ASSESSMENT OF WATER QUALITY IN IN SALINE TRACT OF PURNA VALLEY IN VIDARBHA REGION

ABSTRACT

Commented [h1]: Abstract needs to be rewritten to reflect values for parameters measured

Identification and management of the groundwater quality are of utmost importance for maintaining freshwater resources in arid and semi-arid areas, which is essential for sustainable development. The investigation was carried out to assess the quality of irrigation water in saline tract of Purna valley in Akola and Daryapur tehsil. Forty water samples from open wells, Borewell, Farm Pond and River were collected in post monsoon season (winter). It was observed that, the irrigation water in Purna valley having very high salinity and medium sodium hazard (C_4S_2) during post monsoon (winter) season. Amongst cations, sodium was dominant in water samples. The anionic composition was below the permissible limit, except bicarbonates. The sodium adsorption ratio was close to the permissible limit and Mg:Ca ratio all water samples during post monsoon (winter) ~~season found~~season found to be disturbed. The adjusted sodium adsorption ratio was above the permissible limit. As per Kelley's ratio most of the water samples were above the limit, while the samples collected from well, farm ponds and rivers were within the permissible limit. The residual sodium bicarbonate of water collected from borewell were above permissible limit. Whereas, the soluble sodium percentage of the all irrigation water samples were found above permissible limit. The magnesium adsorption of water ratio is lower than the permissible range. Hence, the borewell water was not advisable to use consistently for irrigation.

Key Words- Saline tract, Borewell, Other irrigation sources

Introduction

Characteristics of irrigation water define its quality~~. It vary~~ and these vary with the source of water. There are regional differences in water characteristics, based mainly on geology and climate. There may be also great differences in quality of water depending on whether and the source of water bodies (rivers and ponds) or from groundwater aquifers with varying geology. The chemical constituents of irrigation water can affect plant growth directly through toxicity or deficiency or indirectly by altering availability of nutrients (Ayers and Westcot, 1985).

The total geographical area of Maharashtra is 307.58 lakh ha spread over in thirty six districts. During the year 2016-17, the gross cropped area in the state was about 232.24 lakh ha while net area sown was 169.10 lakh ha. The forests area was about 20.1 per cent of geographical area. The irrigated area in command area under the jurisdiction of Water Resources Department, GoM was 39.50 lakh ha in 2017-18. In India 51 per cent of irrigation is provided through while in Maharashtra the same is about 56 percent and by canal is about 23 percent (Anonymous, 2010).

Central Ground Water Board is monitoring ground water quality in Akola district for the last four decades through monitoring wells. The objectives behind the monitoring are to develop an overall picture of ground water quality of the district. During the year 2011, the Board has carried out ground water quality by monitoring 27 wells. These wells mainly consist of dug wells representing shallow aquifer. The parameters analyzed include pH, Electrical Conductivity (EC), Total Alkalinity (TA), Total Hardness (TH), Nitrate (NO_3) and Fluoride (F). The sample collection, preservation, storage, transportation and analysis were carried out as per the standard methods given in the manual of American Public Health Association for the Examination of Water and Waste water (APHA, 1998). The ground water quality data thus generated was first checked for completeness and then the validation of data was carried out using standard checks. Subsequently, interpretation of data was carried out to develop overall picture of ground water quality in the district in the year 2011. Ground water quality was good and suitable for drinking and irrigation purpose, however localized nitrate contamination was observed.

Land degradation is widespread problem in India. The estimates of land area affected by different soil degradative processes includes 33 M ha by water erosion, 11 M ha by wind erosion, 3 M ha by fertility decline, 8 M ha by water logging and 7 M ha by salinization. Salt affected soils in Vidarbha occurs mainly in Purna valley which covers part of Amravati, Akola and Buldhana districts on both sides of the Purna river. Around 10-45 km in width and 150 km in length. This tract spreads both sides of Purna river influencing about 892 villages, covering about 4692 sq.km area. The landform is mainly plain. The soils are fine textured with imperfect to poor drainage and high water holding capacity. The clay content ranges from 52-70%. The pHs, ECe and ESP ranges from 7.7 to 9.4, 0.90 to 5.20 dSm^{-1} and 2.57 to 33.78% respectively. The soils are mostly normal at surface horizons and problem of salinity/sodicity increases with depth (Padole *et al*., 1998). In Maharashtra, total irrigated area is 4.2 m ha which accounts to 19.6% of the gross cultivated land. Vidarbha covers 14.1% of its land under irrigation (0.7 m ha). Amravati district of Vidarbha is spread over 12,210 sq. km, with 6.9 lakh ha area under cultivation and 0.9 lakh ha irrigated area (14.1%).

Purna valley is unique tract in Vidarbha, having combination of three fold problems like the native salinity/sodicity, poor drainability and poor quality ground water. The unique feature of salt affected soils of Purna valley is, though salinity is widely reported in this tract, presence of salts on surface is hardly seen (Anonymous, 2010). Exchangeable sodium content, poor physical condition and nutrient deficiency are the major constraints in these soils.

Despite many limitations once ameliorated using gypsum, sodic soils are used successfully for growing tolerant crops (Anonymous, 2010).

