



J. Serb. Chem. Soc. 90 (5) 681–691 (2025)
JSCS–5413

Assessment of water quality in Yapialtın Dam Lake (Sivas, Turkey) during dry and rainy seasons using various parameters and water quality indices

MENEKŞE TAŞ DİVRİK*

Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Şarkışla Aşık Veysel Vocational School, Şarkışla, Sivas, Turkey

(Received 17 September, revised 23 October, accepted 3 December 2024)

Abstract: There are many dam lakes in the Şarkışla district of Sivas, where agricultural activities are intense. Yapialtın Dam Lake, which constitutes our study area, is one of them. The research was conducted at three stations in Yapialtın Dam Lake during the dry season in August 2023 and the rainy season in May 2024. Eighteen physicochemical variables of lake water were measured. The quality of dam lake water was assessed using indices such as the eutrophication index (*EI*), organic pollution index (*OPI*), nutrient pollution index (*NPI*) and water quality index (*WQI*). The similarity of the stations in terms of physicochemical parameters was determined using Bray–Curtis similarity analysis. Additionally, Pearson and Spearman correlation analyses were employed to examine the relationships among the physicochemical data. The analyses revealed seasonal variations in all water quality indices. In conclusion, the study provides recommendations for the sustainable use of the dam lake.

Keywords: environmental variables; reservoir; multivariate analyses.

INTRODUCTION

Dam lakes provide numerous benefits to people, including sources of drinking water, irrigation and hydroelectric power generation. They also play a crucial role in managing river water flow and protecting communities from flood hazards. Additionally, dam lakes offer various recreational opportunities, such as birdwatching, hiking and fishing. Modern dams are strategically important, playing significant roles in energy production, particularly in developing countries.

Eutrophication, acidification and various changes in hydrology and geomorphology are major pressures affecting the integrity of lakes.¹ The excessive input of plant nutrients, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus, into lakes leads to the growth of organic matter, algae, periphyton and macrophytes, resulting in eutrophication. This growth induces changes in aquatic organisms and water quality.²

*Corresponding author. E-mail: menekse.tas@cumhuriyet.edu.tr
<https://doi.org/10.2298/JSC240917109D>

Eutrophication can lead to decreased dissolved oxygen levels in the water, which may cause hypoxia and toxic algal blooms.² Human activities, including domestic and industrial wastewater discharge and agricultural runoff, contribute to physical, chemical and biological pollution of freshwater resources, resulting in a deterioration of water quality. This situation also limits the use of freshwater resources for various purposes.³

However, intensive and excessive use of these areas can harm both the environment and the living organisms that inhabit them.

This study aimed to calculate the water quality indices, such as the eutrophication index (*EI*), organic pollution index (*OPI*), nutrient pollution index (*NPI*) and water quality index (*WQI*), for Yapıaltın Dam Lake, which is used for irrigation purposes. It also sought to evaluate the relationships between these parameters using various statistical methods, identify the factors contributing to the lake's pollution and compare the findings with similar studies conducted in Turkey.

EXPERIMENTAL

The study was conducted at three stations (ST1, ST2 and ST3) during both the dry season 2023 and the rainy season 2024. ST1 represents the relatively clean part of the lake, ST2 is surrounded by pastures where livestock graze and ST3 is situated near agricultural fields. During sampling, water temperature (WT) was measured using a thermometer. Electrical conductivity (*EC*), pH levels and total dissolved solids (TDS) were measured in the field using a portable Hanna HI 98129 instrument. For other physicochemical parameters, water samples were collected with a Nansen water sampler and stored in dark-colored glass bottles with a 1-L capacity.

The water samples brought to the laboratory were immediately prepared for analysis. Dissolved oxygen (DO), calcium and magnesium levels were determined using standard methods.⁴ Chlorides, total hardness (*TH*) and salinity values were measured using conventional titrimetric methods as described in the literature.⁵ Nitrite nitrogen ($\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$), nitrate nitrogen ($\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$), sulfates, phosphates, ammonium nitrogen ($\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$), biochemical oxygen demand (*BOD*₅) and chemical oxygen demand (*COD*) values were also measured according to standards.⁴

The physicochemical parameters of the sampling stations in Yapıaltın Dam Lake were compared using Bray–Curtis cluster analysis in the Biodiversity Pro 2.0 program during both the dry and rainy seasons.⁶ The relationship between physicochemical parameters was examined using Spearman and Pearson correlation analyses conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics version 27.⁷

