

Evaluation of different WQI methods for drinking water assessment with a case study of groundwater from Vizianagaram District, AP, India.

Abstract

Application of Water Quality Index (WQI) to assess the water quality for drinking water suitability and intensity of contamination is in practice the world over. Many WQI methods are in use since their conceptualization, some are country-specific or use-specific. A generalized and widely acceptable method that can project ground truths in non-dimensional numerical form to evaluate the water quality especially for drinking uses is lacking. Complexity and disagreement among different methods are adding to incongruence among the scientists. To demystify the WQI, its concept and a simple calculation method are deliberated. Five different WQI methods using water chemistry results of Vizianagaram District are discussed. The WQI output obtained from these methods displays discrepancies in the true projection of water quality. Some samples show similarities in WQI values obtained from two to four methods. But the suitability status of water for drinking purposes could not be precisely ascertained from these indices. Since the water chemistry results and WQI values are incompatible the output from these methods could be red herring. Few issues are identified among the studied methods which need improvisation. The use of ideal value in the weighted arithmetic index method and, arbitration in assigning weight for each parameter give scope for speculation. Non-uniformity in the categorization of water and the suitability statuses of drinking water are discouraging factors. The WQI is an effective tool in screening the huge database for identifying and addressing the issues in water quality. Since drinking water standards, as well as water supply, are government-sponsored, an institutional intervention is required to standardize the WQI computation procedure. Such an initiative is very much necessary for the effective application of water quality data to contain water-borne diseases.

Keywords: Drinking water specifications; Parameter; Water chemistry; Weightage; Sub-index; Normalization;

Introduction

Water quality assessment has become an integral part of water resource studies. It is slowly evolving as a specialized subject and many researchers across the globe are focusing on these topics. New challenges in this domain are emerging due to rapid deterioration in water quality and detection of hitherto unknown elements or toxic synthetic compounds. Advances in analytical chemistry, as well as diagnostic techniques in medical sciences, could link certain carcinogenic diseases to water contamination. Regular or more frequent water quality monitoring of drinking water sources is gaining ground rapidly by including additional parameters and observation points. In this process, voluminous water chemistry data is generated periodically. To ensure early detection of unsuitable or contaminated water sources many countries are adopting different water quality index methods which help in prioritizing the remedial and preventive measures. In general, the method involves the synthesis of a numerical value using water analysis results, standard or threshold values, and assigning weight to each tested parameter. Some of the WQI methods formulated by several national and international organizations are Weight Arithmetic Water Quality Index (WAWQI), National Sanitation Foundation Water Quality Index (NSFWQI), Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment Water Quality Index (CCMEWQI), Oregon Water Quality Index (OWQI). Iuliana Paun (2016) summed up that - several countries have begun the process of developing composite indices of water quality to describe the state of their domestic waters, including the United States of America (Cude 2001), Taiwan (Liou et al. 2004), Argentina (Pesce and Wunderlin 2000), Australia (ISC 2005), Canada (Khan et al. 2003; Lumb et al. 2006; CMME 2001) and NewZealand (Smith 1989, 1990).

Though many methods are available for detrainning WQI end results differ from each other and do not display the true status of water quality. Moez Kachroud et. al., (2019) while reviewing the main WQI calculations noted - contradictions observed in the final result when, on the same database, the WQI is calculated by different methods. Despite the continuous efforts by academicians and scientists across the globe a widely acceptable WQI method for potable water quality assessment could not be developed. Shweta Tyagi et. al., (2013) emphasized the dire need for the development of a new and globally accepted “Water Quality Index” in a simplified format, which may be used at large and could represent the reliable picture of water quality. Lack of unanimity, universal acceptability, and standardization is hampering the wide applicability of

water quality indexing. An attempt is made through this Paper to evaluate five different WQI methods with a case study. The water chemistry results of Andhra Pradesh state government observations wells of Vizianagaram district are used for determining WQI applying the five methods. The district is selected as it represents a typical Precambrian hydrogeological terrain. Srinivas Rao et. al., (2020) assessed groundwater water quality for part of the district applying of Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment Water Quality Index (CCME-WQI) method. This work is initiated with the hypothesis that no two WQI methods are in agreement and none of the methods are helpful in precisely identifying the water unsuitable for drinking purposes. It is also aimed to draw the attention of Govt. agencies and research institutions to standardize the WQI computation procedure for drinking water assessment.

Material and Methods

Study area: Vizianagaram district is one of the north-coastal districts of Andhra Pradesh. It lies between $17^{\circ} 15'$ and $19^{\circ} 15'$ of the northern latitude and $83^{\circ} 00'$ to $83^{\circ} 45'$ of the eastern longitude. The district can be divided into two distinct natural physical divisions, plain and hilly regions. The hilly region is mostly covered with densely wooded forest and comes under the tribal tract of the district. Since it is hilly terrain its elevation is also uneven. The plain portion of the district is a well-cultivated area. The district is drained by the rivers of Nagavali, Gosthani, Suvarnamukhi, Champavathi, Vegavathi, and Gomukhi which pass through hilly regions and plains. The climate of the district is characterized by high humidity all the year with oppressive summer and good seasonal rainfall. The mean daily maximum temperature is about 35°C and the mean minimum is 27°C during the hot weather period and in the coldest months the mean daily maximum temperature at about 28°C and the mean daily minimum at about 18°C . The Normal annual rainfall for the district is 1131 mm. The district mostly gets rainfall during both the southwest and northeast monsoon seasons. The normal rainfall during southwest monsoon months from June to September amounts to 71 % of the annual rainfall and that of northeast monsoon months from October to December constitutes 11 % of the annual rainfall.

Hydrogeology: The district is mostly occupied by the Khondalite and Charnockite suite of rocks and Granite gneisses (consolidated rocks) belonging to the Achaean age. These rocks are intruded by Quartzites and capped by Laterites at few places. Alluvial formations of Recent to Sub-recent age occur along the flood plains of the rivers flowing through the district.

Groundwater occurs under water table to semi-confined conditions in the consolidated rocks and being tapped using dug wells and bore wells down to depths ranging from 5 to 10 m and 30 to 80 m respectively. The yields of dug wells range from 20 to 40 m³/day while discharge in bore wells varies from 0.5 to 5 lps (liters per second). The aquifers of Alluvial formations are exploited through shallow tube wells (Filter point wells) which range in depth from 10 to 30 m with discharge ranging from 0.5 to 5.5 lps.

