination by using the "PAST" package statistical program.

 Table 1.
 Coordinate information of stations.

Name of Stream	Coordinate			
Name of Stream	North	East		
	41.838	26.749		
Sinanköy Stream	41.777	26.683		
	41.719	26.636		
	41.862	26.700		
Korucuköy Stream	41.791	26.657		
	41.725	26.631		
Hasanağa Stream	41.732	26.569		
	Name of Stream Sinanköy Stream Korucuköy Stream Hasanağa Stream	Coord Name of Stream Coord North 41.838 Sinanköy Stream 41.777 41.719 41.862 Korucuköy Stream 41.791 41.725 41.732		



Figure 1. Meriç – Ergene River Basin, study area and selected stations.

Water Quality Index (WQI)

The WQI is an effective method in evaluating the drinking water quality and has commonly been used, especially in recent years (Wang et al., 2017; Tokatlı, 2019c; Ustaoğlu et al., 2020). The following formula was used to calculate the WQI;

$$WQI = \sum \left[W_i \times \left(\frac{C_i}{S_i} \right) \times 100 \right]$$
⁽¹⁾

$$Wi = \frac{W_i}{\Sigma W_i} \tag{2}$$

Where, W_i is relative weight and W_i values are assigned as a maximum of 5 and a minimum of 1, taking into account the relatively significant effects of the toxicants on human health and their significance in terms of potability (Meng et al., 2016). C_i is the trace-toxic element concentration measured in water and the S_i values refer to the standard values determined by TS266 (2005), EC (2007) and WHO (2011) for drinking water. The Standard values (Si) of the investigated parameters with the assigned Wi coefficients in the present application are given in Table 2 (Meng et al., 2016). The scale of WQI is given in Table 3 (Xiao et al., 2019).

Standard values, assigned weights and relative

weights of parameters.								
Variable	Unit	Standart Value (S _i)	Assigned Weight (W _i)	Relative Weight (W _I)				
рН		7.5	3	0.111111				
EC	μS/ cm	1500	4	0.148148				
TDS	mg/L	600	4	0.148148				
Turbidity	NTU	5	3	0.111111				
Nitrate	mg/L	50	5	0.185185				
Nitrite	mg/L	3	5	0.185185				
Sulphate	mg/L	250	3	0.111111				

Table 2.

lable 3.	Water quality rating for WQI.							
Value	Rating of Water Quality	Usage Possibilities	Grading					
< 50	Excellent water quality	Drinking, irriga- tion, industrial	А					
50 – 100	Good water quality	Drinking, irriga- tion, industrial	В					
100 – 200	Poor water quality	Irrigation, industrial	С					
200 – 300	Very Poor water quality	Irrigation	D					

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

. .

The results of the detected limnological parameters in the main fluvial components of the Hasanağa Stream Basin in 2019 and 2020 are given in Table 3.

According to the Turkish Regulations (2004; 2015), In the winter season of 2019, the Hasanağa Stream Basin had a 1. Class quality in terms of dissolved oxygen, oxygen saturation, pH, TDS and sulphate parameters and has a 2. Class quality in terms of the EC, nitrate, nitrite and phosphate parameters in general (Uslu and Türkman, 1987). In the winter season of 2020, the basin has a 1. Class quality in terms of dissolved oxygen, oxygen saturation, TDS and sulphate parameters, and has a 2. Class quality in terms of the EC and nitrite parameters and has a 3. Class quality in terms of the pH, nitrate and phosphate parameters in general (Uslu and Türkman, 1987). It was also determined that any investigated locations (except K3 station for turbidity parameter) did not exceed the drinking water standards in terms of the investigated parameters (TS266, 2005; EC, 2007; WHO, 2011).