Water quality indices

The *EI* is employed to assess the trophic condition of a surface water body. *EI* values were calculated using the formula below: If the calculated *EI* value is less than 1, it indicates absence of eutrophication. A value of 1 or greater suggests the presence of eutrophication.^{2,8} *DIN*; dissolved inorganic N (mg L^{-1}), *DIP*; dissolved inorganic P (mg L^{-1}).⁸

$$EI = \frac{COD \times DIN \times DIP}{4500} 10^6 \quad (1)$$

The *OPI* is a tool used to evaluate water pollution, specifically focusing on the organic pollution status of surface water resources. *OPI* values were calculated using the formula below. The value obtained from the *OPI* formula categorizes water quality as follows: <0: excellent water quality; 0–1: good water quality; 1–2: water starting to be polluted; 2–3: slightly polluted water; 3–4: moderately polluted water; >4: heavily polluted water.^{8,9}

COD, *DIN*, *DIP* and *DO* standard concentration values were used for these calculations.^{8,10}

$$OPI = \frac{COD}{COD_S} + \frac{DIN}{DIN_S} + \frac{DIP}{DIP_S} + \frac{DO}{DO_S} \quad (2)$$

The *NPI* is derived from concentrations of NO_3 and PO_4 in surface water sources. It is calculated using the following formula: The resulting *NPI* value categorizes pollution levels as follows: <1 no pollution, 1–3 moderately polluted, 3–6 significantly polluted, >6 very high pollution.^{8,11} NO_3 -N maximum limit ($mg\ L^{-1}$) is named as MAC_N , PO_4 -P maximum limit ($mg\ L^{-1}$) is named as MAC_P , values were taken:^{8,10}

$$NPI = \frac{C_N}{MAC_N} + \frac{C_P}{MAC_P} \quad (3)$$

The *WQI* is a crucial metric for assessing the overall quality of surface water resources. It integrates multiple water quality parameters into a single value.^{8,12} In this study, 10 parameters including *EC*, pH, *DO*, *BOD*₅, *COD*, Cl, NO_3 -N, NO_2 -N, NH_4 -N and SO_4 were used to calculate *WQI* values. It is calculated using the following formula; *n*: total number of selected parameters, C_i the value assigned to *i* parameter; P_i : the relative weight of parameter (1–4).⁸ The values are classified as follows: 0–25 indicates very poor water quality, 26–50 indicates poor water quality, 51–70 indicates moderate water quality, 71–90 indicates good water quality and 91–100 indicates excellent water quality:^{8,12}

$$WQI = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n C_i P_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n P_i} \quad (4)$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study area is discussed, in details, in Supplementary material to this paper.

The station codes, coordinates and information on stations are presented in Supplementary material (Table S-I).

Physicochemical parameters, units, average values and quality classes of the dam lake water according to¹³ and Turkey surface water quality regulation¹⁴ protocols are presented in Supplementary material (Table S-II).

The lowest *WT* measured in the lake was 18 °C (rainy season, ST3), with the highest recorded at 35 °C (dry season, ST2) and an average of 26.4 °C. The lowest *EC* value was 307 $\mu S\ cm^{-1}$ (rainy season, ST3), the highest was 584 $\mu S\ cm^{-1}$ (rainy season, ST2) and the average was 424 $\mu S\ cm^{-1}$. The lowest pH value observed was 7.91 (rainy season, ST1), the highest was 8.20 (dry season, ST1) and the average was 8.05. *BOD*₅ ranged from a minimum of 9.6 $mg\ L^{-1}$ (rainy season, ST2) to a maximum of 30.3 $mg\ L^{-1}$ (dry season, ST3), with an average of

18.15 mg L⁻¹. *COD* values ranged from a minimum of 18 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST3) to a maximum of 64.6 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST3), with an average of 35.66 mg L⁻¹. *TDS* ranged from a minimum of 176 ppm (dry season, ST3) to a maximum of 307 ppm (rainy season, ST3), with an average of 238 ppm. *TSS* ranged from a minimum of 85 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST3) to a maximum of 150 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST1), with an average of 113 mg L⁻¹. The lowest *Cl* measured in the lake was 15.99 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST3), with the highest observed 20.99 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST1) and the average 18.49 mg L⁻¹. Salinity ranged from a minimum of 0.01 ‰ (dry season, ST2) to a maximum of 0.05 ‰ (rainy season, ST2 and ST3), with an average of 0.03 ‰. *Ca* levels ranged from a minimum of 18.84 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST3) to a maximum of 44.88 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST3), with an average of 29.72 mg L⁻¹. *Mg* levels ranged from a minimum of 0.58 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST2) to a maximum of 3.80 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST2), with an average of 1.88 mg L⁻¹.

