Global J. Environ. Sci. Manage., 2(1): 79-86, Winter 2016 DOI: 10.7508/gjesm.2016.01.009

ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Seasonal variations of ground water quality and its agglomerates by water quality index

S. Sharma^{1,*}, R.C. Chhipa²

¹Department of Chemistry, Rajasthan Institute of Engineering and Technology, Bhankrota, Jaipur, India

²Department of Chemistry and Centre for Air and Water Modeling, Suresh Gyan, Vihar University, Jaipur 302 025, India

Received 28 July 2015; revised 16 August 2015; accepted 11 September 2015; available online 1 December 2015

ABSTRACT: Water is a unique natural resource among all sources available on earth. It plays an important role in economic development and the general well-being of the country. This study aimed at using the application of water quality index in evaluating the ground water quality innorth-east area of Jaipur in pre and post monsoon for public usage. Total eleven physico-chemical characteristics; total dissolved solids, total hardness, chloride, nitrate, electrical conductance, sodium, fluorideand potassium, pH, turbidity, temperature) were analyzed and observed values were compared with standard values recommended by Indian standard and World Health Organization. Most of parameter show higher value than permissible limit in pre and post monsoon. Water quality index study showed that drinking water in Amer (221.58,277.70), Lalawas (362.74,396.67), Jaisinghpura area (286.00, 273.78) were found to be highly contaminated due to high value of total dissolved solids, electrical conductance, total hardness, chloride, nitrate and sodium. Saipura (122.52, 131.00), Naila (120.25, 239.86), Galta (160.9, 204.1) were found to be moderately contaminated for both monsoons. People dependent on this water may prone to health hazard. Therefore some effective measures are urgently required to enhance the quality of water in these areas.

KEYWORDS: Electrical conductance (EC); Total dissolved solids (TDS); Total Hardness(TH); Water Quality Index (WQI)

INTRODUCTION

Ground water resources are dynamic in nature and are affected by factors of irrigation activities, industrialization, urbanization and geological processes occurring within them and reactions with aquifer minerals (Chartterjee *et al.*, 2010, Nagarajan *et al.*, 2010), rainfall patterns, infiltration rate, leaching of pollutants from the landfill (Srivastava and Ramanathan, 2008). Poor quality of water adversely affects plant growth and human health (Subba, 2009). In Rajasthan, 70% of the population is dependent on groundwater resources for drinking, irrigation and other purposes (Yadav et al., 2010). Water quality index is the most effective tool to express complex water quality data into a single number as an index (Shanker and Latha, 2008; Chaturvedi and Bassin 2010; Saeedi et al., 2010, Sharma and Chhipa, 2013) and it depends upon normalizing the data parameter according to expected concentrations and interpretation of good versus bad concentrations. Correlation coefficients of water quality parameters not only help to evaluate the overall water quality but also to quantify relative concentration of various impurities in water and provide necessary information for implementation of rapid water quality management programs (Jothivenkatachalam et al., 2010; Karbassi and Pazoki 2015). Once a linear relationship has been shown to have a high probability by the value of the correlation coefficient, then the best straight

^{*}Corresponding Author Email: sonikasharmaindia@gmail.com Telefax:+91 412 202020

Note. Discussion period for this manuscript open until March 1, 2016 on GJESM website at the "Show Article".

line through the data points has to be estimated. This study has been carried out in north east area of Jaipur in India during 2012.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Samples of drinking water were collected in clean polyethylene bottles from different sources viz. tube well, bore well and hand pump in the pre and post monsoon from north east area of Jaipur and its agglomerates .TDS is calculated by the evaporation method, TH is determined by EDTA titration (Akpabli, 2002). Chloride has been determined using spectrophotometry. The data have been compared with standard values which are given by Indian (BIS (10500: 1991) and WHO (1996) standards. Parameters are weighted according to their perceived importance to overall water quality and the index is calculated as the weighted average of all observations of interest (Bharti and Katyal 2011). Table 1 shows the classification of water quality based on WQI value.