Hydrochemistry: Groundwater samples were collected from 47 bore wells (Piezometers) distributed throughout the Vizianagaram district in post-monsoon 2019 (Fig. 1). These wells were exclusively developed for monitoring purposes by Andhra Pradesh State Ground Water and Water Audit Dept. (GW&WAD). The groundwater quality parameters like pH, EC, TDS, carbonate, bicarbonate, chloride, fluoride, sulphate, nitrate, sodium, potassium, calcium, magnesium, and Total hardness (TH) were analyzed in Water Quality Level-II laboratory, Visakhapatnam, GW&WAD following the standard methods prescribed by the American Public Health Association (APHA, 2017). The pH is determined using a pH meter with a glass electrode; EC is measured using a digital EC meter of cell constant 1 cm⁻¹. Flame photometer is used for Na⁺ and K⁺ determination where color produced is characteristic of respective alkali metal and has proportionate color intensity with concentration. Mg²⁺ is estimated through titration against EDTA (to be subtracted from Ca²⁺ titer value) with ammonia buffer and EBT indicator. Ca²⁺ is determined through titration against EDTA with NaOH buffer and ammonium purpurate indicator. Titration against HCl (molarity 0.02N) with phenolphthalein indicator is used for CO₃²⁻ and methyl orange indicator is used for HCO₃⁻. Titration against AgNO₃ with potassium chromate indicator is used for Cl⁻. F⁻ is tested using an ion-selective electrode and TISAB. SO₄²⁻ is measured with a Nephelo-turbidity meter involving barium sulfate suspension formation with barium chloride reagent. NO₃⁻ is estimated with a UV-VIS spectrophotometer. TH is calculated using the following formula (Eq No. 1) in which all parameters are taken in meq/L units. M S Excel is used for water chemistry data analysis as well as WQI calculations.

$$TH = (Ca+Mg)*50 \quad \text{Eq. No. 1}$$

WQI methods

General concept and calculation procedure

Since the concept of indexing water quality results evolved it underwent a continuous transformation from theoretical perception to formulae. Following the tenets of original principles, many researchers proposed different equations and input factors for determining the WQI. Broadly it involves the synthesis of water chemistry data with an assigned weight and ratio of parameter content and standards which result in an output of dimensionless numerical value for a sample. Normalized as well as concise outcomes in the form of digital information which can be connected to field scenarios with ease make the WQI an attractive option for hydrochemists the world over. In the process of fine-tuning the WQI calculations, many methods, as well as equations, evolved. Normally WQI is determined in three to five stages-

Stage 1: Assigning weight (w_i) to each tested parameter based on its importance in human health and calculation of relative weights (W_i). In general, w_i range between 1 and 5 with ascending rate of importance in the water quality evaluation.

$$W_i = w_i / \sum w_i \quad \text{Eq. No. 2}$$

E.g.

| Parameter | TDS | Ca | Mg | HCO ₃ | NO ₃ | F | Sum |
|-------------------------------|------|------|-----|------------------|-----------------|------|-----------------|
| w_i (arbitrary value) | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | $\sum w_i = 20$ |
| W_i ($w_i / \sum w_i$) | 0.25 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.20 | 1 |

Stage 2: % calculation of ratio (q_i) of concentration of each tested parameter (C_i) and its standard (drinking water standard or threshold value) value (S_i).

$$q_i = (C_i / S_i) * 100 \quad \text{Eq. No. 3}$$

E.g.

| Parameter | TDS | Ca | Mg | HCO ₃ | NO ₃ | F |
|-------------------------|------|----|----|------------------|-----------------|------|
| Concentration (C_i) | 1480 | 72 | 88 | 270 | 44 | 0.33 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|-----|-----|-----|----|------|
| Standard value (Si) BIS DWS-IS 10500: 2012 - Permissible Limit in the Absence of Alternate Source (Choose the Standards as per requirement) | 2000 | 200 | 100 | 500 | 45 | 1.50 |
| qi | 74 | 36 | 88 | 45 | 97 | 22 |

Stage 3: Determination of sub-index for each parameter (SI_i) which is the product of relative weight (W_i) for each parameter and proportionate parameter (q_i)

$$SI_i = W_i * q_i \quad \text{Eq. No. 4}$$

E.g.

| Parameter | TDS | Ca | Mg | HCO ₃ | NO ₃ | F | Sum ($\sum SI_i$) |
|-----------------|-------|------|------|------------------|-----------------|------|------------------------|
| W _i | 0.25 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.20 | |
| q _i | 74 | 36 | 88 | 45 | 97 | 22 | |
| SI _i | 18.50 | 5.40 | 8.80 | 2.25 | 24.25 | 4.44 | 63.60 |

Stage 4: Calculation of WQI - Summation of all SI_i...n of each sample (SI_i)

$$WQI = \sum SI_i \dots n \quad \text{Eq. No. 5}$$

Stage 5: Categorization of each sample based on the criteria.

E.g.

| WQI Value | Water quality | No. of water samples | % of water samples |
|-----------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| <50 | Excellent | | |
| 50-100 | Good | 1 | |
| 101-200 | Poor | | |
| 201-300 | Very Poor | | |
| >300 | Unsuitable | | |
| Total | | | |

Results and Discussions

Variations in different WQI methods

The above example is an aggregation of the arithmetic equation, different researchers proposed certain modifications to the equations considering geometric and harmonic series (Saeedi et. al., 2009). Divergent results of WQI emerge even by adopting a given method by different scientists which could be due to the scope for arbitration in considering the weights (w_i) for each parameter, choosing the drinking water standards (S_i) as well as criteria for categorization. To substantiate the hypothesis five different commonly used and simple methods of WQI calculations are deliberated. The formulae developed or used by the respective researchers are presented in Table 1, which demonstrates that discordance among these methods exists at the weights level or choosing the weight value. A similar attempt was made by Landwehr and Deininger in 1976 for surface water and brought out the merits and demerits of five different WQI methods. The latest attempt by Moez Kachroud et. al., (2019) was made to illustrate the discrepancies in different WQI methods applying the same database.

Weighted arithmetic index (Brown et. al., 1970 and 1973): In the Weighted arithmetic index (WAQI) method, also referred to as NSFQI, the relative weight (W_n) of each tested parameter is determined by apportioning the drinking water specifications. Water quality rating (Q_n) for each parameter is calculated using the ideal value (V_i) which is at the prudence of the researcher. WQI is arrived at by dividing the product sum of relative weight and quality rating with the sum

relative weight (Supplemental material 1). The method proposed by Brown et. al., (1970) was the initial attempt to bring the theoretical assumption into equation form using the Delphi technique. Subsequently, this method underwent few changes and some scientists attempted to simplify it. Though many options for estimating WQI are available the WAQI method is commonly used. Many researchers are not assigning any value or using 0 for the ideal value (V_i) for the tested parameter (except pH or Dissolved Oxygen) in the calculations thus the formula is losing relevance. Roohollah Noori et. al., (2019) have pointed out NSFQI is widely used with non-original rather than original inputs of the model.

Groundwater quality index (Saeedi et. al., 2009): The groundwater quality index (GWQI) developed by Saeedi et. al., (2009) is one of the simplest methods in practice for groundwater quality assessment. It includes only two steps; in the first step proportion of observed concentrations (C_i) of a few principal parameters to the maximum admissible concentration (S_i) in water quality standards is calculated as the standard value of the parameters. In the second and final step aggregate the product of all the standardized values and weight of participation (W_i) of each parameter (Supplemental material 2). The parameters' weight or weight of participation is assigned according to the judgment of water quality experts and some studies on the importance of each drinking water component (Saeedi et al., 2009). The weight (w_i) considered for each parameter for arriving at a weight of participation as well as equations for deriving the GWQI are not mentioned by the authors leading to speculation and non-acceptance. The classification of water-based on GWQI proposed by the authors is different from the general practice (Table 1), it is high ($GWQI > 0.15$), low ($GWQI < 0.04$), and suitable ($0.04 < GWQI < 0.15$).