TH ranged from a minimum of 1 FS° (rainy season, ST3) to a maximum of 11.6 FS° (dry season, ST2), with an average of 6.26 FS°. *NO₃-N* ranged from a minimum of 3.13 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST3) to a maximum of 20.31 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST2), with a mean value of 7.50 mg L⁻¹. *NO₂-N* was not detected in all three stations during the dry season and the highest concentration found was 0.021 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST1), with an average of 0.0065 mg L⁻¹. The lowest *NH₄-N* measured in the lake 0.010 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST3), with the highest recorded 0.034 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST1) and an average was 0.021 mg L⁻¹. *PO₄* ranged from a minimum of 0.79 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST1) to a maximum of 1.80 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST3), with an average of 1.22 mg L⁻¹. *SO₄* ranged from a minimum of 9.89 mg L⁻¹ (rainy season, ST1) to a maximum of 17.51 mg L⁻¹ (dry season, ST1), with an average of 13.53 mg L⁻¹.

When evaluating the dam lake in terms of water quality indices, the highest *EI* was found at ST3 during the rainy season as 32 and the lowest was at ST1 during the dry season as 8. The *OPI* was also highest at ST3 during the rainy season as 15.09 and lowest at ST1 during the dry season as 5.97. The *NPI* was lowest at ST1 during the dry season as 6.53 and highest at ST3 during the rainy season as 15.8. The *WQI* was lowest at ST2 during the dry season as 10.19 and highest at ST3 during the rainy season as 48.83. The change in water quality index values across the stations for dry and rainy seasons is illustrated in Fig. 1.

Pearson correlation analysis was applied to normally distributed variables among the physicochemical parameters of lake water. According to this analysis, strong positive correlations were found between *WT* and *SO₄*, *TDS* and *NO₃-N*. Strong negative correlations were found between *WT* and *TDS*, *NO₃-N* and *TDS*, *WT* and *NO₃-N*, *TDS* and *SO₄* and *NO₃-N* and *TDS*. The table showing the results of the Pearson correlation analysis and the coefficients of variation is provided in Table S-III of the Supplementary material. Values in the table are

denoted as follows: * indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$); ** indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$); and “–” indicates that no statistically significant correlation was detected.




Fig 1. Variation graph of water quality indices.

Pearson correlation analysis was applied to normally distributed variables among the physicochemical parameters of lake water. According to this analysis, strong positive correlations were found between *WT* and SO_4 , TDS and $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$. Strong negative correlations were found between *WT* and TDS, $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ and TDS, *WT* and $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$, TDS and SO_4 and $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ and TDS. The results of the Pearson correlation analysis and the coefficients of variation is provided in Table S-III. Values in the table are denoted as follows: * indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$); ** indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$); and “–” indicates that no statistically significant correlation was detected.

Spearman correlation analysis was applied to the variables that did not show normal distribution among the physicochemical parameters of water. A strong positive correlation was found between *BOD* and *COD*. A negative correlation was found between salinity and *BOD*, as well as between salinity and *COD*, *TH* and *BOD*. The results of the Spearman correlation analysis and the coefficients of variation is provided in Table S-IV. Values in the table are denoted as follows: * indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$); ** indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$); and “–” indicates that no statistically significant correlation was detected.

The similarity of the stations in terms of physicochemical parameters was analysed using Bray–Curtis similarity analysis. It was observed that the similarity between the stations was quite high. In the dry season, ST2 and ST3 showed 99.83 % similarity, with station 1 also clustering with them. The Bray–Curtis similarity dendrogram for the stations is presented in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. Bray–Curtis similarity dendrogram of stations during the dry season.

In the rainy season, the similarity between the stations was quite high. The ST1 and ST2 showed a similarity of 99.92 %, with ST3 clustering with them. The Bray–Curtis similarity dendrogram for the rainy season is shown in Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. Bray–Curtis similarity dendrogram of stations during the rainy season.