Nitrate is caused by the oxidation of ammonia, which occurs as a result of the decomposition of proteins contained in animal and vegetable wastes, and especially nitrate fertilisers used in agricultural areas. A small amount of nitrate in clean waters is the most common form of nitrogen in streams (Wetzel, 2001; Manahan, 2011). Nitrite is an intermediate in biological oxidation from ammonium to nitrate, and it may have oxidised to nitrate or reduced to ammonia. It is mostly low in natural waters. Nitrite can reach high densities in low oxygenated waters with organic pollution and suggests sewage contamination if it is found in high amounts. The most important sources of nitrite in soils and waters are organic substances, nitrogenous fertilisers and some minerals (Wetzel, 2001; Manahan, 2011). Phosphorus is a significant essential element for plant growth. It is necessary for crop production and is commonly used in fertilisers. It is known as one of the main elements that increase the nutrient enrichment of surface waters and cause the ageing of lakes or streams (Wetzel, 2001; Manahan, 2011). The reason for the quite high nitrate, nitrite and phosphate values detected in the water of some basin components may have been the applied intensive agricultural fertilisers in the region.

CA was applied to the data in order to obtain the similarity groups among the investigated localities on the Hasanağa Stream Basin according to their similar water quality characteristics. The diagram of CA calculated by using the WQI scores of locations is given in Figure 2 and the calculated similarity coefficient of locations are given in Table 4.

According to the results of CA, 3 statistically significant clusters were formed. Cluster 1 (C1) was named as a "less contaminated zone" and corresponded to the stations S1 and K1; Cluster 2 (C2) was named as a "moderate contaminated zone" and corresponded to the station H, S2, S3 and K2; Cluster 3 (C3) was named as a "more contaminated zone" and corresponded to the station of K3.





Tabl	e 4.	Similarity coefficients of locations.							
	S 1	S2	S 3	K1	К2	К3	н		
S 1	1.000								
S2	0.942	1.000							
S3	0.910	0.968	1.000						
K1	0.954	0.951	0.936	1.000					
K2	0.942	0.990	0.968	0.941	1.000				
K3	0.806	0.862	0.894	0.851	0.862	1.000			
Н	0.884	0.941	0.954	0.930	0.941	0.920	1.000		

The Monomial and multinomial risks of pH, EC, TDS, turbidity, nitrate, nitrite and sulphate parameters in the water of the Hasanağa Stream Basin were determined for all the investigated habitats and seasons by using the WQI and the detected data are given in Table 4 and Figure 3.

According to the results of WQI, the values of the overall WQI were within the permissible limits (<100), and all the investigated stations on the Hasanğa Stream Basin in all the seasons were found as "A grade – Excellent" in water quality characteristics. It was also determined that the risk sequence of the investigated parameters in the surface water of the basin is as follows; pH > TDS