WQI (Raychaudhuri et. al., 2011 and 2014): This WQI method differs from others in deciding the weightage (w_i), the authors have proposed weight (w_i) based on the number of samples compliance to drinking water specifications. Weights of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 are assigned to the parameters when 0-20, 21-40, 41-60, 61-80 and 81-100 % of samples are within the permissible limit of drinking water standards (DWS) respectively (Raychaudhuri et al 2011). Nitrate may be assigned the maximum weight of 5 (irrespective of compliance) due to its major importance in water quality assessment. The rest of the steps involved in the computation of WQI are the same as discussed in the General concept and calculation procedure (Supplemental material 3). The procedure of assigning weights based on compliance to DWS lacks scientific support and is

statistical based rather than rationale. This weightage system is site-specific and a generalized model could not be evolved from such a procedure.

WQI (Asit and Surajit 2015): The WQI method adopted by these researchers is the most popular one; in this, the weights (w_i) are assigned according to their relative importance in the overall quality of water for drinking purposes (Asit and Surajit 2015). Many researchers have different perceptions about the drinking water specification and their significance to human health thus they assign varied weightage (w_i) values for each parameter which is discussed in subsequent paragraphs. These authors supported the simple arbitrary approach of choosing w_i values for the tested chemical constituents ranging from 1 to 5 (in increasing order of importance) based on their relative importance in the water quality evaluation. The w_i assigned to each of the parameters are in general agreement with many other researchers. Other steps in arriving at WQI are similar to the general WQI method (Supplemental material 4). This method is often used by researchers and professionals by assigning different w_i values based on the site-specific requirements and demands from epidemiology and environment inputs (Singh et. al., 2017; Hamed et. al., 2018; Adimalla et. al. 2018).

Integrated water quality index (Shrikant et. al., 2019): A radical change in the calculation of WQI is proposed by Shrikant et. al., (2019) and called it an integrated water quality index (IWQI). In this method, the permissible limits (PL) of drinking water specifications of India DWS (BIS 2012) are modified by subtracting 20% of the range between permissible and desirable limits (DL) and termed it as modified permissible limits (MPL). The authors brought out three stages of sub-indexing (SI) for categorizing the water with the presumption that the values which are less than the minimum required concentration ($<DL$) and above MPL will affect the water quality; while the values in between DL and MPL can be supposed as excellent for drinking.

$SI_1 = 0$: If the observed value i th parameter (P_i) is above DL but less than MPL, that is $P_i = >DL$ and $<MPL$. P_i is the water quality of i th parameter.

$SI_2 = (DL - P_i) / DL$: If the value of the i th parameter is less than the desirable limit ($P_i < DL$) then use SI_2 .

It is presumed that if the parameter content is less than the ($<DL$) Acceptable limit (Requirement as mentioned BIS DWS) then it is not suitable for human consumption.

$SI_3 = (P_i - MPL) / MPL$: If P_i is greater than the modified permissible limit (MPL), that is $P_i > MPL$, then follow the SI_3 for calculation. The benchmark (PL) is reduced to facilitate pre-emptive action.

IWQI = the sum of all sub-indices (SI) of each sample.

A varied classification criterion using the index values is suggested by the researchers which range from 1 to 5 (akin to 50 to 300) classes (Excellent, Good, Marginal, etc.) and explanation for each class is with regards to suitability for drinking as is the case with other methods (Supplemental material 5).

The unique features of this method are the simplicity in calculations, provision for considering the deficit ion content, no scope for arbitration or human judgment. Though the normalization of tested parameters and standard values is considered, weightage is ignored. Thus ranking of chemical constituents and samples as a whole will be missing if all parameters strength lies between $\geq DL$ and $\leq MPL$. Reducing the PL of BIS DWS to MPL for IWQI calculation, which has legal sanctity, may not be acceptable and it does not reflect the accurate intensity of deviation from the standard.

Case study

Water chemistry results containing content of 10 parameters of 47 groundwater samples are used to calculate the WQI applying the above discussed five methods with the intent to demonstrate the applicability and efficacy of these methods. The WQI methods selected are generally used by many scientists and professionals. They have logical similarities, easy to calculate, and do not require multiple sets of data. The Indian drinking water standard - BIS DWS-IS 10500: 2012 - Permissible Limit in the Absence of Alternate Source is used as a benchmark to assess the water quality. The K, Na, and CO_3 were not used in the WQI computation as BIS not specified any limits for these ions. Detailed calculations of each method are presented as Supplemental materials 1 to 5 and summary results along with chemical analysis data are provided in Table 2. The parameters above requirement (Acceptable limit) and permissible limit of BIS DWS are displayed distinctly (highlighted in yellow and red respectively) for ready reference. Similar marking is done for the samples classified as a good and poor quality based on WQI values. A cursory look at the final WQI output indicates certain parity among four methods (2 to 5) especially in the case of the highly contaminated samples (Table 2).

The method suggested by Brown et al., (1970) is different by identifying the only sample (Sample No. 16) which has high fluoride content (2.51 mg/l) as of poor quality. Surprisingly many samples having parameters content above acceptable and permissible limits were classified as an excellent category. But the WQI score is high for samples having a fluoride concentration of about 1 mg/l (Supplemental material 1 and Table 2). Lack of provision for assigning the weights for each parameter and double apportioning ($1/S_n$ and K/S_n) the standards could be some of the reasons for poor projection of water quality. The provision for providing the ideal value (V_i) while normalizing the test results (Q_n - the quality rating) is considered only for pH (7) by many researchers (Bora and Goswami 2016; Rawat et al., 2017; Prasad et al., 2019). The content of F^- is controlling the WQI result as that has the most dominating unit weight (W_n) because it is calculated by a value inversely proportional to the recommended standard value (1/1.5). The low denominator value, when compared with other parameters, has enhanced the W_n for F^- leading to its high-quality rating (Sample No. 28). Though 10 samples are not suitable for drinking purposes categorization based on WQI values of the method indicates only one sample as of poor quality (Table 3). The WQI is only 27.80 for a highly contaminated sample (Sample No. 24) which has 8 out of 10 parameters much above PL. In contrast for sample 18 which has all the parameters much below AL the WQI is 26.10 (Table 2). Contradictory output and poor projection of water quality results in WQI values are discouraging the wide application of this method.

The GWQI method identified two samples that are highly contaminated as poor and most of the samples which have parameters concentration above requirement (acceptable limit) of BIS DWS as good. Classification of water samples based on the GWQI values suggested by Saeedi et al., (2009) is different from the rest of the methods which is marginally modified for this study (Table 3). The GWQI value is <0.30 in samples having all the examined parameters within the required (acceptable limit) of BIS DWS. Samples with 4 to 5 parameters content above the required (acceptable limit) of BIS DWS have 0.31 to 0.50 GWQI. Those with >0.78 GWQI value have two parameters above the permissible limit of BIS DWS apart from five parameters above the requirement (acceptable limit) of BIS DWS (Supplemental material 2 and Table 2). The GWQI values are low because normalized parameters are not converted into a percent (tested value/standard value of each parameter) like many other methods. The weight of participation of each parameter (W_i) proposed by Saeedi et. al., (2009) is adopted with minor

changes to suit BIS DWS. Due to lack of information on weight (w_i) assigned to the parameters the W_i factors are used directly. W_i values are not available for NO_3 and F as the authors have not considered these ions. The weight of participation (W_i) specified for K (0.04) and Na (0.06) are used for NO_3 and F which is not in concurrence with the significance of NO_3 and F in drinking water. Similarly, the alkaline earths were accorded high W_i by the authors which may not be apt for other areas. The hindrance on applying the GWQI method was felt due to the non-availability of information on w_i , calculation procedure of W_i and q_n so also equations. A general pattern of categorization of water samples akin to other popular methods would make the GWQI more acceptable. Another drawback is not accounting for low pH (<6.50). The GWQI method is simple and the values display the near-truth status of water quality, it can find wide acceptability provided certain ambiguities are resolved.