Water Quality Index

For calculation of WQI these steps are followed (Ramakrishnaiah *et al.*, 2009)

 $WQI = \sum SI_i$ S I_i=W_i q_i q_i = (C_i/S_i) × 100

Where C_i = concentration of each parameter S_i = respective Indian standard value

$$W_i = \frac{W_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}$$

Each of the essential eleven parameters has been assigned a weight ranging from 1 to 5 depending on the relative importance of parameter with respect to drinking purpose. EC, TH, NO₃ F are assigned maximum weight because of their relative importance in water quality. Na, K and temperature are given minimum credit of 2 as they play low significant role in water quality assignment. The weight of other parameters varied from

2 to 5 depending on their importance in water quality determination given in Table 3.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Total Dissolved Solid -TDS in water is a measure of combined chemicals of all inorganic and organic substances present in water as molecule (Sharma and Chhipa 2012), ions or micro granular suspended form. TDS values were varied from 404 mg/L to 4348 mg/L in pre monsoon (Table 2) and 501mg/L to 4670 mg/L in post monsoon (Table 3). Jamvaramgarh locality exhibits low value of TDS and Lalawas shows higher value of TDS in both monsoons. Higher concentration of dissolved solids are in Post Monsoon samples shows poor quality of water predicted to more seepage and movement of ground water in this area

Electrical Conductivity – High Conductivity may arise through natural weathering and anthropogenic sources (Hameed *et al.*, 2010). EC values varied from 618 to 5341 μ S/cm in pre monsoon and 650 and 7076 μ S/cm in post monsoon. High conductivity in this area is due to presence of high amount of dissolved salts.

Total Hardness

Total hardness is the sum of Ca and Mg hardness so only total hardness is determined in this paper. Ca and Mg hardness not separately determined Total Hardness was varied between 158.6 to 1049.3 mg/L in pre and 170.3 to 1240.3 mg/L in post monsoon. The natural sources of hardness in water are dissolved Calcium and Magnesium ions from sedimentary rocks, seepage and runoff from soils.

Chloride

Chloride concentration of the groundwater samples in the study area was varying from 17.53 to 1359.21 mg/L in Pre Monsoon and 19.99 to 1331.33 mg/L in Post Monsoon with average value of 319.19mg/L and 410.12 mg/L. In Jal Mahal chloride concentration extremely increased in post monsoon. High value of Chloride may be due to contamination from a septic system, sewage and agriculture.

Table 1: Classification of water quality based on WQI value (Ramakrishnaiah et al., 2009)

S. No.	WQI value	Grade	Water quality
1	50 and below	A	Quality of water is excellent
2	50-100	В	Quality of water is good
3	100 -200	С	Quality of water is poor
4	200-300	D	Quality of water is very poor
5	300 and above	E	Quality of water is unsuitable for drinking

Nitrate

The concentration of Nitrate in the study area varying from 8.93 to 202.20 mg/L in Pre Monsoon and 7.96 to 209.16 mg/L in Post Monsoon. It is observed that nearly 40% of samples in Pre Monsoon (Table 2) and 60% of them in Post Monsoon (Table 3) exceed the permissible limit. Amer has extremely higher value of Nitrate because this sampling point is very close to domestic area so all municipal sewage discharged here.

Fluoride

The concentration of Fluoride in the study area varies from to 0.33 to 1.87 mg/L in Pre Monsoon and .56 to 2.50 mg/L in Post Monsoon. All samples in study area except Lalawas have below the permissible limit prescribed by IS standards (Table 4). There are slight changes in the value of Fluoride in post monsoon.

Sodium

It is a major component of potable water. The Sodium concentration of the area in groundwater was varying from 38.03 to 524.5 mg/L in Pre Monsoon and 38.69 mg/L to 966.6 mg/L in Post Monsoon. In Pre Monsoon all the samples have lesser valueof Sodium than prescribed WHO standard (200mg/L) exceptinLalawas but in Post Monsoon 5 samples have the above value than permissible limit. Jal Mahal has extreme increment in Sodium value in post monsoon. Sodium has a strong tendency to remain adsorbed on soil particles, but can be easily exchanged by divalent cations like calcium and Magnesium .The percolating water can undergo this type of exchange that can lead to an increase of sodium in ground water(Goyal 2006).