Witer Season JerrieBernameterSameter5t.DO ppmO2Sat %PHEC ms/cmTDS ppmSal %TUTNO3 ppmNO2 ppmPO4 ppmSO4 ppmSO4 ppm5112.26 1.Class1.Class7.89 1.Class303 1.Class208 1.Class1.Class1.73 1.Class0.007 1.Class0.041 2.Class39 2.Class303 2.Class208 1.Class1.73 1.Class0.007 2.Class0.041 2.Class39 2.Class303 2.Class208 2.Class1.Class<	Table 3.	3. Physical and chemical data detected in 2019 and 2020.										
Barbone Sale Ture NO2 PO4 Sole Sole Ture NO2 PO4 Sole Sole Ture NO2 PD4 Sole Sole Ture NO2 PD4 Sole Sole Ture NO2 PD4 Sole Sole Sole Ture	Winter Season of 2019											
St.DO ppmO2Sat %pHEC ms/cmTDS ppmSal. ms/cm Tur. NO ppmNO ppmNO ppmPO ppmSO ppmS112.26 1. Class1.08.3 1. Class7.89 1. Class303 1. Class208 1. Class0.21 1. Class4.531.73 1. Class0.007 1. Class0.041 2. Class39 1. ClassS212.53 1. Class1.09.9 1. Class7.74 1. Class482 1. Class340 1. Class0.34 2.447.29 2. Class0.047 2. Class3. Class1. Class 1. ClassS312.20 1. Class107.0 1. Class7.70 1. Class541 2. Class382 1. Class0.38 2.0382.77 2. Class7.60 2. Class0.087 2. Class54 2. ClassK112.71 1. Class11.18 1. Class7.73 1. Class513 2. Class303 1. Class2.038 2. Class2.048 2. Class2.0488 2. Class0.087 2. Class0.087 2. Class54 2. ClassK210.91 1. OPI 9.67 1. Class7.77 1. Class448 2. Class3.11 2.023. Class 2. Class2. Class 2. Class <th colspan="11">Parameters *</th>	Parameters *											
S1 12.26 108.3 7.89 303 208 0.21 4.53 1.73 0.007 0.041 39 S2 12.53 109.9 7.74 482 340 0.34 2.44 7.29 0.047 0.176 51 S3 1.Class 1.Class 1.Class 1.Class 1.Class 2.Class 3.Class 1.Class	St.	DO ppm	O2Sat %	рН	EC ms/cm	TDS ppm	Sal. % ₀	Tur. NTU	NO₃ ppm	NO₂ ppm	PO ₄ ppm	SO₄ ppm
S2 12.53 109.9 7.74 482 340 0.34 2.44 7.29 0.047 0.176 51 S3 12.20 107.0 7.70 541 382 0.38 2.27 7.60 0.025 0.087 54 S3 12.20 107.0 7.70 541 382 0.38 2.27 7.60 0.025 0.087 54 K1 12.71 111.8 7.73 513 360 0.36 2.90 8.48 0.015 0.084 71 L Class 1. Class 1. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. C	S1	12.26 1. Class	108.3 1. Class	7.89 1. Class	303 1. Class	208 1. Class	0.21	4.53	1.73 1. Class	0.007 1. Class	0.041 2. Class	39 1. Class
S3 12.20 107.0 7.70 541 382 0.38 2.27 7.60 0.025 0.087 54 K1 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 2. Class 1. Class K1 12.71 111.8 7.73 513 360 0.36 2.90 8.48 0.015 0.084 71 K2 10.91 96.7 7.77 448 311 0.31 2.02 12.80 0.037 0.052 32 K3 12.20 103.0 7.65 559 409 0.41 7.90 3. Class 2. Class 2. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. Class 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class	S2	12.53 1. Class	109.9 1. Class	7.74 1. Class	482 1. Class	340 1. Class	0.34	2.44	7.29 2. Class	0.047 2. Class	0.176 3. Class	51 1. Class
K1 12.71 111.8 7.73 513 360 0.36 2.90 8.48 0.015 0.084 71 K2 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 2. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. Class 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class <th>S3</th> <th>12.20 1. Class</th> <th>107.0 1. Class</th> <th>7.70 1. Class</th> <th>541 2. Class</th> <th>382 1. Class</th> <th>0.38</th> <th>2.27</th> <th>7.60 2. Class</th> <th>0.025 2. Class</th> <th>0.087 2. Class</th> <th>54 1. Class</th>	S 3	12.20 1. Class	107.0 1. Class	7.70 1. Class	541 2. Class	382 1. Class	0.38	2.27	7.60 2. Class	0.025 2. Class	0.087 2. Class	54 1. Class
K2 10.91 96.7 7.77 448 311 0.31 2.02 12.80 0.037 0.052 32 K3 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 2. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. Class 1. Class <th>K1</th> <th>12.71 1. Class</th> <th>111.8 1. Class</th> <th>7.73 1. Class</th> <th>513 2. Class</th> <th>360 1. Class</th> <th>0.36</th> <th>2.90</th> <th>8.48 2. Class</th> <th>0.015 2. Class</th> <th>0.084 2. Class</th> <th>71 1. Class</th>	K1	12.71 1. Class	111.8 1. Class	7.73 1. Class	513 2. Class	360 1. Class	0.36	2.90	8.48 2. Class	0.015 2. Class	0.084 2. Class	71 1. Class
K3 12.20 103.0 7.65 559 409 0.41 7.90 10.60 0.041 0.151 40 K3 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 2. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. Class 2. Class 1. Class <th>K2</th> <th>10.91 1. Class</th> <th>96.7 1. Class</th> <th>7.77 1. Class</th> <th>448 2. Class</th> <th>311 1. Class</th> <th>0.31</th> <th>2.02</th> <th>12.80 3. Class</th> <th>0.037 2. Class</th> <th>0.052 2. Class</th> <th>32 1. Class</th>	K2	10.91 1. Class	96.7 1. Class	7.77 1. Class	448 2. Class	311 1. Class	0.31	2.02	12.80 3. Class	0.037 2. Class	0.052 2. Class	32 1. Class
H 11.74 96.2 7.19 541 409 0.41 4.46 7.97 0.077 0.163 80 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 2. Class 1. Class 2. Class 3. Class 3. Class 3. Class 1. Class 1. Class 1. Class 2. Class 3.	К3	12.20 1. Class	103.0 1. Class	7.65 1. Class	559 2. Class	409 1. Class	0.41	7.90	10.60 3. Class	0.041 2. Class	0.151 2. Class	40 1. Class
Min 10.91 96.20 7.19 303 208 0.21 2.02 1.73 0.01 0.04 32.00 Max 12.71 111.80 7.89 559 409 0.41 7.90 12.80 0.08 0.18 80.30	н	11.74 1. Class	96.2 1. Class	7.19 1. Class	541 2. Class	409 1. Class	0.41	4.46	7.97 2. Class	0.077 3. Class	0.163 3. Class	80 1. Class
Max 12.71 111.80 7.89 559 409 0.41 7.90 12.80 0.08 0.18 80.30	Min	10.91	96.20	7.19	303	208	0.21	2.02	1.73	0.01	0.04	32.00
	Max	12.71	111.80	7.89	559	409	0.41	7.90	12.80	0.08	0.18	80.30
Mean 12.08 104.70 7.67 483 345 0.35 3.79 8.07 0.04 0.11 52.51	Mean	12.08	104.70	7.67	483	345	0.35	3.79	8.07	0.04	0.11	52.51
SD 0.60 6.26 0.22 88 70 0.07 2.08 3.42 0.02 0.05 17.72	SD	0.60	6.26	0.22	88	70	0.07	2.08	3.42	0.02	0.05	17.72