In the third method, three samples were categorized as poor water ($WQI > 100$) which has three or more parameters above the PL limit of BIS DWS. The intensity of ionization is almost truly reflected by index values and the samples having certain parameters beyond PL obtained >71 scores. Samples with all the parameter concentration less than the requirement (Acceptable limit) of BIS DWS has <30 WQI value, and it varies between 30 and 70 for samples that have one or more parameter above the AL (Supplemental material 3 and Table 2). Unlike other methods, Raychaudhuri et. al., (2014) relied on compliance of samples to BIS DWS for determining w_i . This method too does not account for low pH (<6.50) but in the present calculations it is considered and quality rating (q_i) is calculated for all the samples for both <6.50 as well as >8.50 pH. The WQI values are reduced by about 10 if q_i is computed in either of the categories (samples with < 6.50 or >6.50). This method did not distinguish the samples unsuitable for drinking purposes (above PL of BIS DWS) with high WQI values (>100). Compliance to BIS DWS show seven samples (15%) are above PL and 33 samples (70%) above AL whereas WQI classification indicates only two samples are of poor quality and all are fit for drinking uses (Table 3). Irrespective of the epidemiologic importance of parameters concerning drinking purposes same (1) weightage (w_i) is accorded to each parameter because of the compliance procedure adopted by the authors. The process camouflages the actual water chemistry of analyzed samples. This makes the method site-specific and is not popular among scientists.

The fourth method is very much like the third one except the procedure used for assigning the weight for each parameter (w_i) is different which is chosen according to its relative importance

in the water quality for drinking purposes. The authors have assigned low (2) w_i to TH, Ca, and Mg; 3 to HCO_3 and Cl; 4 to pH, TDS, SO_4 , and F; only NO_3 is assigned a weight of 5. K, Na, and CO_3 are not considered as BIS DWS not specified any limits. The w_i pattern followed is fairly in agreement with other researchers and realistic to epidemiological concerns. Though w_i assigned for each parameter is higher than that of the third method but the relative weight (W_i) on average is almost the same thus the WQI values and categorization of samples are similar in both the WQI methods (Supplemental material 4 and Table 3). In the method used by Asit and Surajit (2015) the WQI values are marginally higher (~3%) in all but 7 samples and are lesser by 4% (in 7 samples) than the values obtained using the method suggested by Raychaudhuri et. al., (2014). The average WQI value of 47 samples is 60 and 62 in the third and fourth methods respectively (Table 2). This method could not differentiate the samples by categorization based on two different (AL and PL) criteria of BIS DWS. The samples having at least (ignoring pH) one parameter above PL have >65 WQI values. This WQI method is used by many researchers due to the flexibility of allocating w_i to each parameter independently based on the local conditions. The classification proposed by the authors is also in tune with other popular methods. The wide scope for discretion in choosing w_i for want of norms is the major setback for the method. Adopting this method by different researchers for the same water chemistry data produces varied WQI values due to a lack of standardization or authenticated practice in assigning weight to tested parameters in concurrence with health concerns.

The fifth method put forth by Shrikant et. al., (2019) is distinctly different from others and suggested a radical change in water quality assessment for drinking purposes. The WQI values obtained from the method exhibit two highly mineralized water samples (along with 2 to 4 methods) and five samples which have ion content lesser than the required (acceptable limit) of BIS DWS as poor waters (not suitable for drinking). Though certain samples have more than one parameter above PL and a few above AL they are categorized as excellent (<1) and good water (1-2) which could be misleading (Supplemental material 5 and Table 2). The authors followed the Requirement (Acceptable limit) criteria mentioned in column 3 of Table 1 to 3 of (BIS DWS) IS 10500: 2012 Indian Standard drinking water-specification and probably interpreted that water with chemical constituents less than the AL limit as poor water since it does not contain ion concentration to the required level. Theoretically, it is maybe correct but practically it is very difficult to implement and BIS DWS did not specify as such. Another initiative of Shrikant et al.,

(2019) to modify the PL (to MPL) may not be acceptable since BIS DWS are legal documents. The IWQI values (1 to 5) and unusual pattern of water classification (2-3: Marginal: Acceptable for Domestic) is another hurdle in practicing the method (Table 3). Despite these shortcomings, the IWQI model is very simple and contains limited scope for bias. No provision for according weightage based on the parameter importance in the context of health significance in drinking water is resulting in treating all tested parameters on par.

Assigning weight (w_i) to parameters

Ranking the parameters based on their epidemiological significance in drinking water constitutes crucial input in water quality assessment for potable water through WQI. Various water quality indices that are in practice follow different procedures in deciding the ranking but the most common and simple one is to assigning weight (w_i) in the form of a numerical score between 1 and 5 in increasing order of importance. Chemical quality criteria for drinking water are considered based on toxicity to human health apart from physiological and regional climatic conditions. These factors will be also governing the ranking pattern of parameters in calculating the indices for drinking water quality evaluation. To upkeep, the sanctity of drinking water standards and true projection of water quality status freedom for grading the tested parameters is provided in WQI estimation. Since the methodology of WQI is still in evolving stage a robust weight pattern is yet to be developed. Many researchers followed different grading models based on their wisdom and available inputs which are adding to ambiguity in the outcome of WQI which is illustrated in Table 4 along with citations. Experiment with the case study data is carried out by changing the weights of each parameter and calculating WQI values for different weight patterns (Supplemental material 6a). The results indicate a minor variation in WQI values among five different patterns (SD values vary from 2.27 to 4.16) and samples with border values of categorization are classified into neighboring category e.g. sample no. 12, 27, and 28 (Supplemental material 6b). The mean WQI values obtained using different w_i patterns (w_{i1} - w_{i2} ; w_{i2} - w_{i3} etc) are almost similar (mean values vary from 55 to 62 and SD is 2.66) though assigned w_i values differs significantly. An increase in weightage between 1 and 5 for any of the parameters or assigning the highest (5) or lowest (1) rank to all parameters is not making a notable distinction in WQI output. Rather assigning different weights between 1 and 5 is showing some variations in WQI. The freedom of assigning weights depending on the health significance, local conditions, and input from interdisciplinary literature can be left to researchers

until statutory agencies standardize the pattern. Moez Kachroud (2019) made a similar inference that weighting factors are poorly determined and suggested weighting should be decided according to the use of water. Accordingly, a Universal WQI cannot be defined.