Chemical degradation of soils of the Purna valley in terms of increase in exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP) and exchangeable magnesium percentage (EMP) with depth has adversely affected the hydraulic and other properties important for crop growth. The soils of the Purna valley have been extensively studied during 1990–1993 by several workers. The salinity and/or sodicity problems are diagnosed in these soils, although most of the soils have good production potential. In view of the climate change during the Holocene period coupled with intensified agricultural practices, it becomes imperative to monitor the land degradation periodically to develop strategies for land development. In this context, it was proposed to conduct the present study by interpreting the soil datasets studied earlier. The Department of Agriculture, Government of Maharashtra has delineated a strip of 15 to 20 km (*kharpatta*) wide and 90–100 km long, along the Purna River as salt-affected. It is obvious that a river or any natural drainage helps in reducing salts. However, the present observation is contrary to the general understanding. According to earlier reports, the soils of the Purna valley are neither saline, and sodic nor saline-sodic according to the criteria suggested by the US Salinity Laboratory Staff, still they have severe drainage problems following irrigation and/or rains, which affects the cultivation of crops in the rainy season. This condition becomes more severe if the soils are irrigated with the river or well water. Nimkar *et al.* reported the development of sodicity in the surface and accumulation of salts in the surface soil when well water was used for irrigation. Precise pedogenic processes responsible for sodification are not known that lead to poor drainage, nor is there any comprehensive information about the extent of this problem and the suitability of water for irrigation. Many researchers who had worked in the Purna valley and similar soils concluded that considerable part of these soils has the problem of internal drainage along with accumulation of salts in the sub-surface horizons and are prone to water-logging. The salinity and/or sodicity of these soils pose major constraint in the attempt to conserve these soils. Poor drainage condition is the root cause of many problems. Due to poor drainage, salts have accumulated in the soils and further aggravated by the application of poor quality irrigation water. Indiscriminate use of irrigation water for getting higher yield has led to water logging, nutrient losses and increased salinization of lands that were once fertile; and this threatens the sustainability of crop yields. Groundwater in the Purna valley occurs under the phreatic, semi-confined and confined conditions. The depth of the water table generally varies from 3 to 25 m below ground level. The average annual recharge to the groundwater is approximately 8% of the average annual rainfall. Groundwater is highly

Commented [h2]: Not in the reference list, only Nimka (1990) and not Nimka et al., as stated brackish. Exceptionally high salinity was of marine origin as a result of incursion of a stretch of sea water into the Purna sub-basin. However, this water does not have a source with very high salts because the ratios of major anions and cations in this saline water are not the same as those of sea water and this water is digenetically altered meteoric water with a long residence time, as is evident from high Na/ (Ca + Mg) ratio, negative indices of the base exchange and high SiO_2 content.

Hence, considering the boundaries for crop diversification, higher yield and soil improvement are very narrow in Purna valley. Therefore, considering the possibility of supplemental irrigation and to explore the initiatives for crop divergence, the available water resources can be trapped and they can be judiciously used for maximization of crop yield.

Commented [h3]: The aim or intentions of the research article is not clearly stated here.

Materials and Methods

Study Area

The Purna river has a drainage area of 2431 km^2 and its travels 180 km before joining with Arabian sea. Navsari city is located in southern Gujarat and is situated on the bank of the Purna river, within a few kilometres of the river's delta, which is west of the city and empties into the Gulf of Khambhat. Its immediate banks are mostly liable to flooding. This enormous catchment area is often tagged as a sub-basin of Godavari river and along with its tributaries forms a dendritic drainage pattern. (Fig. 1). It is located at It lies between 20°42'26.02" to 77°00'10" North latitudes and East longitudes and falls in survey of India Toposheet 55-A, 55-C, 55-D and 55-P. The district covers a total geographical area of 9670 sq.km. While Daryapur is the adjoining tehsil to Akola lies in Amravati district and falls in Survey of India Toposheet. . It is at an altitude of 925 ft (287m) to 1036.745 ft (316m) above sea level. The area is covered by mainly two formations i.e. Deccan Basalt and recent Alluvium. Alluvium is consisting of boulder, sand, silt and clay. The clayey and silty alluvium deposited all along the river Purna on both Northern & Southern side of Saline tract. It covers about 330 villages i.e. about 1/3 villages of the district. The Alluvial Tract lying between Satpura hills & saline tract is covered by Boulder Alluvium & sweet water (Alluvial) zone. The total area covered by alluvium is 1864 sq. km. The Igneous formations comprise 90 % of the aerial distribution of rock types in the catchments, which consist of Hard compact massive Basalt., Vesicular Zeolitic Basalt, Fractured and jointed basalt. and Weathered Basalt.

Commented [h4]: This figure was not provided

Commented [h5]: Do you mean underlain by ?

Commented [h6]: This word relates to inflight or airborne, please rephrase to better present your thoughts.

Sampling and analytical methods

FourtyForty ground water samples were collected from well, bore well, Farm pond and river from villages viz. Ghusar, Apatapa, Ambikapur, Siloda, Ugava, Katyar, Mhaisang, Ganori, Gandhigram from Akola and Ramgad, Karatkhed, Chandikapur, Khalar, Ramtirth, Dongargaon from Daryapur tehsil of Amravarti District in Purna valley accordingly analyzed for various parameters at Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Dr. P.D.K.V., Akola during 2019-2020.