Winter Season of 2020

Parameters *											
St.	DO ppm	O2Sat %	рН	EC ms/cm	TDS ppm	Sal. %₀	Tur. NTU	NO₃ ppm	NO ₂ ppm	PO₄ ppm	SO₄ ppm
S 1	11.51 1. Class	113.3 1. Class	9.35 4. Class	643 2. Class	387 1. Class	0.39	1.75	9.10 2. Class	0.005 1. Class	0.640 3. Class	50 1. Class
S2	10.01 1. Class	99.6 1. Class	9.48 4. Class	630 2. Class	390 1. Class	0.39	2.05	22.40 4. Class	0.009 1. Class	0.760 4. Class	51 1. Class
S 3	9.79 1. Class	95.3 1. Class	9.39 4. Class	6472. Class	406 1. Class	0.41	3.01	24.30 4. Class	0.036 2. Class	1.210 4. Class	64 1. Class
K1	9.23 1. Class	89.3 2. Class	9.10 4. Class	601 2. Class	416 1. Class	0.32	1.88	15.10 3. Class	0.011 2. Class	0.070 2. Class	17 1. Class
K2	8.64 1. Class	83.4 2. Class	8.73 3. Class	676 2. Class	431 1. Class	0.43	2.48	23.70 4. Class	0.021 2. Class	0.150 2. Class	27 1. Class
К3	7.57 2. Class	73.1 2. Class	8.60 3. Class	827 2. Class	528 2. Class	0.53	4.65	24.30 4. Class	0.065 3. Class	0.370 3. Class	43 1. Class
н	9.98 1. Class	97.2 1. Class	8.76 3. Class	694 2. Class	437 1. Class	0.44	2.59	20.20 4. Class	0.054 2. Class	0.130 2. Class	73 1. Class
Min	7.57	73.10	8.60	601	387	0.32	1.75	9.10	0.01	0.07	17.00
Max	11.51	113.30	9.48	827	528	0.53	4.65	24.30	0.07	1.21	73.00
Mean	9.53	93.03	9.06	674	427	0.42	2.63	19.87	0.03	0.48	46.43
SD	1.23	12.78	0.36	73	48	0.06	0.99	5.76	0.02	0.42	19.59

St.: Stations; Sal.: Salinity; Tur.: Turbidity; Min: Minimum; Max: Maximum; SD: Standard Deviation; *3. – 4. Class water qualities are given in bold

> turbidity > EC > nitrate > sulphate > nitrite for 2019 and pH > TDS > nitrate > EC > turbidity > sulphate > nitrite in general.