Groundwater quality assessment for drinking purposes

The water chemistry results of Vizianagaram when compared with BIS DWS (less than a requirement; Acceptable limit) display that only 6 samples are suitable for drinking uses. If the PL is considered as a benchmark, 12 samples are suitable for drinking uses. The survey by Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Department (RWS & S) indicates about 25% of the area is under the non-potable category due to the high concentration of nitrate and total hardness (DSR-Vizianagaram Dist. 2018). The different WQI methods used to assess the suitability of water for drinking purposes could not present the prevailing water quality conditions with regards to BIS DWS (sample no. 6, 9, 10, 13, 19, 23, 31, 38). But water quality status is fairly represented in the WQI values (Table 2). The degree of difference or extent of deviation among DWS and WQI values is very high. The classification scheme of all the examined methods is inappropriate for assessing drinking water suitability. The excellent (Class A or 1) and good (Class B or 2) categories can be considered as suitable for drinking but all the methods have classes like poor and very poor or in some methods marginal and poor (Class C and D or 3 and 4 respectively). The last class (E or 5) is categorized as unsuitable for drinking purposes. It is incongruent with the suitability criteria of drinking water specifications. The potability of water grouped as poor and very poor classes is questionable. Few methods explained marginal (Class C or 3) water as acceptable for domestic and poor (Class D or 4) as not suitable for drinking, whereas the last category (Class E or 5) is labeled as Unacceptable or Unsuitable which is rather perplexing and misleading (Table 3). Moez Kachroud et. al., (2019) noted - despite the use of the same variables, the classification from each index differs, especially in the evaluation for drinking water. In conjunction with DWS, the WQI methods are required to be refined particularly in third world countries so that index values would be able to raise red flags in the database to facilitate immediate focus on the problem areas. Since the research for a more useful and universal water quality index is going on, the water agencies, users, and water managers in different countries may use and adapt the available WQI methods with little modifications to meet their needs (Shweta Thyagi et. al., 2013).

Conclusions

Evaluation of five WQI methods indicates certain commonalities and diversities in principles engraved in these methods. Normalization of tested parameter values with selected standards is commonly followed whereas the procedure of rating parameters by assigning relative weightage and categorization varies in different methods. Despite weightage being a strategic input in indexing water quality, the present practice leaves wide scope for discretion. Its standardization by statutory organizations is required to minimize or avoid assumptions and to authenticate the WQI results. It is all the more essential since WQI is largely applied to assess water quality for drinking uses by govt. agencies. WQI score and classification criteria need to be rationalized in tune with the drinking water suitability criteria. Precise use of DWS in WQI calculations is to be ensured to withstand legal scrutiny and the output can be used by administrators as well. Though researchers are making enormous efforts in refining and popularizing the WQI, a consensus approach for the presentation of ground truth through indices is yet to be achieved. Institutional intervention at WHO or country level is required to standardize the methodology, accord legal status to WQI, and emphasize its parallel use with DWS to ensure safe drinking water for maintaining good human health.

COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist. The products used for this research are commonly and predominantly use products in our area of research and country. There is absolutely no conflict of interest between the authors and producers of the products because we do not intend to use these products as an avenue for any litigation but for the advancement of knowledge. Also, the research was not funded by the producing company rather it was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

References

Adimalla, N., Li, P. and Venkatayogi, S. (2018) Hydrogeochemical Evaluation of Groundwater Quality for Drinking and Irrigation Purposes and Integrated Interpretation with Water Quality Index Studies. *Environ. Process.* 5, 363–383. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40710-018-0297-4>.

APHA (2017): *Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater* (23rd edition). NW Washington, Dc: (2017). American Public Health Association. <https://www.awwa.org/Store/Product-Details/productId/65266295>.

Asit Kumar Batabyal, and Surajit Chakraborty (2015) Hydrogeochemistry and Water Quality Index in the Assessment of Groundwater Quality for Drinking Uses. *Water Environment Research*, vol. 87, no. 7, pp. 607–617., www.jstor.org/stable/24586014. Accessed 28 Feb. 2021.

BIS DWS (2012): *Indian Standard Drinking Water-Specification* (Second Revision) -IS 10500 : 2012 (adopted by BIS), <https://bis.gov.in/>

Bora, M., Goswami, D.C. (2016) Water quality assessment in terms of water quality index (WQI): case study of the Kolong River, Assam, India. *Appl Water Sci*, 7, 3125–3135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13201-016-0451-y>.

Brown RM, McClelland NI, Deininger RA, Tozer RG (1970) A water quality index-Do we dare? *Water Sew Works* 117(10):339–343.

Brown RM, McClelland NI, Deininger RA, Landwehr JM (1973). Validating the WQI. The paper presented at national meeting of *American society of civil engineers on water resources engineering*, Washington, DC.

CCME (2001) Canadian water quality guidelines for the protection of aquatic life: CCME Water Quality Index 1.0, user's manual. In *Canadian environmental quality guidelines, 1999*, Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Winnipeg, Manitoba. http://www.ccme.ca/assets/pdf/wqi_usermanualfactsheet_e.pdf.

Cude C G (2001) Oregon water quality index: a tool for evaluating water quality management effectiveness. *J Am Water Resour Assoc*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2001.tb05480.x>.

DSR-Vizianagaram Dist. (2018): *District Survey Report Vizianagaram District* (2018) Department Of Mines and Geology Government Of Andhra Pradesh. Andhra Pradesh Space Applications Centre (Apsac).

Hamed Soleimani, Omid Nasri, Boshra Ojaghi, Hasan Pasalari, Mona Hosseini, Bayram Hashemzadeh, Ali Kavosi, Safdar Masoumi, Majid Radfard, Amir Adibzadeh, Ghasem Kiani Feizabadi, (2018) Data on drinking water quality using water quality index (WQI) and assessment of groundwater quality for irrigation purposes in Qorveh & Dehgan, Kurdistan, Iran, *Data in Brief*, Volume 20, 2018, Pages 375-386, ISSN 2352-3409, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2018.08.022>.

ISC (2005) Index of stream condition: The second benchmark of Victorian River. Victorian Government Department of Sustainability and Environment, Melbourne, August 2005. www.vicwaterdata.net.

Iuliana Paun, Liliana Valeria Cruceru, Florentina Laura Chiriac, Marcela Niculescu, Gabriela Geanina Vasile, Nicoleta Mirela Marin (2016) Water Quality Indices - Methods For Evaluating The Quality Of Drinking Water. INCD ECOIND – International Symposium – Simi 2016, *The Environment And The Industry*, Proceedings Book. DOI: [10.21698/simi.2016.0055](https://doi.org/10.21698/simi.2016.0055).

Khan, F., Husain, T., & Lumb, A. (2003). Water quality evaluation and trend analysis in selected watersheds of the Atlantic region of Canada. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 88, 221– 242. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025573108513>

Landwehr, J. M., and Deininger, R. A. (1976). A comparison of several water quality indexes. *J. Water Pollut. Control Fed.* 48, 954–958. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234129859_A_Comparison_of_Several_Water_Quality_Indexes.

Liou, S. M., Lo, S. L., and Wang, S. H. (2004). A generalized water quality index for Taiwan. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 96, 35–32. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EMAS.0000031715.83752.a1>

Lumb, Ashok., Halliwell, D., & Sharma, T. (2006). Application of the CCME water quality index to monitor water quality: A case study of the Mackenzie River Basin, Canada. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 113, 411–429. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-005-9092-6>.