The high d.ensitydensity PVC bottles were used for sampling. They were thoroughly cleaned by rinsing with 8N HNO. and deionized rvater followed by reieated washing with water sarnple as suggested by De (1989). BeforiBefore sampling from a well, water was purnped pumped out sufficiently so that the sample represents the ground rvater from which the well is fed (Raghunath, 1990). The bottles were kept air tight ancl labeled properly for identification. Aeration during sampling was avoided by stoppering the bottle quickly. The samples were brought to the laboratory by using an icebox, and stored at 4 °C until the physiochemical parameters were analyzed. The in situ parameters pH, temperature (degrees Celsius) and electrical conductivity were measured immediately while sampling using a field kit. Furthermore, the samples were filtered through 0.45-µm-size fiber glass filters to remove suspended particles in the laboratory and then analyzed by using standard methods The EC and pH were determine as per methods described by Richards (1954).Ionic TDS was sirnply determined by rnultiplying the measured EC values (in iS/cm) by 0.64 as there exists an approximate relation between EC and TDS

For most natural water in the range of 100 to5000 iS/cm leading to the equivalencies 1 me1- of cations = 100 iµS/crn and 1 mel-r= 1.56 iµS/cm (Todd, 1980)' $Na^+$and K^+were determinecl by flame photometry (Jaqkson, 1967); Ca^{2+} $Mg^{2+}$and B by visible spectrophotometry (Jackson, 1967 and Page et al., 1989); Cl-and HCO. the by titration method (Jackson, 1967).The sodium adsorption ratio (SAR) was by the equation using the values obtained for,Ca^{2+}, Mg^{2+} in mel-r (Richards, 1954).; the soluble sodium percentage (SSP) was determined by the equation using the values obtained for Na^+,K^+, Ca^{2+},It Mg^{2+} in mel'r (Todd, 1980); the residual sodium carbonate (RSC) was deterrnined by the equation using the values obtained for CO., HCO. Irl melr (Eaton, 1950). The Kelly's ratio was dcterrnined by the equation using the values obtained for Na^+, Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} in mel' I (Kelly, 1 953). Adj.R Na^+ was detennined by the equation using the values obtained for Na , Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} in mel'r (Suarez, 1981). The permeability index was calculated according to Doneen (1964) by using values obtained for HCO'.,Na^+, Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+}. The residual sodium bicarbonate was caiculated according to Gupta and Gupta

Commented [h7]: Do you mean water?

Commented [h8]: Don't know this word

Commented [h9]: You mean.... water sample or water to be sampled?

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [h10]: You mean...and labelled?

Commented [h11]: The right notation is µS/cm. you can find this symbol under—insert—symbols in Word document.

(1987). Chloro Alkaline Indices ratio was determined by the equation using the values obtained for Na^{+}, K^{+} and Cl in meql

Commented [h12]: Please write out the equation

Commented [h13]: Milliequivalent is written as meqL-1.

Results and Discussion

Cation

The calcium content in bore well water was 4.6 to 6.9 meL^{-1} in analyzed samples from villages, which was within the normal range of 0-20 meL^{-1} however, the calcium content from other sources of irrigation was 4.3 to 5.6 meL^{-1} . The concentration of magnesium was 3.0 to 5.4 meL^{-1} in borewell water and the magnesium content in other sources of irrigation was in the range of 2.9 to 4.1 meL^{-1}. Some villages were beyond permissible limit (0-5 meL^{-1}) in respect of water collected from borewell water except other sources of irrigation where it was within safe limit which indicates that the higher concentration of magnesium in irrigation water can increase the soil pH. While the sodium concentration in bore well water was in between 10.18 to 16.35 $meL^{-1}$and from other sources was in the range of 8.21 to 13.8 meL^{-1}.The sodium content in borewell water was lower than that of other sources of irrigation. The sodium content was more than the permissible limit, which may cause dispersion in soil

The potassium concentration was very low in the bore well water above permissible limit and it was in between 0.09 to 0.22 meL^{-1} whereas, in other sources of irrigation it ranges between 0.09 to 0.18 meL^{-1}. These results were supported by the findings of Muhamtnad et.al (2013), Kamlesh Kumar et al. (2015) and Jadhao et al., (2016) who reported that the concentration of potassium in water is very low to low . In a nut shell it can be concluded that the sodium was the dominant cation in irrigation water followed by calcium, magnesium and potassium. The dominancy of Na^{+} over Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+}may be one of the geological cause for development of native sodicity in Purna valley soil. Babhulkar et al, (2009). Jadhao et al., (2016). Whereas The irrigation water that has high sodium content can bring about a displacement of exchangeable cation $Ca^{2+}$and Mg^{2+} from the clay minerals of the soil, followed by the replacement of the cations by sodium. Islam and Shamsad, (2009). Jadhao et al., (2016).

Commented [h14]: Poorly written reference. If it's a compound name, please present as Kamlesh-Kumar et al., (2015)

Anions

The bicarbonate concentration in borewell water was in the range of 8.6 to15.3 meL^{-1} while, bicarbonate concentration in water from other sources of irrigation was in the range of 7.7 to 12.3 meL^{-1}. Most of the values in respect of bicarbonates of water sample from both sources fall into "slight to moderate" and "severe" degree of restriction to use (UCCC, 1974). The

Commented [h15]: Not in your reference list.

bicarbonate content can bring about a change in soluble sodium percentage in irrigation water which, regulates the sodium hazards (Adhikary and Biswas, 2011). Jadhao et al., (2016). The chloride content in irrigation water from borewell was varied from 3.6 to 14.4 meL^{-1} and from other sources was varied 2.6 to 12.2 meL^{-1}. The values of chloride exceeds the permissible limit of 4 meL^{-1} which indicates the impact of settlement and anthropogenic effect. Adhikary and Biswas, (2011) Jadhao et al., (2016). also reported that the chloride content normally ~~increase~~increases as the mineral content increase and may ~~reduced~~reduce phosphorus availability to plants.