In a study performed in the catchments of the Emet and Orhaneli Streams, the water quality of the basin was evaluated by using the WQI. According to the results of this investigation, being significantly different from the present investigation, the general trend of the WQI for Emet and Orhaneli Streams was found to be of a heavily polluted water quality (WQI > 300) (Omwene et al., 2019).

Table 4.	Monomial and multinomial results of applied WQI.										
Parametre		Sinanköy Stream			Korucuköy Stream		Hasanağa Stream				
	S1	S 2	\$3	K1	K2	К3	н				
Winter Season of 2019											
рН	11.689	11.467	11.407	11.452	11.511	11.333	10.652				
EC	2.993	4.760	5.343	5.067	4.425	5.521	5.343				
TDS	5.136	8.395	9.432	8.889	7.679	10.099	10.099				
Turbidity	10.067	5.422	5.044	6.444	4.489	17.556	9.911				
Nitrate	0.641	2.700	2.815	3.141	4.741	3.926	2.952				
Nitrite	0.043	0.290	0.154	0.093	0.228	0.253	0.475				
Sulphate	1.742	2.244	2.400	3.173 1.422		1.787	3.569				
WQI	32.310	35.279	36.596	38.259	34.495	50.474	43.001				
			Winter Sea	ason of 2020							
рН	13.852	14.044	13.911	13.481	12.933	12.741	12.978				
EC	6.351	6.222	6.390	5.936	6.677	8.168	6.854				
TDS	9.556	9.630	10.025	10.272	10.642	13.037	10.790				
Turbidity	3.889	4.556	6.689	4.178	5.511	10.333	5.756				
Nitrate	3.370	8.296	9.000	5.593	8.778	9.000	7.481				
Nitrite	0.031	0.056	0.222	0.068	0.130	0.401	0.333				
Sulphate	2.222	2.267	2.844	0.756	1.200	1.911	3.244				
WQI	39.270	45.070	49.081	40.283	45.870	55.591	47.437				



In another study performed in the same watershed, the groundwater quality of the Ergene River Basin was evaluated by using the WQI. According to the results of this research, as similar to the present research, the investigated element accumulations in the groundwater of the basin were recorded within the range of human consumption standards (Tokatlı, 2019).

In a study performed in the Black See Region of Turkey, the WQI was used to assess the surface water qualities. As similar to the data of the current study, it was reported that the investigated Turnasuyu Stream has an excellent water quality in terms of the WQI (Ustaoğlu et al., 2020).

In a study conducted abroad in the city of Nagpur (India), The WQI was applied to determine the quality of different surface water resources. According to the results of this study, as differ-

ent of the results of the present study, the calculated WQI for the various lakes studied showed poor water quality (Puri et al., 2011).

CONCLUSION

In the present research, the temporal and spatial change of the water quality of the Hasanağa Stream Basin including the Sinanköy, Korucuköy and Hasanağa Streams were evaluated by using the Water Quality Index (WQI) and Cluster Analysis (CA). As a result of this research, the water quality of the basin was found to have significantly decreased over time and it has a 1. – 2. Class water quality in 2019 and has a 2. – 3. Class water quality in 2020 in general. As a result of the WQI, the basin was found as having "A Grade – Excellent" water quality (<50) in both 2019 and 2020. As a result of CA, 3 statistically significant clusters were formed and the locations investigated were classified as "less polluted zones". For the protection and sustainability of this important aquatic system, it is necessary to constantly monitor and raise the aware-ness of local people in agricultural activities.

Financial Disclosure: The present study was funded by Trakya University, Commission of Scientific Research Projects (Project No. 2019/127).