Potassium

The Potassium concentrations vary from 2.59 to 15.76 in Pre Monsoon and 1.28 to 21.95 mg /L in Post Monsoon. The Bureau of Indian Standard has not included Potassium as a parameter in Drinking Water Standards however European Economic Community has prescribed the guideline level of potassium at 10 mg/L in drinking water. Two localities water samples (Amer and Jaisinghpura) shows high value of Potassium in Post Monsoon.

Acidity

pH value in North East varied between 6.5 to 8.17 in Pre Monsoon and 6.49 to 8.09 in Post Monsoon. All the values in both seasons were in the prescribed limit given by Indian Standard. The mean values of pH in pre and post Monsoon were 7.33 and 7.26 given in (Table 4).

Table 2: Data analysis of pre monsoon north east area of Jaipur and itsagglor

Study area	pН	TDS	EC	TH	Cl	NO ₃	F	Na	K	Turbidity	Temp.
Amer	7.79	1600	2059.6	639	359.54	80	0.92	86.91	15.76	30	38
Jal Mahal	6.91	426	618.3	217.3	52.6	19.73	0.33	38.05	3.96	10	38
Kukas	7.51	808	1188.3	208.1	105.3	15.83	1.37	128	4.08	7.3	37
Jaisinghpura	7.59	2652	3606.6	1049	552.44	202.2	1.71	167.6	6.93	5.67	37
Saipura	7.07	1440	1915.3	221.7	236.78	9.9	1.48	199.5	3.81	7	37
Naila	7.43	961	1394	298.3	192.91	39.33	1.31	97.92	3.67	8	38
Lalawas	8.17	4348	5341	711.7	1359.2	70.13	1.87	524.6	6.95	20.67	37
Heerawala	7.21	896	1415	158.7	87.68	24.3	0.87	86.29	2.59	7	37
Jamvaramgarh	6.5	404	649	239	17.53	8.93	0.53	51.91	3.02	13.67	37
Galta	7.19	1234	1543	585.7	227.99	118.13	1.1	82.61	6.79	7.3	37

Table 3: Data analysis of post monsoonnorth east area of Jaipur and itsagglomerates

Study area	pH	TDS	EC	TH	Cl	NO ₃	F	Na	K	Turbidity	Temp.
Amer	7.9	2672	3182	900.6	426.93	209.16	0.95	183.4	21.95	11	22
Jal Mahal	6.53	3795	4134	1240	759.62	52.03	1.45	417.4	7.85	5.3	22
Kukas	7.04	508	650	190.6	59.97	23.96	1.25	124.9	3.51	10.67	21
Jaisinghpura	7.78	2643	3477	940	527.83	152.1	1.14	266.7	12.87	9.67	23
Saipura	6.93	1168	2760	240.6	299.9	10.13	1.63	267.3	1.77	9	23
Naila	7.4	1994	2607.7	840	403.8	121.73	1.47	294.1	4.99	11.33	25
Lalawas	8.09	4670	5876.3	450	1331.3	104.13	2.5	966.7	1.55	11.67	23
Heerawala	7.05	1044	1491.7	170.3	99.95	25.87	0.95	90.46	1.28	8.33	23
Jamvaramgarh	6.49	501	723.66	220.3	19.99	7.96	0.56	38.69	1.63	7.67	25
Galta	7.43	1513	2132.7	760	171.91	197.96	1.24	64.05	4.29	10	23

		Pre Monsoo	on		Post Monso	oon	IS	WHO
parameter	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean		
pН	6.5	8.17	7.33	6.49	8.09	7.26	6.5-8.5	No guideline
TDS	404	4348	1476.9	501	4670	2050.8	500 mg/L	1000 mg/L
EC	618.3	5341	1973.01	650	5876.3	2703.5	600 µS/cm	No guideline
TH	158.66	1049.3	432.87	170.3	1240.3	595.27	300 mg/L	No guideline
Cl	17.53	1359.21	319.19	19.99	1331.3	410.12	250 mg/L	250 mg/L
NO ₃	8.93	202.2	58.84	7.96	209.16	90.5	45 mg/L	50 mg/L
F	0.33	1.87	1.14	0.56	2.5	1.31	1.0 mg/L	1.5 mg/L
Na	38.05	524.57	146.33	38.69	966.67	271.37	Not mentioned	200 mg/L
K	2.59	15.76	5.75	1.28	21.95	6.16	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
Turbidity	5.67	30	11.66	5.3	11.67	9.46	5NTUmax	5NTU
Temperature	37	38	37.3	21	25	23	-	-