Whereas, the concentration of sulphate was in between 2.1 to 14.6 meL^{-1} from bore well and 1.2 to 10.2 meL^{-1} from other sources of irrigation, which was within the higher than permissible limit given by Richards (1954). Sulphate is relatively common in irrigation water and has no major effect on the soil other than contributing to the total salt content. Irrigation water high in sulphate ion reduced phosphorus availability to plants (Khalil *et al.* 2010) and Jadhao et al., (2016)

Sodium adsorption ratio (SAR)

Sodium adsorption ratio was in the range of 4.19 to 7.83 mmol$^{1/2}$L$^{-1/2}$ and other sources of irrigation ranges from 3.91 to 7.17 mmol$^{1/2}$L$^{-1/2}$. As per the criteria given by Richards (1954) sodium adsorption ratio in the villages were within the permissible limit and irrigation water samples fall under low to medium sodium hazards class i.e. S_1 class and slightly useful for irrigation. High sodium adsorption ratio in any irrigation water implies hazards of sodium (Alkali) replacing Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} of the soil through cation exchange process, a situation eventually damaging of soil structure like permeability which ultimately affect the fertility of soil and reduce crop yield Gupta, (2005) and Jadhao et al., (2016)..

Residual Sodium Carbonate (RSC)

The residual sodium carbonate content of borewell water and it was in the range of 0.3 to 3.6 meL^{-1} which was classified under high as per criteria of suitability of irrigation water given by Richards (1954).Whereas the RSC of water collected from other sources of irrigation was in the range of 0.2 to 2.6 meL^{-1} which is unsuitable for irrigation above 2.5. Water contains appreciable quantity of carbonate, bicarbonate, calcium and magnesium which precipitate down when the concentration of soil solution increase through evapotranspiration Eaton, (1950), Jadhao et al., (2016).

Commented [h16]: Poorly referenced, should be written as (Easton, 1950; Jadhao et al., 2016).

Magnesium: Calcium Ratio (Mg:Ca)

The data showed that the values of the Mg^{2+}/Ca^{2+} ranged between 0.65 to 0.79 with an average value of 0.72, indicate that these water samples were in suitable category for irrigation purpose. The high magnesium: calcium ratio increases the exchangeable magnesium on soil exchange complex and build up magnesium calcium ratio in the soil which increases with increase in the magnesium calcium ratio in the ground water. Proportion of magnesium over calcium in ground water enhances sodification of soils at given sodium adsorption ratio and electrical conductivity. The crop yield is affected adversely as magnesium calcium ratio in the ground water when it exceeds 2.0. Similar results were reported by Girdhar and Yadav (2004) and Kanaskar (2007). High Mg^{2+}/Ca^{2+} ratio can increase precipitation of calcium, phosphates and carbonates which are less soluble than their magnesium counterparts Fatemi,(2015) Jadhao et al., (2016)..

Commented [h17]: Poorly referenced

Adjusted Sodium Absorption Ratio (SAR)

The adjusted sodium adsorption ratio of borewell water was in range of 4.72 to 9.46 whereas, the Adjusted SAR from other sources of irrigation was 4.83 to 9.41. The coefficient of variance of Adj. SAR of borewell water was lower than other sources of irrigation which indicate there is variation of adjusted SAR in water sample. The presence of bicarbonate and carbonate ions in the ground water increases the permeability hazard as quantified by sodium adsorption ratio (Bauder *et.al*. 2011). The adj. SAR measures the water sodium level against calcium and magnesium, while adjusting the effect of bicarbonates and carbonate ion, these ions causes the calcium ions precipitate and resulting in high sodicity. Ayers, (1985) and Jadhao et al., (2016).

Adj. R_{Na}

The Adj. R_{Na} of borewell water was in the range of 6.52 to 8.37 and that of other sources having range of 5.36 to 7.77. The Adj. R_{Na} can be used to predict more correctly potential infiltration problem due to relatively high sodium (or low calcium) in ground supplies and can be substituted for sodium adsorption ratio which is concern to the standards for Adj. R_{Na}. The concept regarding sodium hazards from irrigation water developed by Bower and Massland (1963) is being used to predict the effect of sodium hazard on soil properties which in turn affect plant growth and yield.

Kelley's Ratio (KR)

Sodium problem in irrigation water could very conveniently be worked out on the basis of the values of Kelley's ratio (Kelly, 1953). Kelley's ratio more than 1 indicates an excess level of sodium in water. In the present study In the present study, values of Kelley's ratio of borewell water was in the range of 0.8 to 1.8 and that of irrigation water collected from other sources was in the range of 0.9 to 1.8 this ratio clearly indicate that out of ~~fourty~~forty sample twenty seven sample are unfit and thirteen sample for suitable for irrigation.

Permeability Index (PI)

In the present study the minimum and maximum permeability of bore well water was 62.0 to 78.4% and PI of other sources 66.2 to 78.6% hence, as per the permeability index the collected water samples were suitable for irrigation from other sources of irrigation. The soil permeability is affected by long term use of irrigation water and sodium, calcium, magnesium content in the soil (Raju et. al., 2007). The water is classified in class I and class II according to Doneen's criteria (1964). Permeability Index can be categorized in three classes: class I (>75%, suitable), class II (25–75%, good) and class III (<25%, unsuitable). Water under class I and class II ~~is~~are recommended for irrigation (Doneen, 1964 and Raghunath, 1990).

Chloro Alkaline Indices-lon (CAI - I)

The water sample collected from various villages from Akola and Daryapur tehsils shown negative values of CAI-I which proves the base exchange reaction indicates that exchange between sodium and potassium in water with calcium and magnesium in the rock by a type of base exchange reactions Raju *et al*. (2007) and Jadhao et al (2016).

Residual Sodium Bicarbonate (RSBC)

The residual sodium bicarbonate in collected borewell water samples was recorded and in the range of 3.9 to 8.7 meL^{-1} while, samples from other sources ranges between 3.2 to 6.7 meL$^{-1.}$ As per the criteria all water samples ~~was~~were above permissible limit and unsafe for irrigation. The residual sodium bicarbonate values were greater than 3.0 meL^{-1} and are therefore considered as unsafe for irrigation purpose.