In this paper, the analyses conducted at three selected stations in the Yapi-altın dam lake during both dry and rainy seasons are discussed in detail. It was found that the *WT*, *pH*, *COD*, *TDS*, *Cl*, *NO₂-N*, *NH₄-N* and *SO₄* values of the dam lake were within the first class water quality standards.^{13,14} The *EC* value was determined to fall between class I and II water quality standards.^{13,14} The *DO* and *NO₃-N* values of the dam lake water were found to range between class II and III water quality.^{13,14} Additionally, the *BOD₅* value was identified to be within the III class quality range.^{13,14}

It is observed that the water temperature values of the dam lake are higher in summer (dry season). This variation may be attributed to seasonal temperature

changes. The *WT* is a critical climatic factor that enhances biological activity rates and reduces oxygen saturation.¹⁵ The *DO* values of the lake also exhibited significant differences between dry and rainy seasons. The solubility of oxygen in water increases as temperature decreases.¹⁶ In this study, it can be observed that the lowest *DO* values were recorded during the dry season when temperatures were highest, whereas the highest *DO* values were observed in the rainy season when temperatures were lowest (Table S-II).

The pH value of the lake was determined to be alkaline. It was observed that *TDS* levels were low during the dry season and high during the rainy season (Table S-II). Precipitation is likely the primary reason for this variation, as rain-water runoff carries dissolved solids into the lake. It has been noted that water conductivity values vary based on geological structure and precipitation levels, rather than nutrient salts in the water.¹⁷ Specifically, conductivity in the dam lake was lowest only in ST3 during the rainy season. It is recognized that regions with high rainfall generally have less saline surface waters due to continuous soil washing.¹⁵ The salinity values were found to be higher in the rainy season compared to the dry season, with minimal difference in Cl values.

The Ca levels in the water were higher than the Mg levels, which may be attributed to the geological composition of the lake. During the rainy season, Ca levels peaked in ST1 and ST3 (Table S-II). In terms of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ values, they were classified as water quality class I and II during the dry season, while in ST2 they reached class III during the rainy season. This variation could be linked to livestock grazing near ST2, with animal feces potentially contributing to increased $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ levels in that area. $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$ values were found in first class water quality. PO_4 content of the lake was found to be quite low.

SO_4 levels were higher during the dry season and lower during the rainy season. This seasonal variation is expected and can be attributed to the dilution effect of rainfall during the rainy season.

The *BOD* represents the amount of oxygen consumed by bacteria and other microorganisms when decomposing organic matter under aerobic conditions at a given temperature.¹⁸ The *COD* is the amount of oxygen required for the oxidation of organic matter and inorganic chemicals. The *COD* value is higher than the *BOD* value.¹⁹ In the study, *COD* values were higher than *BOD* values.

In this study, it was found that the water quality level indices obtained from the results of *EI*, *OPI*, *NPI* and *WQI* calculated using parameters other than *WT*, *TDS*, *TSS*, Cl, salinity, Ca, Mg and *TH* were very similar to each other. When evaluated in terms of indices, since *EI* values ≥ 1 in all stations, it is seen that there is eutrophication in the lake both in dry and rainy seasons. Since the *OPI* values were > 4 , the lake was found to be extremely organically polluted. Since the *NPI* values were > 6 in the seasons and all stations examined in the lake, it was found that there was very high pollution. ST1 in dry season and ST1 and

ST3 in rainy season were found to have poor water quality, while the other stations were found to have very poor water quality in dry and rainy seasons. During the dry season, all three stations were found to have extremely poor water quality. An increase in dam lake water temperature leads to higher evaporation from the dam lake's surface, which lowers the lake level and alters the water quality.²⁰ It was determined that ST2 had very poor water quality during the rainy season. During this period, ST1 and ST3 were found to have poor water quality. According to all index results, eutrophication was observed in the lake and overall, the lake had poor water quality. During the rainy season, the increase in rainfall on the lake's surface can lead to changes in the amount of water in the lake, which may affect the water quality of the dam lake.

According to the Bray–Curtis dendrogram, the highest similarity rates between ST1 and ST2 occurred during the rainy season. The primary reason for this could be the absence of factors affecting these stations during this season. In contrast, ST3, situated near agricultural areas, experiences heavy pesticide use during May fertilization period. These pesticides can be transported via irrigation or rainwater into the lake, altering its physicochemical parameters and distinguishing it from other stations. In the dry season, ST2 and ST3 exhibited the highest similarity rates. The primary reason for this could be attributed to several factors: firstly, the high rate of water evaporation from the lake due to warming weather conditions, leading to a decrease in lake water levels. Additionally, water withdrawal from the lake for irrigation purposes in agricultural areas near the ST3 further reduces the lake's water volume, thereby increasing the concentration of physicochemical substances in the remaining water. Furthermore, around the ST2, grazing of animals may contribute to the transport of animal feces into the water. This, coupled with pesticides applied to nearby agricultural areas, can lead to changes in the physical, chemical and biological composition of the lake water.