Table 4: Statistical analysis of pre and post monsoon north east area of Jaipur and its agglomerates

Table 5: Computed average WQI values of different sampling station innorth east area in pre monsoon of Jaipur city and its agglomerates

Daramatar	Ci (Observed	Si (Standard	Qi (Quality	W	Wi (Relative	SI
Falameter	value)	value)	Rating)	(weight)	Weight)	(Sub Index)
pН	7.33	7.5	0.08	3	97.73	7.33
TDS	1477	500	0.08	3	295.4	22.15
EC	1973	600	0.13	5	328.8	41.1
TH	432.9	300	0.13	5	144.3	18.04
Cl	319.2	250	0.1	4	127.7	12.77
NO ₃	58.84	45	0.13	5	130.8	16.34
F	1.14	1.5	0.13	5	76	9.5
Na	146.3	200	0.05	2	73.17	3.658
Κ	5.75	10	0.05	2	57.5	2.875
Turbidity	11.66	5	0.08	3	233.2	17.49
Temperature	37.3	25	0.08	3	149.2	11.19
WQI						162.4

Table 6: Computed average WQI values of different sampling station innorth east area in post monsoon of Jaipur city and its agglomerates

Parameter	Ci (Observed value)	Si (Standard value)	Qi (Quality Rating)	W (weight)	Wi (Relative Weight)	SI (Sub Index)
pН	7.26	7.5	0.075	3	96.8	7.26
TDS	2051	500	0.075	3	410.2	30.8
EC	2704	600	0.125	5	450.6	56.3
TH	595.3	300	0.125	5	198.4	24.8
Cl	410.1	250	0.1	4	164	16.4
NO ₃	90.5	45	0.125	5	201.1	25.1
F	1.31	1.5	0.125	5	87.33	10.9
Na	271.4	200	0.05	2	135.7	6.78
Κ	6.16	10	0.05	2	61.6	3.08
Turbidity	9.46	5	0.075	3	189.2	14.2
Temperature	23	25	0.075	3	92	6.9
WQI						203

Turbidity

Turbidity values in North West varied from 5.67 to 30 NTU in Pre Monsoon and 5.30 to 11.67 NTU in Post Monsoon. Average value of turbidity in Pre Monsoon was 11.66 NTU and in Post Monsoon 9.46 NTU. Most of samples are within the permissible limits except than Lalawas, Naila and Amer indicating the presence of organic matter pollution, other effluents, and runoff with high suspended matter content (Yisa and Jimoh, 2010). The overall WQI of all the samples taken in pre

Global J.	Environ.	Sci.	Manage.,	<i>2(1)</i> :	79-86,	Winter 20	16
-----------	----------	------	----------	---------------	--------	-----------	----