Moez Kachroud, Fabienne Trolard, Mohamed Kefi, Sihem Jebari and Guilhem Bourrié (2019) Water Quality Indices: Challenges and Application Limits in the Literature. *Water*, 2019, 11, 361. Pp1-26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w11020361>

Pesce, S. F., & Wunderlin, D. A. (2000). Use of water quality indices to verify the impact of Cordoba City (Argentina) on Suquia River. *Water Research*, 34, 2915–2926. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(00\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(00)00036-1).

Prasad M., V. Sunitha, Y. Sudharshan Reddy, B. Suvarna, B. Muralidhara Reddy, M. Ramakrishna Reddy (2019) Data on water quality index development for groundwater quality assessment from Obulavaripalli Mandal, YSR district, A.P India, *Data in Brief*, Volume 24, 2019, 103846, ISSN 2352-3409, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2019.103846>.

Rawat, K.S., Singh, S.K., Jacintha, T.G.A. (2017) Appraisal of long term groundwater quality of peninsular India using water quality index and fractal dimension. *J Earth Syst Sci*, 126, 122 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-017-0895-y>.

Raychaudhuri, Mausumi, Raychaudhuri, S., Dhal, S, Kumar, A and Jena, S. K. (2011). Groundwater quality along Daya river for irrigation use. In: *Workshop on Ground Water Development and Management Prospect in Odisha* (March 7th, 2011) (Eds D. P. Pati, P. K. Mahapatra, D. N. Mandal, C. Maohanty and A. Chowdhury). Central Ground Water Authority & Central Ground Water Board, S E Region, Ministry of Water Resources, GOI. 111 – 121.

Raychaudhuri , Mausumi, Raychaudhuri, S., Jena, S. K. Kumar, Ashwani and SrivastavaR. C., (2014) WQI to Monitor Water Quality for Irrigation and Potable Use. *DWM Bulletin No. 71* Directorate of Water Management (ICAR), Bhubaneswar, India, 43p.). http://www.iwmm.res.in/pdf/Bulletin_71.pdf.

Roohollah Noori, Ronny Berndtsson, Majid Hosseinzadeh, Jan Franklin Adamowski, Maryam Rabiee Abyaneh (2019) A critical review on the application of the National Sanitation Foundation Water Quality Index, *Environmental Pollution*, Volume 244, 2019, Pages 575-587,ISSN 0269-7491, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.10.076>.

Saeedi M, Abessi O, Sharifi F, Meraji H (2009) Development of ground water quality index. *Environ Monit Assess* 163:327–335. doi:[10.1007/s10661-009-0837-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-009-0837-5).

Shrikant Mukate, Vasant Wagh, Dipak Panaskar, James A. Jacobs, Akash Sawant (2019) Development of new integrated water quality index (IWQI) model to evaluate the drinking suitability of water, *Ecological Indicators*, Volume 101, , Pages 348-354, ISSN 1470-160X, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.01.034>.

Shweta Tyagi, Bhavtosh Sharma, Prashant Singh, and Rajendra Dobhal (2013) Water Quality Assessment in Terms of Water Quality Index.” *American Journal of Water Resources*, 1, no. 3: 34-38. <https://doi.org/10.12691/ajwr-1-3-3>

Singh, R., Syed, T.H., Kumar, S. et al. (2017) Hydrogeochemical assessment of surface and groundwater resources of Korba coalfield, Central India: environmental implications. *Arab J Geosci*, 10, 318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-017-3098-6>.

Smith, D. G. (1989): A new form of water quality index for rivers and streams. *Water Science and Technology*, 21(2), 123–127. <http://iwaponline.com/wst/article-pdf/21/2/123/99994/123.pdf>.

Smith D G (1990) A better water quality indexing system for rivers and streams. *Water Res* 24(10):1237–1244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354\(90\)90047-A](https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(90)90047-A).

Srinivasa Rao G. V. R., G. Rupa Kumari, T. P. Sreejani, B. Kalyanaramu (2020) WQI based Analysis of Groundwater Quality in Lakkavarapu Kota region, Vizianagaram District, Andhra Pradesh. *Research J. Science and Tech.* 12(4):235-241. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2349-2988.2020.00031.5>.

Table 1. Steps involved and formulae of five different methods used for WQI calculations.

| Steps | Symbols | Weighted arithmetic index (after Brown 1970). | GWQI (after Saeedi et. al., 2009). | WQI (after Raychaudhuri et. al., 2014). | WQI (Asit and Surajit 2015). | Integrated water quality index (after Shrikant et. al., 2019). |
|-------|----------------|---|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| | | Method - 1 | Method - 2 | Method - 3 | Method - 4 | Method - 5 |
| 1 | w_i/w_i & K | $1/\sum(1/S_n)$ | | w_i based on compliance to DWS | w_i based health significance | Range = Permissible limit (PL) Desirable limit (DL) |
| 2 | W_i | K/S_n | Parameters' weight | $w_i/\sum w_i$ | $w_i/\sum w_i$ | Modified Permissible Limit (MPL)=Permissible Limit (20% Range) |
| 3 | q_n | $100 [(V_n - V_i)/S_n - V_i]$ | $(C_i/S_i) \times 100$ | $(C_i/S_i) \times 100$ | $(C_i/S_i) \times 100$ | $SI_1=0$; $SI_2=(D_i - P_i)/DL$; $SI_3=(P_i - MPL)/MPL$ |
| 4a | S_{li} | $\sum q_n * W_n / \sum W_n$ | $S_{li} = W_i * q_i$ | $S_{li} = W_i * q_i$ | $S_{li} = W_i * q_i$ | |
| 4b | WQI | $WAI = \sum(q_n * W_n / \sum W_n)$ | $GWQI = \sum S_{li}$ | $WQI = \sum S_{li}$ | $WQI = \sum S_{li}$ | $IWQI = \sum SI_3$ to SI_5 |
| 5 | Classification | <50 : Excellent | <0.50 : Excellent | <50 : Excellent | <50 : Excellent | <1.00 : Excellent |
| | | 51 to 100 : Good | 0.50 to 1.00 : Good | 50 to 100 : Good | 50 to 100 : Good | 1.00 to 2.00 : Good |
| | | 101 to 200 : Poor Water | 1.00 to 2.00 : Marginal | 101 to 200 : Poor Water | 100 to 200 : Poor Water | 2.00 to 3.00 : Marginal |
| | | 201 to 300 : Very Poor Water | 2.00 to 3.00 : Poor | 201 to 300 : Very Poor Water | 200 to 300 : Very Poor Water | 3.00 to 5.00 : Poor |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | >300 : Water Unsuitable For Drinking | >3.00 : Water Unsuitable | >300 : Water Unsuitable For Drinking | >300 : Water Unsuitable For Drinking | >5.00 : Water Unsuitable |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Table 2. Water chemistry results and WQI values obtained from different methods.