Magnesium Adsorption Ratio (MAR)

The magnesium adsorption ratio of irrigation water collected from borewells were in the range of 37.73 to 44.34 and from other sources were in the range of 39.18 to 48.19. Indicating that all collected water samples were below acceptable range i.e. below 50. Magnesium content in well water is considered as one of the most important qualitative criteria in determining the quality of water for irrigation. Generally, calcium and magnesium maintain a state of equilibrium in most waters. More magnesium in water will adversely affect crop yield as the soil become more saline (Joshi *et al*, 2009).

Soluble Sodium Percentage (SSP)

The soluble sodium percentage values of studied borewell water samples was in range of 46.6 to 65.5% and that of water samples from other sources ranges from 48.6 to 65.3% On the basis of soluble sodium percentage, the irrigation water samples were above permissible limit.

Conclusion

From this study it can be concluded that the irrigation water collected from various water sources in Akola and Daryapur tehsils during post monsoon season categorized under high salinity and medium sodium hazard class i.e.C_4S_2. Therefore, while irrigating the crops, it is advocated to prefer other sources of irrigation. However, under unavoidable circumstances, the borewell water can be blend with other sources.

References

Anonymous, 2010. Soil resource management for sustainable soil health and food security state level seminar held at a Dr. P.D.K.V, Akola, 2-3 Jan. pp 138-144.

Adhikary, P.P and H. Biswas, 2011. Geospatial assessment of ground water quality in Datia district of Bundelkhand. Indian Journal of Soil concservation.39(2), 108-116.

APHA, 1998. (American Public Health Association) . Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater, 20th Edn. Washington DC: APHA.

Ayers, R.S. and D.W. Westcot, 1985. Water quality for agriculture FAO irrigation and drain. Paper No 29(1) : 1-109.

Bhumbla, D.R. and I.P. Abrol, 1972. Is your water suitable for irrigation Indian Farming. 22 : 15-17.

Babhulkar, V.P., S.S. Balpande, P.R. Kadu and Madhumita G. Mande, 2009. Soil and water characteristics and their relationships in Purna valley tract of Vidarbha region. *Journal on Soils and Crops*. 19(2) : 329-332.

Bajarang Bali, B.L. Kumawat, Ajeet Singh and Rahul Chopra, 2015, Evaluation of ground water in Sriganganagar district of Rajasthan. The ecoscan, 9 (l&2): 133-135.

De, A.K. 1989 .Environment Chemistry .Wiley Eastern Limited, New Delhi ,India, pp. 42-43.

Doneen, L.D. 1964. Notes on water quality in agricullture. Published as a water science ~~und~~and engineering paper 4001, Department of Water Science and Engineering University of California.

Eaton, F.M. 1950. Significance of carbonates in irrigation water. Soil Sci. 67 : 128-133.

Fatemi, A., 2015. Long term assessment of water quality and soil degradation risk via hydrochemical indices of Gharasoo River ,Iran.*Journal of Applied research in Water and Waste water*.,3: 131-136

Commented [h18]: This information is documented with pages. Kindly use the compiler or author and editors as the source instead of anonymous.

Girdhur, I.K. and J.S.P. Yadav, 2004. Influence of Mg rich irrigation wuters on soil sodicity development and on plant growth. UP Council of Agricultural Reseurch, Lucknow, 1 : 88-89.

Gupta. S.S. and I.C. Gupta, 1987. Managernent of suline soils ancl water,. Oxford.and.lBH Publication Coy, New Delhi, India, pp. 399.

Gupta, P.K. 2005. Methocls in Environmental"Analysis: Water, Soil and Air. Published by Agrobios (India), Jodhpur. pp. l-127.

Handu, B.K. 1969. Description and classification of media for hydro geochemical investigation. Symposiurn on Groundwater Studies In Arid antl Semi Arid Regions. pp. 45-47.

Islam. M.S. and S.Z.K.M. Shamsad, 2009. Assessment of Irrigation Wuter Quality of Bogra District In Bangladesh. Issn 0258- 7122 Bangludesh J. Agril. Res. 34 (4) : 597-608.

Jackson, M.L. 1967. Soil Chernical Analysis- Advance Course. Publ. by,the Author, University of Wisconsin Ma'dison, USA.

Jadhao, S.M. P. R. Kadu, Reshma G. Pondkule and D.V. Mali 2016. Assessment of irrigation water quality of purna valley of Vidharbh, Journal of Soils and Crops 26 (2) 375 – 382.

Joshi, D.M., A. Kumar and N. Agrawal 2009 Assessment of the irrigation water quality of river Ganga In Haridwar District, Rasayan Journal of Chemistry, 2(2), 285-292

Kamlesh Kumar, B.N. Saha, S. Saha, M.K. Prabhakar, A. Das, S.R.P Singh, N. Basak and O.P. Verma, 20 15. Assessment of groundwater quality under intensively rice-wheat cultivated semi-arid regions of Hilryana, India. The ecoscan. 9 (I&z): l2'7 -132.

Kanaskar, S.R. 2007. Effect of irrigation oi ptrys;cat ancl chemical properties of Vertisols in Upper Wardha command area.Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, submitted to Dr. PDKV Akola.

Khalil, A.A. and V. Akther, 2010. Irrigation Water Quality Guideline' reclaimed water project, Jorden Valley Authority and German Technical Corporation.

Muhammad, A., N. Muhammad, B.K. Muhammad and U. Farah,2013. Characterization of groundwater quality for irrigation in tehsil and district Layyah, Punjab Pakistan, Nature and Science. ll.