S No.Sampling stationSource of Drinking waterSeasonWQIResults1.AmerHand pumppre221.58Very poor2.Jal MahalTube wellpre74.90Good3.KukusHand pumppre100.67Good4.JaisinghpuraHand pumppre286.00Very poor5.SaipuraHand pumppre122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre120.25Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre366.74Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPre99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre100.9Poor		1				1 00
1.AmerHand pumppre post221.58 277.70Very poor Very poor2.Jal MahalTube wellpre post74.90 soil 0.04Good Unfit for drinking purpose3.KukusHand pumppre post100.67 soid 0.067Good Good4.JaisinghpuraHand pumppre post286.00 273.78Very poor Very poor5.SaipuraHand pumppre post122.52 273.78Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre Post120.25 398.66Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre Post396.677 396.677Unfit for drinking purpose Post8.HeerawalawellPre Post99.29 300dGood9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05 66.73 GoodGood10GaltaHand pumpPre Post160.9Poor	S No.	Sampling station	Source of Drinking water	Season	WQI	Results
1.AnterHand pumppost277.70Very poor2.Jal MahalTube wellpre74.90Good3.KukusHand pumppre100.67Good4.JaisinghpuraHand pumppre286.00Very poor5.SaipuraHand pumppre122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre120.25Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre362.74Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPre362.74Unfit for drinking purpose9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre106.77Good	1	Amor	Hand nump	pre	221.58	Very poor
2.Jal MahalTube wellpre post74.90Good yost3.KukusHand pumppre post100.67Good yost4.JaisinghpuraHand pumppre post286.00Very poor yost5.SaipuraHand pumppre post122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre Post131.00Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre Post302.74Unfit for drinking purpose Post8.HeerawalawellPre Post99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre Post100.9Poor	1.	Amer	Trand pump	post	277.70	Very poor
2.Jai MaharHube wenpost301.04Unfit for drinking purpose3.KukusHand pumppre100.67Good4.JaisinghpuraHand pumppre286.00Very poor5.SaipuraHand pumppre122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre120.25Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre362.74Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPre99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre160.9Poor	2	Ial Mahal	Tuba wall	pre	74.90	Good
3.KukusHand pumppre post100.67Good good4.JaisinghpuraHand pumppre post286.00Very poor Post5.SaipuraHand pumppre Post122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre Post120.25Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre Post396.67Unfit for drinking purpose Post8.HeerawalawellPre Post99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre Post160.9Poor	Ζ.	Jai Wallal	Tube well	post	301.04	Unfit for drinking purpose
5.KukusHand pumppost82.79Good4.JaisinghpuraHand pumppre286.00Very poor5.SaipuraHand pumppre122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre131.00Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre362.74Unfit for drinking purpose7.LalawasHand pumpPost396.67Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPre99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre160.9Poor	2	Kulaus	Hand nump	pre	100.67	Good
4.JaisinghpuraHand pumppre post286.00Very poor post5.SaipuraHand pumppre Post122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre Post120.25Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre Post396.67Unfit for drinking purpose Post8.HeerawalawellPre Post99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Pre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre Post160.9Poor	5.	Kukus	Trand pump	post	82.79	Good
4.Jaising putaHand pumppost273.78Very poor5.SaipuraHand pumppre122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre120.25Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre362.74Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPre99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre160.9Poor	4	Inisinghpurg	Hand nump	pre	286.00	Very poor
5.SaipuraHand pumppre Post122.52Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre Post120.25Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre Post398.60Very poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre Post396.67Unfit for drinking purpose Post8.HeerawalawellPre Post99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre Post160.9Poor	4.	Jaisinghpura	Trand pullip	post	273.78	Very poor
5.SalphiaHand pumpPost131.00Poor6.NailaHand pumpPre120.25Poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre398.60Very poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre396.67Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPost102.28Poor9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre160.9Poor	5	Sainura	Hand nump	pre	122.52	Poor
6.NailaHand pumpPre Post120.25Poor 239.867.LalawasHand pumpPre Post396.67Unfit for drinking purpose 90.578.HeerawalawellPre Post99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre Post160.9Poor	5.	Salpura	Trand pump	Post	131.00	Poor
0.NamePrest239.86Very poor7.LalawasHand pumpPre362.74Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPre99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre160.9Poor	6	Naila	Hand nump	Pre	120.25	Poor
7.LalawasHand pumpPre Post362.74Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPre Post99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05Good10.GaltaHand pumpPre Pre160.9Poor	0.	INalla	Trand pump	Post	239.86	Very poor
7.LarawasHand pumpPost396.67Unfit for drinking purpose8.HeerawalawellPre99.29Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre160.9Poor	7	Lalawas	Hand nump	Pre	362.74	Unfit for drinking purpose
8.HeerawalawellPre Post99.29Good Poor9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05Good Poor10.GaltaHand pumpPre Pre160.9Poor	7.	Lalawas	Trand pump	Post	396.67	Unfit for drinking purpose
b.Post102.28Poor9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre78.05Good10GaltaHand pumpPre160.9Poor	8	Haarawala	well	Pre	99.29	Good
9.JamvaramgarhHand pumpPre Post78.05 66.73Good Good10.GaltaHand pumpPre160.9Poor	0.	Ticciawala	well	Post	102.28	Poor
10 Galta Hand pump Post 66.73 Good Pre 160.9 Poor	9	Iamvaramgarh	Hand nump	Pre	78.05	Good
10 Galta Hand nump Pre 160.9 Poor	9.	Janivaranigani	Trand pump	Post	66.73	Good
	10	Galta	Hand numn	Pre	160.9	Poor
Post 204.1 Very poor	10.	Gana		Post	204.1	Very poor