| Village | pH | TD S | TH | Ca ²⁺ | Mg ²⁺ | TAsHCO ₃ ⁻ | Cl ⁻ | SO ₄ ²⁻ | NO ₃ ⁻ | F ⁻ | WAI (Brown et al., 1970) | GWQI (Saedi et al., 2009) | WQI (Raychaudhuri et al., 2014) | WQI (Asit and Surajit 2015) | IWQI (Shrikant et al., 2019) |
|---------------|------|------|-----|------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | mg/l | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alamanda | 7.00 | 1480 | 540 | 72 | 88 | 270 | 333 | 250 | 44 | 0.33 | 21 | 0.63 | 74 | 77 | 0.97 |
| Badangi | 7.47 | 1485 | 600 | 160 | 49 | 300 | 380 | 200 | 25 | 0.21 | 14 | 0.63 | 71 | 72 | 0.94 |
| Balijipeta | 6.95 | 2266 | 100 | 240 | 10 | 110 | 19 | 28 | 1 | 0.58 | 30 | 0.18 | 31 | 34 | 5.06 |
| Bhogapuram | 7.65 | 1728 | 600 | 120 | 73 | 350 | 428 | 255 | 19 | 0.79 | 45 | 0.68 | 79 | 79 | 0.38 |
| Bobbili | 7.40 | 1487 | 440 | 560 | 73 | 400 | 285 | 147 | 10 | 0.28 | 17 | 0.50 | 61 | 61 | 1.24 |
| Bodasingipeta | 7.45 | 643 | 200 | 400 | 24 | 220 | 124 | 85 | 1 | 0.70 | 38 | 0.30 | 43 | 46 | 2.04 |
| Cheepur | 7. | 15 | 1 | 49 | 40 | 285 | 13 | 5 | 0. | 17 | 0.6 | 76 | 81 | 1.78 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|------|-----|------|-----|------|------|
| upalli | 40 | 488 | 604 | 4 | | 0 | | 8 | 9 | 23 | | 4 | | | |
| Denkada | 7.15 | 2657 | 1300 | 200 | 194 | 500 | 760 | 350 | 39 | 0.30 | 21 | 1.15 | 119 | 111 | 4.26 |
| Devupalli | 7.00 | 589 | 200 | 32 | 29 | 250 | 95 | 50 | 2 | 0.38 | 20 | 0.27 | 39 | 41 | 2.59 |
| G.L.Puram | 6.51 | 512 | 200 | 40 | 24 | 220 | 95 | 51 | 1 | 0.10 | 4 | 0.25 | 35 | 36 | 2.92 |
| Gantkada | 7.65 | 1256 | 500 | 128 | 44 | 250 | 333 | 170 | 37 | 0.17 | 13 | 0.57 | 67 | 70 | 1.01 |
| Garbhama | 7.03 | 794 | 360 | 64 | 49 | 250 | 143 | 81 | 15 | 0.26 | 15 | 0.39 | 50 | 51 | 1.92 |
| Garividi | 7.31 | 605 | 260 | 16 | 53 | 200 | 143 | 45 | 4 | 0.15 | 9 | 0.30 | 41 | 42 | 2.84 |
| Garugubilli | 7.37 | 1478 | 660 | 200 | 39 | 420 | 304 | 200 | 18 | 0.20 | 13 | 0.65 | 73 | 71 | 1.22 |
| Jiyyamavalasa | 7.05 | 1853 | 640 | 96 | 97 | 550 | 428 | 250 | 9 | 1.00 | 55 | 0.71 | 82 | 81 | 0.51 |
| Kothavalasa | 8.10 | 1181 | 400 | 80 | 49 | 350 | 238 | 200 | 6 | 2.51 | 137 | 0.55 | 75 | 79 | 0.84 |
| Kurupama | 6.00 | 1590 | 800 | 168 | 92 | 550 | 428 | 120 | 2 | 0.12 | 6 | 0.69 | 73 | 66 | 2.03 |
| L.Kota | 7.55 | 455 | 200 | 40 | 24 | 150 | 95 | 62 | 2 | 0.48 | 26 | 0.27 | 39 | 42 | 2.83 |
| Maradama | 7.36 | 506 | 260 | 40 | 39 | 150 | 95 | 77 | 3 | 0.93 | 50 | 0.32 | 45 | 48 | 2.03 |
| Mentada | 7. | 15 | 51 | 153 | 35 | 238 | 10 | 1 | 0. | 19 | 0.5 | 60 | 60 | 1.23 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|---------|---------|------|-------------|------------------|--------------|----------|----------|-----|---------|------|
| | 4 0 | 1 1 0 | 0 0 2 | 1 2 | | 0 | | 0 2 3 | | | 1 | | | | |
| M.M.Palli | 7. 2 5 | 9 6 0 | 3 6 0 | 7 2 | 44 | 25 0 | 247 | 94 8 | 0. 7 0 | 38 | 0.4 2 | 54 | 55 | 0.89 | |
| Pachipenta | 7. 4 6 | 8 9 6 | 3 6 0 | 8 0 | 39 | 26 0 | 219 | 10 7 | 1 1 2 | 61 | 0.4 3 | 56 | 57 | 0.59 | |
| Parvathipuram | 6. 4 5 | 6 8 3 | 3 0 0 | 8 0 | 24 | 20 0 | 95 | 13 3 | 1 7 0 | 0. 0 8 | 4 | 0.3 5 | 44 | 47 | 2.08 |
| Poosapatirega | 6. 8 2 | 3 8 0 2 | 1 5 0 0 | 3 6 0 | 14 6 | 70 0 | 1045 | 60 0 | 6 3 | 0. 3 9 | 28 | 1.4 8 | 149 | 14 3 | 7.47 |
| R.B.Puram | 7. 5 0 | 1 2 8 5 | 4 8 0 | 1 0 4 | 53 | 40 0 | 285 | 10 8 | 1 9 3 8 | | 76 | 0.5 6 | 71 | 73 | 0.46 |
| Satiwada | 7. 8 5 | 1 4 0 8 | 5 0 0 | 1 2 8 | 44 | 40 0 | 285 | 17 5 | 1 8 0 | 0. 3 0 | 19 | 0.5 7 | 67 | 68 | 0.82 |
| Seethanagaram | 7. 3 2 | 9 3 8 | 3 0 0 | 5 6 | 39 | 25 0 | 143 | 29 4 | 2 | 0. 0 4 | 3 | 0.4 1 | 50 | 52 | 1.65 |
| T.Boddivara | 7. 0 0 | 2 5 3 | 1 0 0 | 2 4 | 10 | 50 | 19 | 84 | 9 | 1. 0 0 | 53 | 0.2 1 | 36 | 41 | 4.60 |
| Therlam | 7. 3 0 | 7 7 4 | 3 6 0 | 6 4 | 49 | 20 0 | 143 | 15 0 | 8 | 0. 1 8 | 11 | 0.3 9 | 49 | 50 | 1.65 |
| Vepada | 6. 8 8 | 1 1 5 2 | 4 0 0 | 8 8 | 44 | 25 0 | 333 | 11 3 | 1 8 | 1. 3 4 | 73 | 0.5 0 | 63 | 66 | 0.44 |
| Vizianagaram | 7. 6 5 | 6 0 2 | 2 0 0 | 4 0 | 24 | 18 0 | 143 | 75 | 3 | 0. 8 0 | 44 | 0.3 0 | 44 | 47 | 2.01 |
| Bonangi | 7. 5 0 | 9 2 6 | 3 6 0 | 1 0 4 | 24 | 30 0 | 190 | 12 0 | 1 2 | 0. 8 3 | 46 | 0.4 4 | 57 | 59 | 1.00 |
| Budarayavalasa | 7. 5 0 | 1 2 0 | 4 4 0 | 1 2 | 34 | 25 0 | 333 | 12 5 | 1 3 | 0. 8 3 | 46 | 0.5 1 | 62 | 64 | 0.55 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|------|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|----|------|----|------|-----|-----|------|--|
| | | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gopalar ayudupeta | 7.35 | 1848 | 700 | 184 | 58 | 450 | 523 | 200 | 13 | 0.64 | 36 | 0.73 | 81 | 79 | 0.85 | |
| Jonnada | 6.70 | 406 | 200 | 32 | 29 | 110 | 95 | 55 | 7 | 0.44 | 23 | 0.26 | 37 | 39 | 3.15 | |
| Kantaka palli | 7.50 | 2052 | 640 | 96 | 97 | 400 | 475 | 350 | 37 | 0.99 | 57 | 0.78 | 91 | 94 | 0.59 | |
| Kedaripuram | 6.53 | 165 | 100 | 16 | 15 | 60 | 29 | 20 | 1 | 0.17 | 8 | 0.15 | 26 | 28 | 5.79 | |
| Komarda | 7.30 | 676 | 260 | 48 | 34 | 250 | 124 | 110 | 2 | 0.62 | 33 | 0.34 | 46 | 48 | 1.70 | |
| Kothagudem | 6.45 | 406 | 200 | 56 | 15 | 150 | 48 | 45 | 13 | 0.13 | 6 | 0.25 | 35 | 38 | 3.67 | |
| Kurukutti | 7.20 | 240 | 140 | 40 | 10 | 100 | 29 | 34 | 1 | 0.19 | 10 | 0.20 | 30 | 33 | 4.99 | |
| Panchali | 7.50 | 205 | 600 | 168 | 44 | 500 | 380 | 280 | 64 | 0.61 | 38 | 0.78 | 91 | 97 | 1.53 | |
| Ravada | 7.00 | 2080 | 640 | 96 | 97 | 400 | 475 | 320 | 60 | 0.35 | 23 | 0.78 | 90 | 94 | 1.90 | |
| Salur | 7.74 | 789 | 360 | 14 | 24 | 270 | 133 | 100 | 7 | 0.76 | 42 | 0.41 | 54 | 55 | 1.40 | |
| Viyyamapeta | 6.45 | 182 | 100 | 24 | 10 | 70 | 19 | 25 | 5 | 0.24 | 11 | 0.16 | 27 | 30 | 5.71 | |
| Y S Valasa | 6.47 | 110 | 60 | 16 | 5 | 40 | 10 | 22 | 3 | 0.12 | 5 | 0.13 | 23 | 27 | 6.64 | |
| Jannivalasa | 9.17 | 2352 | 740 | 216 | 49 | 450 | 523 | 380 | 69 | 0.97 | 61 | 0.94 | 109 | 115 | 2.17 | |
| Maripiv | 8. | 5 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 21 | 105 | 56 | 1 | 0. | 29 | 0.3 | 42 | 48 | 2.50 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|----------|----------------------------|--|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| alasa | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 3. | 4 | | 1 | | | |
| | 8 | 2 | 0 | | | | | 7 | 8 | | | | | |
| 168 | concentration \geq AL and \leq PL | | | | 20 52 | concentration \geq to PL | | | | Good category highlighted in yellow; Poor quality highlighted in red | | | | |