Ethics committee approval: Ethics committee approval is not required.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Acknowledgments: -

Disclosure: -

REFERENCES

- Akin, B. S., Atıcı, T., Katircioglu, H., Keskin, F. (2011). Investigation of water quality on Gökçeekaya dam lake using multivariate statistical analysis, in Eskişehir, Turkey. Environmental Earth Sciences, 63: 1251–1261. [CrossRef]
- Akoteyon, I. S., Omotayo, A. O., Soladoye, O., Olaoye, H. O. (2011). Determination of water quality index and suitability of urban river for municipal water supply in lagos-Nigeria. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 54: 263–271.
- Akter, T., Jhohura, F. T., Akter, F., Chowdhury, T. R., Mistry, S. K., Dey, D., Barua, M. K., Islam, M. A. & Rahman, M. (2016). Water quality index for measuring drinking water quality in rural Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition*, 35:4. [CrossRef]
- Arslan, N., Tokatlı, C., Çiçek, A., Köse, E. (2011). Determination of some metal concentrations in water and sediment samples in Yedigöller region (Kütahya). *Review of Hydrobiology* 4,1: 17-28.
- Atıcı, T., Tokatlı, C., Çiçek, A. (2018). Diatoms of Seydisuyu stream basin (Turkey) and assessment of water quality by statistical and biological approaches. Sigma Journal of Engineering and Natural Sciences, 36 (1): 271-288.
- Belkhiri, L., Narany, T. S. (2015). Using multivariate statistical analysis, geostatistical techniques and structural equation modeling to identify spatial variability of groundwater quality. *Water Resources Management*, 29: 2073–2089. [CrossRef]
- Çiçek, A., Köse, E., Tokatlı, C. (2019). Use of factor analysis to evaluate the sediment quality of a significant mining area: Seydisuyu stream basin (Turkey). Polish Journal of Environmental Studies, 28 (3): 2021-2025. [CrossRef]
- EC (European Communities) (2007). European Communities (drinking water) (no. 2), Regulations 2007, S.I. No. 278 of 2007.
- Köse, E., Çiçek, A., Uysal, K., Tokatlı, C., Emiroğlu, Ö. & Arslan, N. (2016). Evaluation of surface water quality in Porsuk stream. University Journal of Science and Technology – C Life Sciences and Biotechnology, 4 (2): 81-93. [CrossRef]
- Köse, E., Emiroğlu, Ö., Çiçek, A., Tokatlı, C., Başkurt, S., Aksu, S. (2018). Sediment quality assessment in porsuk stream basin (Turkey) from a multi-statistical perspective. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies*, 27 (2): 747-752. [CrossRef]
- Köse, E., Tokatlı, C. & Çiçek, A. (2014). Monitoring stream water quality: A statistical evaluation. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies*, 23 (5): 1637-1647.
- Manahan, S. E. (2011). Water Chemistry: Green Science and Technology of Nature's Most Renewable Resource. Taylor and Francis Group. CRC Press, 398p. [CrossRef]
- Meng, Q., Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., Wu, T. (2016). Geochemistry of dissolved trace elements and heavy metals in the dan river drainage (China): Distribution, sources, and water quality assessment. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23, 8091–8103. [CrossRef]
- Mukatea, S., Wagha, V., Panaskara, D., Jacobs, J. A. & Sawantc, A. (2019). Development of new integrated water quality index (IWQI) model to evaluate the drinking suitability of water. *Ecological Indicators*, 101, 348-354. [CrossRef]
- Puri, P. J., Yenkie, M. K. N., Sangal, S. P., Gandhare, N. V., Sarote, G. B. & Dhanorkar, D. B. (2011). Surface water (lakes) quality assessment in nagpur city (India) based on water quality index (WQI). *Rasayan Journal of Chemistry*, 4(1): 43-48.
- Sutadian, A. D., Muttil, N., Yilmaz, A. G., Perera, B. J. C. (2016). Development of river water quality indices—A review. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 188: 58. [CrossRef]
- Tokatlı, C. (2019). Drinking Water Quality Assessment of Ergene River Basin (Turkey) by water quality index: Essential and toxic elements. Sains Malaysiana, 48 (10): 2071-2081. [CrossRef]