Table 7: Comparison of WQI in pre -post monsoon in north-east area of Jaipur and its agglomerates

Table 8: Correlation matrix of pre monsoon north-east area of Jaipur and its agglomerates

	pН	TDS	EC	TH	Cl	NO ₃	F	Na	K	Tur.	Temp
pН	1	0.795**	0.796**	0.598	0.785**	0.432	0.722*	0.689*	0.557	.442	0.058
TDS	0.795**	1	0.997**	0.726*	0.982**	0.514	0.776**	0.916**	0.350	.346	-0.276
EC	0.796**	0.997**	1	0.736*	0.970**	0.536	0.794**	0.902**	0.331	.311	-0.292
TH	0.598	0.726*	0.736*	1	0.647*	0.936**	0.546	0.406	0.590	.268	-0.111
Cl	0.785**	0.982**	0.970**	0.647*	1	0.404	0.704*	0.941**	0.333	.419	-0.203
NO_3	0.432	0.514	0.536	0.936**	0.404	1	0.452	0.157	0.453	003	-0.139
F	0.722*	0.776**	0.794**	0.546	0.704*	0.452	1	0.746*	0.108	072	-0.412
Na	0.689^{*}	0.916**	0.902^{**}	0.406	0.941**	0.157	0.746^{*}	1	0.098	.274	-0.351
Κ	0.557	0.350	0.331	0.590	0.333	0.453	0.108	0.098	1	.798**	0.363
Tur.	0.442	0.346	0.311	0.268	0.419	-0.003	-0.072	0.274	0.798^{**}	1	0.381
Temp.	0.058	-0.276	-0.292	-0.111	-0.203	-0.139	-0.412	-0.351	0.363	.381	1

Table 9: Correlation matrix of post monsoon north-east area of Jaipur and its agglomerates

	pH	TDS	EC	TH	Cl	NO ₃	F	Na	K	Tur.	Temp.
pН	1	0.511	0.555	0.223	0.515	0.749*	0.441	0.467	0.444	0.803**	-0.118
TDS	0.511	1	0.963**	0.614	0.958^{**}	0.397	0.676^{*}	0.851**	0.309	0.068	-0.159
EC	0.555	0.963**	1	0.509	0.967^{**}	0.362	0.773^{**}	0.889^{**}	0.230	0.138	-0.109
TH	0.223	0.614	0.509	1	0.401	0.630	0.067	0.170	0.638^{*}	-0.160	-0.092
Cl	0.515	0.958^{**}	0.967^{**}	0.401	1	0.242	0.821**	0.963**	0.107	0.166	-0.103
NO ₃	0.749^{*}	0.397	0.362	0.630	0.242	1	0.051	0.066	0.681^{*}	0.498	-0.057
F	0.441	0.676^{*}	0.773^{**}	0.067	0.821**	0.051	1	0.903**	-0.266	0.355	-0.144
Na	0.467	0.851**	0.889^{**}	0.170	0.963**	0.066	0.903**	1	-0.104	0.244	-0.061
Κ	0.444	0.309	0.230	0.638^{*}	0.107	0.681*	-0.266	-0.104	1	0.152	-0.318
Tur.	0.803**	0.068	0.138	-0.160	0.166	0.498	0.355	0.244	0.152	1	0.016
Temp.	-0.118	-0.159	-0.109	-0.092	-0.103	-0.057	-0.144	-0.061	-0.318	0.016	1

and post monsoon were calculated according to the procedure presented in Table 5 and Table 6). In Jal Mahal water quality changed from good to very poor in Pre to Post Monsoon (Table 7). Sampleof Jal Mahal was taken from nearby JalMahal Lake. All the contamination and exploitation of water from city area move toward lake in Post Monsoon. In Amer, Jaisinghpura, Lalawas drinking water is highly polluted





Fig. 1: Correlation between total dissolved solids and electrical conductance in pre monsoon, north-east area of Jaipur and its agglomerates



Fig. 2: Correlation between total dissolved solids and electrical conductance in post monsoon, north-east area of Jaipur and its agglomerates

due to high value of TDS, EC, TH, Cl, NO₃, Na in both monsoons. High value of parameter is due to various anthropogenic activities and geochemical processes prevailing in the region. In Galta water quality was changed into poor to very poor in pre to Post Monsoondue to increment of NO₃, TH, TDS and EC in Post Monsoon. Lalawas to Jamvaramgarh (Lalawas, Jaisinghpurakhor, Saipura, Heerawala and Jamvaramgarh) WQI value reduces (Table 7) i.e. water quality changes from unsuitable water to good water for drinking purpose.