Table 3. Classification of water based on different WQI methods.

| | | WAI after Brown et al., 1970; Method -1 | | WQI after Raychaudhuri et. al., 2014; Method -3 | | WQI used by Asit and Surajit 2015; Method -4 | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--------------------|---|--|--|--------------------|
| WQI value & (Class) | Water quality status | No. of water samples | % of water samples | No. of water samples | % of water samples | No. of water samples | % of water samples |
| <50 (A) | Excellent | 39 | 83 | 21 | 45 | 19 | 40 |
| 51 to 100 (B) | Good | 7 | 15 | 23 | 49 | 25 | 53 |
| 101 to 200 (C) | Poor Water | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| 201 to 300 (D) | Very Poor Water | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| >300 (E) | Water Unsuitable For Drinking | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 47 | 100 | 47 | 100 | 47 | 100 |
| GWQI after Saeedi et al., 2009 (Modified) : Method -2 | | | | IWQI after Shrikant et. al., 2019; Method -5 | | | |
| WQI value | Class | No. of water samples | % of water samples | WQI value | Class & Explanation (w.r.t. to drinking water) | No. of water samples | % of water samples |
| <0.49 | Excellent | 26 | 55 | <1 | Excellent | 13 | 28 |
| 0.5 to 0.99 | Good | 19 | 40 | 1–2 | Good | 13 | 28 |
| 1.00 to 1.49 | Marginal | 2 | 4 | 2–3 | Marginal | 11 | 23 |
| 1.50 to 1.99 | Poor | 0 | 0 | 3–5 | Poor | 5 | 11 |
| 2.00 to 3.00 | Unsuitable | 0 | 0 | >5 | Unsuitable | 5 | 11 |
| Total | | 47 | 100 | | | 47 | 100 |

Table 4. Parameter weight (wi) adopted by different researchers.

| | Abbasnia et. al (2018) | Hamed et. al., (2018) | Singh et. al., (2017) | Adimala et. al., (2018) | Krishna et. al., (2014 and 2015) | Saeedi et. al., (2010) | Das et. al., (2017) | Shah Jehan et. al., (2020) | Hamlat and Guidoum (2018) |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Parameters | Factor Weight | Weight (wi) | Weight (wi) | Weight (wi) | Weight (wi) | Modified to Weight (wi) | Assigned weight (AW) | Weight (wi) | Weight (wi) |
| pH | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1.00 | 2.54 | 4 | 4 |
| EC (m S/cm) | | | | | 4 | | 3.22 | 4 | 4 |
| TDS (mg/l) | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0.75 | 2.75 | 4 | 0 |
| TH as CaCO ₃ (mg/l) | 3 | | 2 | 3 | | | 1.46 | | |
| Ca ²⁺ (mg/l) | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1.00 | | 2 | 2 |
| Mg ²⁺ (mg/l) | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0.75 | | 2 | 1 |
| K ⁺ (mg/l) | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0.20 | | 2 | 2 |
| Na ⁺ (mg/l) | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0.30 | 1.67 | 3 | 2 |
| TA - HCO ₃ ⁻ (mg/l) | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 1 | 3 |
| Cl ⁻ (mg/l) | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0.50 | | 4 | 3 |
| SO ₄ ²⁻ (mg/l) | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0.50 | | 3 | 4 |
| NO ₃ ⁻ (mg/l) | 5 | | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 2.57 | | 5 |
| F ⁻ (mg/l) | 4 | | 4 | 5 | | | | | |
| PO ₄ ³⁻ (mg/l) | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Fe (mg/l) | | | 4 | | | | | | |

*mean of weight values from earlier publications




Fig. 1. Study area with sample locations.