- Tokatlı, C., 2020a. Use of water quality index to evaluate the groundwater characteristics of villages located in edirne province. *International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Food Sciences, 4*(3): 362-367. [CrossRef]
- Tokatlı, C., 2020b. Water quality assessment of Ergene river basin using multivariate statistical analysis. *Journal of Limnology and Freshwater Fisheries Research*, 6 (1): 38-46. [CrossRef]
- Tokatlı, C., Köse, E., Arslan, N., Emiroğlu, Ö., Çiçek, A. & Dayıoğlu, H. (2016). Water quality of emet stream basin. Uludağ University Journal of the Faculty of Engineering, 21(2): 9-24. [CrossRef]
- Tokatlı, C., Köse, E. & Çiçek, A. (2014). Assessment of the effects of large borate deposits on surface water quality by multi statistical approaches: A case study of the Seydisuyu stream (Turkey). *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies*, 23(5): 1741-1751.
- Tokatlı, C., Ustaoğlu, F. (2020). Health risk assessment of toxicants in Meriç river delta wetland, thrace region, Turkey. *Environmental Earth Science*, 79, 426. [CrossRef]
- TS 266 (2005). Sular-İnsani tüketim amaçlı sular. Türk Standartları Enstitüsü, ICS 13.060.20.
- Turkish Regulations (2004). Yüzeysel Su Kalitesi Yönetimi Yönetmeliği, 31 Aralık 2004, Resmi Gazete No: 25687, http://suyonetimiormansu.gov.tr.
- Turkish Regulations (2015). Yüzeysel su kalitesi yönetimi yönetmeliğinde değişiklik yapılmasına dair yönetmelik, 15 Nisan 2015, Resmi Gazete No: 29327, http://suyonetimiormansu.gov.tr.
- Tyagi, S., Sharma, B., Singh, P. & Dobhal, R. (2013). Water quality assessment in terms of water quality index. American Journal of Water Resources, 1(3):34–8. [CrossRef]
- Uslu, O. & Türkman, A. (1987). *Su kirliliği ve kontrolü.* T.C. Başbakanlık Çevre Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları, Eğitim Dizisi 1, Ankara.
- Ustaoğlu, F., Aydın, H. (2020). Health risk assessment of dissolved heavy metals in surface water in a subtropical rivers basin system of Giresun (north-eastern Turkey). *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 194, 222-234. [CrossRef]
- Ustaoğlu, F. & Tepe, Y. (2019). Water quality and sediment contamination assessment of Pazarsuyu stream, Turkey using multivariate statistical methods and pollution indicators. *International Soil and Water Conservation Research*, 7, 47-56. [CrossRef]
- Ustaoğlu, F., Tepe, Y. & Taş, B. (2020). Assessment of Stream quality and health risk in a subtropical Turkey river system: A combined approach using statistical analysis and water quality index. *Ecological Indicators*, [CrossRef]
- Varol, M. (2020). Use of water quality index and multivariate statistical methods for the evaluation of water quality of a stream affected by multiple stressors: a case study. *Environmental Pollution*, 266: 115417. [CrossRef]
- Varol , M., Gökot B., Bekleyen, A., Şen, B. (2012). Water quality assessment and apportionment of pollution sources of Tigris river (Turkey) Using multivariate statistical techniques—a case study. *River Research and Applications*, 28, 1428–1438. [CrossRef]
- Wang, J., Liu, G., Liu, H. & Lamc, P. (2017). Multivariate statistical evaluation of dissolved trace elements and a water quality assessment in the middle reaches of Huaihe river, Anhui, China. Science of the Total Environment, 583: 421–431. [CrossRef]
- Wetzel, R. G. (2001). Limnology: Lake and River Ecosystems. Elsevier Academic Press. 1006p. [20] Manahan, S.E. (2011) Water Chemistry: Green Science and Technology of Nature's Most Re-newable Resource. Taylor and Francis Group. CRC Press, 398p.
- WHO (World Health Organization) (2011). Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality. World Health Organization Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data, NLM classification: WA 675.
- Xiao, J., Wang, L., Deng, L. & Jin, Z. (2019). Characteristics, sources, water quality and health risk assessment of trace elements in river water and well water in the Chinese loess plateau. *Science of the Total Environment*, 650: 2004-2012. [CrossRef]