When comparing this study with previous research conducted in lakes²¹ we utilized the *WQI* based on 13 water quality parameters in the Kastamonu Karaçomak dam lake. They found that *WQI* values varied from poor to excellent water quality, attributing these variations to seasonal changes and surface runoff in the downstream area, which contributed to water quality degradation. It is noted that the *EC*, *BOD*, *COD*, $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$, $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ and $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$ values measured in this current study are consistent with their findings. When comparing this study with the findings of ²² on four dam lakes in Poland, several similarities and differences are noted. In their study,²² it was found that *WQI* values ranged between moderate and poor. Specifically DO ratios were higher in our current study compared to their findings. *EC* values were similar between both studies. $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ values were lower in this current study. SO_4 and Ca values were higher in this current study. Mg values were comparable between the two studies. These com-

parisons suggest both similarities and variations in water quality parameters between the two studies conducted in different dam lakes.

Researchers have conducted an analysis of 17 water quality parameters by sampling water from a dam lake in Mexico across different months.²³ The study revealed several key findings: they found no significant difference in *WQI* values between the selected stations within the dam. They observed seasonal variations in *WQI*, indicating that water quality varied throughout the year. The categorization of water quality varied from poor in some months to moderate and to good in others, also moderate to poor in other months. These findings underscore the dynamic nature of water quality in dam lake ecosystems, influenced by seasonal changes and possibly local environmental conditions. Comparisons with their study can provide valuable insights into the variability and factors affecting water quality assessments in different geographical contexts.

Also, a research conducted an assessment of water quality by calculating the *WQI* using 22 physicochemical parameters from waters sampled from Mumcular and Geyik dam lakes, as well as Çamköy underground wells.²⁴ The study reported finding very low *WQI* values, indicating poor water quality. Specifically, the dam lakes evaluated, which are used as sources of drinking water, were identified as requiring treatment before use to meet quality standards. This highlights the importance of ongoing monitoring and treatment processes to ensure safe drinking water supply from these sources.

The studies provide various information to examine whether the dam lakes are suitable for the purpose for which they will be used. The common point seen in all studies is that water quality parameters vary seasonally. In the studies, various suggestions are also given about the purpose for which the dam water can be used or not. In this study, various recommendations on the sustainable use of the dam lake were summarised in the conclusion section.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study analysed water samples collected from three stations in Yapialtın Dam Lake, during both dry and rainy seasons. Significant relationships were identified regarding seasonal variations in water quality indices. It was observed that agricultural activities and livestock breeding near water sources could lead to reductions in water quality parameters, potentially shifting from class I to class III water quality standards.

To ensure the sustainable use of the dam lake, regular monitoring of water quality is crucial. Additionally, assessments for toxic metals, microbiological contaminants, pesticides and algal biodiversity are recommended. These measures are essential for maintaining and improving water quality standards, safeguarding both ecological health and the suitability of the dam lake as a water resource.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Additional data and information are available electronically at the pages of journal website: <https://www.shd-pub.org.rs/index.php/JSCS/article/view/13049>, or from the corresponding author on request.

ИЗВОД

ПРОЦЕНА КВАЛИТЕТА ВОДЕ У ЈЕЗЕРУ YAPIALTIN DAM (СИВАС, ТУРСКА) ТОКОМ СУШНИХ И КИШНИХ СЕЗОНА, КОРИШЋЕЊЕМ РАЗЛИЧИТИХ ПАРАМЕТАРА И ИНДЕКСА КВАЛИТЕТА ВОДЕ

MENEKŞE TAŞ DİVRİK

Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Şarkışla Aşık Veysel Vocational School, Şarkışla, Sivas, Turkey

Постоји много језера насталих изградњом брана у округу Şarkışla у Сивасу, где су пољопривредне активности интензивне. Језеро Yarıaltın Dam, које чини подручје нашег истраживања, је једно од њих. Истраживање је спроведено на три станице у језеру Yarıaltın Dam током сушне сезоне у августу 2023. и кишне сезоне у мају 2024. Измерено је осамнаест физичко-хемијских варијабли језерске воде. Квалитет воде у језерским бранама је процењен коришћењем индекса као што су индекс еутрофикације (EI), индекс органског загађења (OPI), индекс загађења нутријентима (NPI) и индекс квалитета воде (WQI). Сличност станица у погледу физичко-хемијских параметара утврђена је помоћу Bray–Curtis анализе сличности. Поред тога, коришћене су Пирсонове и Спирманове корелационе анализе да би се испитале везе између физичко-хемијских података. Анализе су откриле сезонске варијације у свим индексима квалитета воде. У закључку, студија даје препоруке за одрживо коришћење језера насталих изградњом бране.