It is evident that distribution of TDS, Cl, F, Na was significantly correlated with EC in Pre Monsoon (Table 8) indicating the high mobility of these ions. EC is positive correlated with TH, NO₃, K and turbidity and negatively correlated with temperature. Highly positive correlation is observed between TDS & Cl TDS & Na (Gajendran and Thamarai, 2008), pH and turbidity, F &

Cl, Cl & F, Na & Cl, Na & F. While highly negative correlation is seen among Temperature and all parameters except Turbidity. Positive correlation occurs between pH and Na, TDS and TH (Udayalaxami *et al.*, 2010). Good relation to Cl and TH indicating that Hardness in groundwater is mainly due to CaCl₂ and MgCl₂ (Ramakrishna *et al.*, 2009).

In post monsoon positive correlation occurs TDS with TH, Cl, Na, K. Thus, the TDS can give a reasonable good indication of a no. of parameters. Table 9 shows that Highly positive correlation occurs between pH and turbidity, TDS and EC, TDS and Cl, TDS and Na, EC and Cl, EC and Na, Cl and Na, Na and F. While negative correlation was observed between Temperature and all parameter except turbidity. TDS shows highly positive correlation with EC in pre and post monsoon indicating in Figs 1 and 2.

CONCLUSION

Higher concentration of Total Dissolved Solids during Post Monsoon samples exhibits poor quality of water as compared to Pre Monsoon due to leaching of various salts into Post Monsoon ground water by infiltrating recharge waters. In pre monsoon only one sample out of 10 (Lalawas) shows high value of sodium than the prescribed limit by WHO but in Post Monsoon 5 samples show high value of sodium. According to study inurban area of Jaipur have high value of sodium in post monsoon. In most of the area, nitrate concentration increases in post monsoon. Study of water quality indices revealed that the drinking water in most locations of north-east area was found to be highly contaminated.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Akpabli, C.K; Amoako, C.; Acheampong, K., (2002). Quality evaluation of natural mineral water produced in Ghana, J. Appl. Sci. Tech., 7 (1-2): 71-76 (6 pages).
- APHA, (1998). Standard method for examination of water and wastewater, 28^{th.} Ed. American Public Health Association, Washington, D C.
- BIS (1991). Indian Standard Drinking Water: Specification (BIS 10500); New Delhi, Bureau of Indian Standards.
- Bharti, N.; Katyal, D., (2011). Water quality indices used for surface water vulnerability assessment, Int. J. Environ. Sci., 2: 154-172 (19 pages).
- Chaturvedi, M.K.; Bassin, J.K., (2010). Assessing the water quality index of water treatment plant and Bore wells, in

Delhi, India. Environ. Monit. Assess.163: 449-453 (5 pages).

