

**Research Article** 

# GIS Analysis of spatial-temporal variation of the ecological risk caused by element and organic pollutants in Lake Marmara TURKIYE

# Şakir Fural

Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Faculty of Arts and Science, Department of Geography, Kırşehir, TURKIYE

\* E-mail: furalsakir@gmail.com

Received 02.08.2022 Accepted 13.09.2023

How to cite: Şakir, F. (2023). GIS Analysis of spatial-temporal variation of the ecological risk caused by element and organic pollutants in Lake Marmara (Türkiye), *Journal of Environment and Geoinformatics (IJEGEO)*, 10(3): 139-153. doi: 10.30897/ijegeo.1336939

#### Abstract

Located in western Anatolia (Türkiye), Lake Marmara is a wetland with high ecological value. Lake Marmara, which was exposed to intense anthropogenic effects after 1940, is experiencing ecological deterioration in recent years. This study aimed to analyze the ecological risk level of the lake by using Enrichment Factor (EF), Toxic Risk Index (TRI), Modified Potential Ecological Risk Index (mER) etc. The research hypothesized that the discharge of water from the Gediz River and Kum Stream to the lake after 1940 triggered ecological risk problems. Moderate toxic risk, low potential ecological risk, moderate element contamination were detected throughout the lake. It was determined that Mo, P and Hg of anthropogenic origin and As, Ni, Cr, Cu of lithological origin created ecological risk at a regional scale. Domestic-industrial wastes and agriculture in the Gediz River basin and around the lake were identified as the dominant anthropogenic activity. The temporal variation of the ecological risk indices based on the elements did not reflect the anthropogenic traces of water discharge into the lake from the Gediz River basin. However, the temporal variation of TOC, N, P and CDP showed the effects of anthropogenic interventions in the lake. According to the threshold values; P is highly contaminated and N is close to the severely contaminated limit. The findings, while confirming the research hypothesis, showed that the dominant ecological risk factor in Lake Marmara is not elemental contamination, but organic pollutants, nitrogen and phosphate.

Keywords: Wetland ecology, Limnology, Ecological risk, Organic pollution

#### Introduction

Anthropogenic activities increased rapidly after the industrial revolution and the post-1784 era was defined as the Anthropocene (Crutzen, 2006; Ertek, 2017). Elemental and organic pollutants triggered ecological risk issues as natural biomes transformed into anthropogenic biomes in the Anthropocene (Vitousek et al., 1997; Cürebal et al., 2015; Nawab et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2021). Ecological deterioration occurred in wetlands such as marine ecosystem (Bat et al., 2017; Özkan et al., 2022), dams (Fural et al., 2022; Cüce et al., 2022), rivers (Yüksel et al., 2022; Ustaoğlu et al., 2022), and lakes (Kükrer et al., 2015; Kaya et al., 2017). The most striking example of the diffuse effect of the elements in wetlands is the detection of Hg pollution at a depth of 10 km in the Pacific Ocean (Sanei et al., 2021). Elements entering the aquatic environment are stored in the sediment, increasing the toxic level and are not cleaned with standard treatment systems (Wang et al., 2015). Interaction related to culture and natural environment between wetlands and people is quite extensive. Therefore, potential pollution problems in wetlands can cause serious health problems in humans (Rovira et al., 2011). Wetlands should be protected from highly contaminated element and organic matter discharges in order to prevent the cited risks.

Lake Marmara (Western Anatolia, Türkiye) is a wetland with high natural resource value where ecological risk

problems are observed (Figure 1). There are commercial fishing activities in the lake for fish species such as Cyprinus carpio, Sander lucioperca, Mugu cephalus etc. (Ilhan and Sari 2015). 34 species of waterfowl use the lake as a breeding ground such as Microcarbo pygmeus, Pelecanus crispus, Ixobrychus minutus, Tadorna ferruginea, Tadorna ferruginea, Chlidonias hybridus and Vanellus spinosus (Gül et al., 2013). The basin, which has been a settlement since the Bronze Age, has received increased and continuous human influence in the Anthropocene and the natural environment has been gradually destroyed (Tağıl, 2007; Gülersoy, 2013; Vardar 2018; Kılıç et al., 2023). After 1940, water started to be discharged from the Kum Stream and Gediz River, which drain the Gediz basin to Lake Marmara with the help of irrigation regulators (İnandık, 1965; Girgin, 2011; Derinöz, 2022). So, Lake Marmara, which drains a small closed basin of 1780 km<sup>2</sup>, to the anthropogenic effects of the Upper Gediz Basin of 17500 km<sup>2</sup>, where approximately one million people live.