(Примљено 17. септембра; ревидирано 23. октобра; прихваћено 3. децембра 2024.)

REFERENCES

1. J. Young, A. Watt, P. Nowicki, D. Alard, J. Clitherow, K. Henel, R. Johnson, E. Laczko, D. McCracken, S. Matouch, J. Niemela, C. Richards, *Conserv. Biol.* **14** (2005) 1641 (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-004-0536-z>)
2. C. W. Chen, Y. R. Ju, C. F. Chen, C. D. Dong, *Int. Biodeterior. Biodeg.* **113** (2016) 318 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibiod.2016.03.024>)
3. V. Kumar, A. Sharma, R. Kumar, R. Bhardwaj, K.A. Thukral, J. Rodrigo-Comino, *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess* **26** (2020) 1 (<https://doi.org/10.1080/10807039.2018.1497946>)
4. *APHA Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater*, American Public Health Association, Washington DC, 1999
5. O. Egemen, U. Sunlu, *Water quality*, Ege University Fisheries Faculty, Issue number: 14, İzmir, 1999, p.150 (in Turkish)
6. N. McAleece, J. D. G. Gage, P. J. D. Lambshead, G. L. J. Paterson, *BioDiversity professional statistic analysis software*, Jointly developed by the Scottish Association for Marine Science and the Natural History Museum, London, 1997
7. C. J. Krebs, *Ecological Methodology*, Benjamin/Cummings, San Francisco, CA, 1999
8. M. Varol, C. Tokatlı, *Chemosphere* **311** (2023) 137096 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2022.137096>)
9. P. Barnwal, S. Mishra, S. K. Singhal, *J. Int. Sci. Technol.* **3** (2015) 22 (<https://pubs.iscience.in/journal/index.php/jist/article/view/266/149>)

10. *TSWQR, Turkish Surface Water Quality Regulation*, Official Gazette No. 29797, 2016, Turkey
11. B. O. Isiuku, C. E. Enyoh, *Environ. Adv.* **2** (2020) 100018 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envadv.2020.100018>)
12. M. Varol, *Environ. Pollut.* **266** (2020) 115417 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115417>)
13. *SKKY, Su Kirliliği Kalite Kontrol Yönetmeliği*, Resmi Gazete Sayısı: 25687, 2004, Türkiye (in Turkish)
14. *TSWQR, Turkish Surface Water Quality Regulation*, Official Gazette No. 31513, 2021, Turkey
15. B. Taş, *Ekoloji* **15** (2006) 6
16. S. Çirik Ş. Çirik, *Limnoloji III*. Baskı, No. 21, Ege Üniversitesi Basımevi, İzmir, 1999
17. M. K. Temponeras, J. Kristiansen, M. Moustaka-Gouni, *Hydrobiologia* **424** (2000) 109 (<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003909229980>)
18. G. C. Delzer, S. W. McKenzie, in *U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations, Book 9: Handbooks for Water-Resources Investigations*, D. N. Myers, F. D. Wilde, Eds., USGS TWRI Book 9-A7 (Third Edition), USGS, Washington DC, 2003
19. *PEDIAA: Difference Between BOD and COD* (<https://pediaa.com/difference-between-bod-and-cod/>) (visited 17.08.2024)
20. Ž. Brkić, *Heliyon* **9** (2023) e19248 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e19248>)
21. I. B. Imneisi, M. Aydin, *J. Environ. Anal. Toxicol.* **6** (2016) 407 (<https://doi.org/10.4172/2161-0525.1000407>)
22. I. Cymes, K. Glińska-Lewczuk, *J. Elem.* **4** (2016) 1211 (<https://doi.org/10.5601/jelem.2016.21.2.1200>)
23. C. D. L. Mora-Orozco, H. Flores- Lopez, H. Rubio-Arias, A. Chavez- Duran, J. Ochoa-Rivero, *Int. J. Env. Res. Pub. Health* **14** (2017) 439 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14050439>)
24. C. Koç, *J. Eng. Sci.* **7** (2018) 694 (<https://doi.org/10.28948/ngumuh.444731>).