Matthess, G. 1982. The Properties of Ground Water, John Wiley and Sons, New York, USA. pp. 397.

Nimkar, A. M.1990. Evaluation of physical and chemical characteristics of the soils of the Purna valley of Maharashtra, M.Sc. Thesis (unpub.), Dr.P.D.K.V., Akola.

Padole, V.R., R.K. Chakolkar and P.W. Deshmukh, 1998. Characterization of salt affected Vertisols of Vidarbha region, Maharashtra. PKV Res. l. 22 z 26.

Raghunath, H.M. 1990. Ground Water. Wiley Eastern Limited, 2nd ed. New Delhi, India. pp. 563.

Page, A.L., R.H. Miller and D.R. Keeney, 1989. Methods of soil analysis, Second Edition, Part II, chemical and Microbiological Properties, ASA, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp. 500-505.

Raju N. Janardhan, 2007. Hydrogeochemical parameters for assessment of groundwater quality in the upper Gunjanaeru River basin, Cuddapah district. Andhra Pradesh, South India, Environmental Geology, 52 : 631-645.

Richards, L.A. 1954. Diagnosis and implovement of saline and alkali soils Agric. Handbook No. 60 USDA and IBH Publishing Coy. Ltd., New Delhi inclia, pp. 98 -99.

Suarez, 1981. Irrigation water quality guidelines for tuffgrass sites, Penn State University.

Todd, D.K. 1980. Ground Water Hyclorlogy. 2"d ed., John Wiley and Sons Inc. New York, USA. 14: pp. l0-138.

Table 1(a):Cationic concentration in water samples of borewell

Village name	Sample No.	Ca	Mg	Na	K
		(meqL^{-1})			
Apatapa	APBW1	6.1	4.4	11.30	0.23
Ambikapur	AMBW1	4.7	3.2	13.48	0.18
Ambikapur	AMBW2	5.1	3.5	12.81	0.20
Katyar	KTBW1	5.5	4	10.86	0.18
Katyar	KTBW2	5.3	3.7	12.22	0.22
Katyar	KTBW3	5	3.5	14.17	0.13
Mhaisang	MHBW1	6.2	4.4	10.18	0.16
Mhaisang	MHBW2	5.6	4	10.60	0.13
Karatkhed	KRBW1	6.2	4.5	10.42	0.18
Ramtirth	RTBW1	6.5	5.1	10.36	0.13
Ramtirth	RTBW2	6.7	5.2	10.24	0.17
Ramagad	RGBW1	5.5	3.9	12.39	0.14
Ramagad	RGBW2	5.1	3.6	13.30	0.13
Siloda	SLBW1	5.7	4.1	11.65	0.12
Ugava	UGBW1	6.7	5.1	10.34	0.16
Ugava	UGBW2	6.4	4.8	10.26	0.11
Ugava	UGBW3	6.4	4.7	10.32	0.12
Dongargaon	DGBW1	4.6	3	13.57	0.18
Dongargaon	DGBW2	4.7	3.2	12.96	0.09
Ganori	GNBW1	6.6	5.2	10.45	0.13
Chandikapur	CDBW1	6.9	5.4	16.30	0.10
Chandikapur	CDBW2	6.6	5.1	10.58	0.11
Chandikapur	CDBW3	6.7	5.3	10.68	0.10
Chandikapur	CDBW4	6.6	5.2	10.52	0.11
Chandikapur	CDBW5	6.4	5.1	10.34	0.12
Khalar	KHBW1	4.9	3.8	16.35	0.18
Khalar	KHBW2	5.2	3.7	15.65	0.11
Khalar	KHBW3	6.6	4	10.35	0.15
Khalar	KHBW4	6.3	3.9	10.65	0.09
Khalar	KHBW5	5.8	4.2	10.55	0.16
	Max	**6.9**	**5.4**	**16.35**	**0.22**
	Min	**4.6**	**3**	**10.18**	**0.09**
	Mean	**5.88**	**4.29**	**11.79**	**0.14**
	CV	**0.1235**	**0.1683**	**0.1606**	**0.2605**

Table 1(b): Cationic concentration in water samples of other sources

Village name	Sample No.	Ca (meqL^{-1})	Mg(meqL^{-1})	Na(meqL^{-1})	K(meqL^{-1})
Ghusar	GHFP1	4.7	3.1	13.10	0.19
Ghusar	GHFP2	4.4	3	13.80	0.18
Ghusar	GHHP1	5.6	4.1	12.20	0.19
Ambikapur	AMDam	4.6	3	11.50	0.16
Mhaisang	MHRiver	4.5	2.9	8.70	0.12
Ramagad	RGFP1	4.6	3	9.22	0.15
Ramagad	RGFP2	4.7	3.1	9.68	0.16
Ugava	UGRiver	4.3	4	8.56	0.09
Gandhigram	GGRiver	5.2	3.6	8.21	0.13
Dongargaon	DGWell	4.4	3	10.34	0.11
	Max	**5.6**	**4.1**	**13.8**	**0.18**
	Min	**4.3**	**2.9**	**8.21**	**0.09**
	Mean	**4.7**	**3.28**	**10.53**	**0.14**