Ecological deterioration in Lake Marmara started with eutrophication and the trophic level increased rapidly (Ustaoğlu 1993; Kocataş 2002; Yıldız et al., 2005). The sediment sampling study conducted in the summer of 2019 determined that the hypertrophic level progressed towards the last stage. It was observed that most of the lake surface was covered with aquatic plants and swampy areas were formed. The lake dried up completely in the summer of 2020. Due to heavy rains, water began to be retained in some parts of the lake in January 2022.

However, in the meantime, the wetland ecosystem has experienced an ecological destruction that is difficult to transform.



Fig. 1. Location and sampling point map.

This study analyzed the spatial and temporal variation of the ecological risk originating from element and organic pollutants in Lake Marmara, undergoing the process of drying out. The research statement was defined as follows: Lake Marmara is experiencing ecological degradation problems. The research hypothesized that the discharge of water from Gediz River and Kum Stream to Lake Marmara triggered ecological deterioration in the lake. A holistic evaluation was conducted with ecological risk indices, multivariate statistical analyzes and spatial analyzes to offer solutions to the research problem and test the validity of the hypothesis.

### **Material and Method**

Elements stored in sediment remain stable for a long time (Wang et al. 2015). For this reason, sediment samples were used in the study. Surface sediment samples were taken from 25 sampling points in the summer of 2019 by using the Van Veen Grab. A 70 cm core was taken from the deepest point of the lake (4.5 m) with a Kajak sediment sampler. Sediments contained the last ecological records before the lake completely dried out.

Prepared sample is digested with a modified Aqua Regia solution of equal parts concentrated HCI, HNO<sub>3</sub>, and DIH<sub>2</sub>O for about one hour in a heating block. Sample was made up to volume with dilute HCI. Within the scope of the study; Calcium (Ca), Iron (Fe), Aluminum (Al), Magnesium (Mg), Potassium (K), Phosphate (P), Manganese (Mn), Nickel (Ni), Chromium (Cr), Zinc (Zn), Arsenic (As), Copper (Cu), Lead (Pb), Molybdenum (Mo), Cadmium (Cd) and Mercury (Hg) elemental analyzes were performed by ICP-MS in the Bareu Veritas laboratory (Canada). Hg concentration measurement was made with the closed system of ICP – MS.

Quality control was performed with standard reference material. Recovery was determined between 95% and 106%. Carbonate  $(CO_3^{-2})$  concentration was found with Scheibler Calcimeter (Schlichting and Blume 1966), and Chlorophyll Degradation Products (CDP) analysis was performed by spectrophotometric method with acetone extraction (Lorenzen, 1971). Total Organic Carbon (TOC) was analyzed by Walkley-Black Titration method (Gaudette et al., 1974). Nitrogen (N) analysis was carried out at Kastamonu University Central Laboratory Application and Research Center using the CHL analyzer.

The enrichment factor (EF) was used to determine the natural and anthropogenic sources of the elements (Formula 1).

$$EF = \frac{(C_x/C_n)_{Environment}}{(B_x/B_n)_{backgorund}}$$
(Eq.1)

In the formula;  $C_x$  represents element concentration and  $C_n$  represents the element (Al) concentration used in geochemical normalization.  $B_x$  is the background value of the element and  $B_n$  is the background value of Al selected for normalization (Sutherland 2000; Bo et al., 2015; Kükrer et al., 2021). The minimum element concentrations in the core slices after geochemical normalization were used as background values. Toxic Risk Index (TRI) was used for toxic risk analysis (Formula 2). (Zhang et al., 2016).

$$TRI_i = \sqrt{\frac{(C_x/TEL)^2 + (C_x/PEL)^2}{2}}$$
 (Eq.2)

In the formula;  $TRI_i$  represents individual toxic risk,  $C_x$  represents element concentration, TEL represents "Threshold Effect Level" and PEL represents "Probable Effect Level" (MacDonald et al., 2000). Integrated toxic risk was calculated with TRI (Formula 3).

$$TRI = \sum_{i=1}^{n} TRI_i \tag{Eq.3}$$

The Modified Ecological Risk Index (mER) was used to determine the ecological risk level. (Formula 4). (Hakanson 1980).

$${}_{\rm m}{\rm ER} = {\rm T}_{\rm RF} \, {\rm x} \, {\rm EF} \tag{Eq.4}$$

In the formula;  $T_{RF}$  represents the toxic risk coefficient and EF represents the enrichment factor (Hakanson 1980; Brady et al., 2015). Toxic risk coefficients are as follows: Hg=40, Cd=30, As=10, Cu=Pb=Ni=5, Cr=2, Zn=1, Mn=1 (Hakanson 1980). The modified potential ecological risk index (mPER) was used to determine the integrated ecological risk (Formula 5). (Hakanson 1980; Brady et al. 2015).