- Chartterjee, R.; Tarafder, G.; Paul S., (2010), Groundwater quality assessment of Dhanbad District, District, Jharkhand, India, Bull. Eng. Geol. Environ. 69:137-141(5 pages).
- Guidelines for drinking water quality (1996). 2th. Ed., World Health Organization, Geneva, Gajendran, C.; Thamarai, P., (2008) Study on Statistical relationship between ground water quality parameters in Nambiyar River basin, Tamilnadu, India. Poll. Res. 27(4): 679-683 (5 pages).
- Goyal P.K; (2006). Water pollution causes; Effects the control. 2th. Ed. International Limited Publishers, New Age Publishers.
- Hameed, A.; Alobaidy, M. J.; Abid, H. S.; Maulood, B. K, (2010). Application of water quality index for assessment of Dokan Lake ecosystem, Kurdistan Region, Iraq. J. Water Res. Prot., 2 (9): 792-798. (8 pages). DOI: 10.4236/ jwarp.2010.29093
- Jothivenkatachalam, K.; Nithya, A.; Mohan, S. C., (2010). Correlation analysis of drinking water quality in and around Perur Block of Coimbatore District, Tamil Nadu, India, Rasayan. J. Chem., 3(4): 649-654 (6 pages).
- Karbassi, A.R.; Pazoki, M., (2015). Environmental qualitative assessment of rivers sediments. Global J. Environ. Sci. Manage. 1(2): 109-116 (8 pages).
- Kumar, K.S.; Kumar, R. R., (2011), Analysis of water quality parameters of groundwater near Ambattur Industrial area, Tamil Nadu, India. Indian J. Sci. Tech., 4(5):1732-1736 (5 pages).
- Nagarajan, R.; Rajmohan, N.; Mahendran, U.; Senthamilkumar, S., (2010). Evaluation of groundater quality and its suitability for drinking and agricultural use in Thanjavur city, Tamil Nadu, India, Environ. Monit. Assess., 171(1-4): 289-308 (19 pages).
- Ramakrishna, C. H.; Rao, D.M.; Rao, K. S.; Srinivas, N., (2009) Studies on groundwater quality in slums of Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, Asian J. Chem., 21(6): 4246-4250 (5 pages).
- Saeedi, M.; Abessi, O.; Sharifi, F; Meraji, H., (2010). Development of Ground Water Quality Index, Environ. Monit. Assess. 163: 327-335 (9 pages).
- Shankar, S.; Latha, S., (2008), Assessment of water quality index for the ground water of an industrial area in Bangalore, India. Environ. Eng. Sci., 25(6): 911-916 (6 pages).
- Sharma, S.; Chhipa, R. C.; (2012), Evaluation and optimization of water quality index for ground water source of North West, Jaipur and agglomerates. Int. J. Chem. Sci., 10(4): 2297-2305 (9 pages).
- Sharma, S.; Chhipa, R.C., (2013). Interpretation of ground water quality parameter for selected area of Jaipur using regression and correlation analysis, J. Sci. Ind. Res., 72: 781-783 (3 pages).
- Srivastava, S. K; Ramanathan, A. L.,(2008), Geochemical assessment of groundwater quality in vicinity of Bhalswa landfill, Delhi, India, using graphical and multivariate statistical methods. Environ. Geol. 53: 1509–1528 (20 pages).

Seasonal variations of ground water quality

- Subba, R.N., (2009). Fluoride in groundwater, Varaha River Basin, Visakhapatnam District, Andhra Pradesh, India. Environ. Monit. Assess., 152(1-4): 47-60 (14 pages).
- Yadav, A. K.; Khan, P.; Sharma, S. K., (2010). Water quality index assessment of ground water in Todarai Singh Tehsil of Rajasthan State, India: A greener approach. E–J. Chem., 7 (SI) S428-S432 (5 pages).
- Udayalaxami, G; Himabinda, D; Ramadass, G., (2010). Geochemical evaluation of ground water quality in selected

areas of Hyderabad, A.P. India. Indian J. Sci. Tech. 3 (1-5): 546-553 (8 pages).

- WHO (1996) Guidelines for drinking water quality Vol. II. World Health Organization. Geneva
- Yisa, J.; Jimoh, T; (2010). Analytical studies on water quality index of Landzu River, Nigeria. Am. J. Appl. Sci. 7 (4): 453-458 (6 pages).
- WHO, (1996). Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality Vol. II. World Health Organization. Geneva.

AUTHOR (S) BIOSKETCHES

Sharma, S., Ph.D., Associate Professor Department of Chemistry, Rajasthan Institute of Engineering and Technology, Bhankrota, Jaipur, India. Email: *sonikasharmaindia@gmail.com*

Chhipa, R.C., Ph.D., Assistant Professor Department of Chemistry and Centre for Air and Water Modeling, Suresh Gyan, Vihar University, Jaipur 302 025, India. Email: *cawm@gyanvihar.org*

How to cite this article:

Sharma, S.; Chhipa, R.C., (2016). Seasonal variations of ground water quality and its agglomerates by water quality index. Global J. Environ. Sci. Manage., 2(1): 79-86.

DOI: 10.7508/gjesm.2016.01.009

URL: http://gjesm.net/article_14651_1931.html