	CV	**0.0856**	**0.1369**	**0.1902**	**0.0335**

Table 2(a): Anionic concentration in water samples of borewells

Village name	Sample No.	HCO_3 (meqL^{-1})	Cl (meqL^{-1})	SO_4(meqL^{-1})
Apatapa	APBW1	11.8	11.5	13.6
Ambikapur	AMBW1	8.6	4.8	3.2
Ambikapur	AMBW2	9.8	4.9	2.1
Katyar	KTBW1	10.6	10.6	10.4
Katyar	KTBW2	10.2	11.7	9.2
Katyar	KTBW3	10.1	9.2	4.2
Mhaisang	MHBW1	12.3	10.2	6.4
Mhaisang	MHBW2	12.2	10.2	4.2
Karatkhed	KRBW1	12.4	10.2	14.6
Ramtirth	RTBW1	12.5	10.4	4.4
Ramtirth	RTBW2	12.3	8.2	6.6
Ramagad	RGBW1	10.2	6.6	3.2
Ramagad	RGBW2	9.2	10.4	4.6
Siloda	SLBW1	10.6	8.2	5.6
Ugava	UGBW1	12.1	7.8	4.4
Ugava	UGBW2	12.7	6.6	4.6
Ugava	UGBW3	12.4	9.2	6.6
Dongargaon	DGBW1	9.2	3.6	3.2
Dongargaon	DGBW2	8.6	4.3	2.6
Ganori	GNBW1	12.7	6.6	10.6
Chandikapur	CDBW1	14.6	14.4	8.6
Chandikapur	CDBW2	15.3	6.4	6.6
Chandikapur	CDBW3	13.2	10.2	9.6
Chandikapur	CDBW4	12.3	6.6	8.2
Chandikapur	CDBW5	13.8	7.3	9.4
Khalar	KHBW1	10.3	7.9	5.8
Khalar	KHBW2	10.6	9.1	6.2
Khalar	KHBW3	11.2	9	4.8
Khalar	KHBW4	10.6	8.2	4.4
Khalar	KHBW5	11.1	6.1	3.2
	Mean	**11.45**	**8.34**	**6.37**
	CV	**0.1460**	**0.2931**	**0.4995**

Table 2(b): Anionic concentration in water samples of other sources of irrigation

Village name	Sample No.	HCO_3(meqL^{-1})	Cl(meqL^{-1})	SO_4(meqL^{-1})
Ghusar	GHFP1	9.2	8	1.2
Ghusar	GHFP2	8.3	8.2	1.6
Ghusar	GHHP1	12.3	12.2	10.2
Ambikapur	AMDam	7.8	4.6	2.2
Mhaisang	MHRiver	9.6	7.8	3.2
Ramagad	RGFP1	7.9	3.6	2.4
Ramagad	RGFP2	8	3.4	1.2
Ugava	UGRiver	9.8	5.6	3.2
Gandhigram	GGRiver	9.4	4.2	3.8
Dongargaon	DGWell	7.7	2.6	1.2
	Mean	**9**	**6.02**	**3.02**
	CV	**0.1567**	**0.4951**	**0.8914**

Table 3(a): Sodium absorption ratio, Adjusted SAR and Adjusted R_{Na} of water samples collected borewell

Village name	Sample No.	SAR	AdjSAR	Adj R_{Na}
Apatapa	APBW1	4.93	9.46	6.34
Ambikapur	AMBW1	6.78	8.95	8.50
Ambikapur	AMBW2	6.17	5.99	7.78
Katyar	KTBW1	4.98	5.53	6.30
Katyar	KTBW2	5.76	4.72	7.28
Katyar	KTBW3	6.87	8.17	8.52
Mhaisang	MHBW1	4.42	7.20	5.69
Mhaisang	MHBW2	4.83	7.45	6.03
Karatkhed	KRBW1	4.50	7.52	5.77
Ramtirth	RTBW1	4.30	6.58	5.52
Ramtirth	RTBW2	4.19	4.78	5.45
Ramagad	RGBW1	5.71	4.85	7.30
Ramagad	RGBW2	6.37	6.95	8.09
Siloda	SLBW1	5.26	7.94	6.74
Ugava	UGBW1	4.25	5.15	5.56
Ugava	UGBW2	4.33	7.63	5.57
Ugava	UGBW3	4.38	5.56	5.66
Dongargaon	DGBW1	6.96	7.44	8.58
Dongargaon	DGBW2	6.52	8.93	8.17
Ganori	GNBW1	4.30	5.33	5.53
Chandikapur	CDBW1	6.57	8.54	8.40
Chandikapur	CDBW2	4.37	7.21	5.49
Chandikapur	CDBW3	4.36	6.01	5.60
Chandikapur	CDBW4	4.33	5.76	5.59
Chandikapur	CDBW5	4.31	6.03	5.42
Khalar	KHBW1	7.83	8.54	9.51
Khalar	KHBW2	7.41	7.34	9.23
Khalar	KHBW3	4.49	6.15	6.13
Khalar	KHBW4	4.71	6.03	6.37
Khalar	KHBW5	4.71	6.13	6.03
	Mean	**5.30**	**6.80**	**6.67**
	CV	0.2122	0.1986	0.1955

Table 3(b): Sodium Absorption ratio, Adjusted SAR and Adjusted R_{Na} of water samples collected from other sources of irrigation

Village name	Sample No.	SAR	AdjSAR	Adj R_{Na}
Ghusar	GHFP1	6.63	9.41	8.23
Ghusar	GHFP2	7.17	6.74	8.82
Ghusar	GHHP1	5.53	5.87	6.87
Ambikapur	AMDam	5.89	7.07	7.50
Mhaisang	MHRiver	4.52	8.36	5.48
Ramagad	RGFP1	4.72	7.56	6.00
Ramagad	RGFP2	4.90	6.37	6.24
Ugava	UGRiver	4.20	5.21	4.83
Gandhigram	GGRiver	3.91	5.20	4.99
Dongargaon	DGWell	5.37	4.83	6.70
	Mean	**5.28**	**6.66**	**6.53**
	CV	**0.1985**	**0.2223**	**0.1918**

Table 4(a): Magnesium: Calcium Ratio (Mg:Ca), Kelley's Ratio (KR) and Magnesium Absorption Ratio (MAR) of water samples of borewell

Village name	Sample No.	Mg/Ca Ratio	Kelly's Ratio	MAR
Apatapa	APBW1	0.72	1.07	41.90
Ambikapur	AMBW1	0.68	1.70	40.50
Ambikapur	AMBW2	0.73	1.48	40.69
Katyar	KTBW1	0.72	1.14	42.10
Katyar	KTBW2	0.65	1.35	41.11
Katyar	KTBW3	0.68	1.66	41.17
Mhaisang	MHBW1	0.68	0.96	41.50
Mhaisang	MHBW2	0.72	1.10	41.66
Karatkhed	KRBW1	0.70	0.97	42.05
Ramtirth	RTBW1	0.70	0.89	43.96
Ramtirth	RTBW2	0.71	0.86	43.69
Ramagad	RGBW1	0.78	1.31	41.48
Ramagad	RGBW2	0.77	1.52	41.37
Siloda	SLBW1	0.65	1.18	41.83
Ugava	UGBW1	0.70	0.87	43.22
Ugava	UGBW2	0.70	0.91	42.85
Ugava	UGBW3	0.71	0.92	42.34
Dongargaon	DGBW1	0.76	1.78	39.47
Dongargaon	DGBW2	0.75	1.64	40.50
Ganori	GNBW1	0.69	0.88	44.06
Chandikapur	CDBW1	0.65	1.32	43.90
Chandikapur	CDBW2	0.68	0.90	43.58
Chandikapur	CDBW3	0.68	0.89	44.16
Chandikapur	CDBW4	0.78	0.89	44.06
Chandikapur	CDBW5	0.78	0.89	44.34
Khalar	KHBW1	0.77	1.87	43.67
Khalar	KHBW2	0.79	1.75	41.57
Khalar	KHBW3	0.78	0.97	37.73
Khalar	KHBW4	0.79	1.04	38.23
Khalar	KHBW5	0.77	1.05	42
	Mean	**0.72**	**1.19**	**42.02**
	CV	**0.0633**	**0.2773**	**0.0405**

Table 4(b): Magnesium: Calcium Ratio (Mg:Ca) ,Kelley's Ratio (KR) and Magnesium Absorption Ratio of water samples of other sources of irrigation

Village name	Sample No.	Mg/Ca Ratio	Kelly's Ratio	MAR
Ghusar	GHFP1	0.65	1.67	39.74
Ghusar	GHFP2	0.68	1.86	40.54
Ghusar	GHHP1	0.73	1.25	42.26
Ambikapur	AMDam	0.65	1.51	39.47
Mhaisang	MHRiver	0.69	1.17	39.18
Ramagad	RGFP1	0.64	1.21	39.47
Ramagad	RGFP2	0.72	1.24	39.74
Ugava	UGRiver	0.65	1.03	48.19
Gandhigram	GGRiver	0.93	0.93	40.90
Dongargaon	DGWell	0.73	1.39	40.54
	Mean	**0.71**	**1.33**	**41.00**

	CV	0.1170	0.2160	0.0654

Table 5(a): Residual Sodium Bicarbonates and Residual Sodium Carbonates of water samples of borewell

Village name	Sample No.	RSBC(meL^{-1})	RSC(meL^{-1})
Apatapa	APBW1	5.7	1.3
Ambikapur	AMBW1	3.9	0.7
Ambikapur	AMBW2	4.7	1.2
Katyar	KTBW1	5.1	1.1
Katyar	KTBW2	4.9	1.2
Katyar	KTBW3	5.1	1.6
Mhaisang	MHBW1	6.1	1.7
Mhaisang	MHBW2	6.6	2.6
Karatkhed	KRBW1	6.2	1.7
Ramtirth	RTBW1	6	0.9
Ramtirth	RTBW2	5.6	0.4
Ramagad	RGBW1	4.7	0.8
Ramagad	RGBW2	4.1	0.5
Siloda	SLBW1	4.9	0.8
Ugava	UGBW1	5.4	0.3
Ugava	UGBW2	6.3	1.5
Ugava	UGBW3	6	1.3
Dongargaon	DGBW1	4.6	1.6
Dongargaon	DGBW2	3.9	0.7
Ganori	GNBW1	6.1	0.9
Chandikapur	CDBW1	7.7	2.3
Chandikapur	CDBW2	8.7	3.6
Chandikapur	CDBW3	6.5	1.2
Chandikapur	CDBW4	5.7	0.5
Chandikapur	CDBW5	7.4	2.3
Khalar	KHBW1	5.4	1.6
Khalar	KHBW2	5.4	1.7
Khalar	KHBW3	4.6	0.6
Khalar	KHBW4	4.3	0.4
Khalar	KHBW5	5.3	1.1
	Mean	5.56	1.27
	CV	0.1995	0.5808

Table 5(b): Residual Sodium Bicarbonates and Residual Sodium Carbonates of water samples of other sources of irrigation

Village name	Sample No.	RSBC(meL^{-1})	RSC(meL^{-1})
Ghusar	GHFP1	4.5	1.4
Ghusar	GHFP2	3.9	0.9
Ghusar	GHHP1	6.7	2.6
Ambikapur	AMDam	3.2	0.2
Mhaisang	MHRiver	5.1	2.2
Ramagad	RGFP1	3.3	0.3
Ramagad	RGFP2	3.3	0.2
Ugava	UGRiver	5.5	1.5
Gandhigram	GGRiver	4.2	0.6
Dongargaon	DGWell	3.3	0.3

	Mean	4.3	1.02
	CV	0.2714	0.8544