$$mPER = \sum_{m} ER = (T_{RF} x EF)$$
(Eq.5)

Unlike the above indices, the Modified Hazard Quotient (mHQ) was calculated by comparing the "threshold effect level" (TEL), "probable effect level" (PEL) and "severe effect level" (SEL) of the element concentrations (Formula 6). (MacDonald et al., 2000; Benson et al., 2018).

mHQ = 
$$\left[C_{x}\left(\frac{1}{\text{TEL}} + \frac{1}{\text{PEL}} + \frac{1}{\text{SEL}}\right)\right]^{1/2}$$
 (Eq.6)

In the formula;  $C_x$  represents element concentration and TEL, PEL and SEL represent threshold levels. ECI performs ecological risk assessment in an integrated manner using mHQ data and principal component analysis/factor analysis data (Benson et al. 2018).  $B_n$  is the inverse of the eigenvalue obtained from principal component analysis in ECI (Formula 7).

$$ECI = B_n \sum_{i=1}^n m HQ_i \tag{Eq.7}$$

Contamination level was determined by Contamination Severity Index (CSI) (Pejman et al., 2015). CSI was calculated based on ERL (*effect range low*) and ERM (*effect range median*) data (Formula 8). (Long et al., 1998).

$$CSI = \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_i \left[ \left( \frac{Cx}{ERL_i} \right)^{1/2} + \left( \frac{Cx}{ERM_i} \right)^2 \right] \qquad (Eq.8)$$

In the formula;  $W_i$  is the contamination weight,  $C_x$  is the element concentration, and n is the number of elements used in the analysis. CSI was calculated with statistical data (Formula 9). Index findings were evaluated according to Table 1.

$$W_i = \frac{(\text{loading value}_i x \text{ eigen value})}{\sum_i^n (\text{loading value}_i x \text{ eigen value})}$$
(Eq.9)

Spatial analyzes were performed with the kriging interpolation device in the Arc – Map 10.7 interface. Multivariate statistical analyzes were performed with Statgraphics 19 software.

#### **Results and Discussion**

The lake floor was divided into five regions for spatial analysis. (1) Gediz Regulator (GR), the area where water is discharged from the Gediz River. (2) Kum Stream Regulator (KSR), the area where water is discharged from the Kum Stream, (3) Irrigation Canal Regulator (ICR), irrigation canal outlet, (4) Road Region (RR), the highway to the south and (5) Northern Region (NR), the north of the lake.

Mean element concentration is as follows: (mg/kg): Ca (69800) > Fe (36300) > Al (32500) > Mg (19400) > K(8900) > P (600) > Mn (832.72) > Ni (121.02) > Cr (93.20) > Zn (64.92) > As (43.06) > Cu (35.30) > Pb(20.80) > Mo(1.01) > Cd(0.18) > Hg(0.078). Elemental concentrations in the GR and KSR region were generally minimal (excluding Mo, P, and Hg). There are two possible reasons for this situation: (1) Deceleration of the sedimentation rate due to the driving force of the stream and (2) decreased element uptake due to the increase in the grain size of the sediment. Mo, Hg and P were not affected by the two conditions mentioned above. Mo and Hg reached the highest concentration in the GR region, and P in the KSR region (Figure 2). The probable reason for this is the discharge of Mo, P and Hg into the lake in very high concentrations, which precipitate at the water discharge points despite the unfavorable settling conditions. Generally, stable spatial distributions were observed in regions other than GR and KSR. Figure 2 presents the detailed spatial distribution of the elements. Except for Cr, Fe, Mn, all elemental concentrations tend to decrease from the core to the surface (Figure 3). The temporal variation of element concentrations does not adequately reflect the effects of the connection between Lake Marmara and Gediz basin.

Total organic carbon (TOC) is at its maximum in the KSR region, which consists of reed and marshy areas. Carbonate  $(CO_3^{-2})$  concentration is high in the ICR and KSR region. The spatial distribution of  $CO_3^{-2}$  is compatible with the distribution of limestone formations around the lake (MTA, 2022). The concentration of chlorophyll degradation products (CDP) is high in the KSR region. TOC,  $CO_3^{-2}$  and CDP concentrations decrease in the GR region due to unfavorable settling conditions (Figure 2). The regions where TOC and CDP reach high concentrations are the areas where eutrophication, aquatic plant distribution and swamp environment occur.

Annual precipitation rate in Marmara Lake was calculated as 0.06 cm (Bulkan et al. 2018). The data show that each slice of the core, divided into 5 cm sections, was deposited in about 83 years. In this case, the first slice of the core (0 -5 cm) represents a temporal change of approximately 83 years (1935 – present). A 65 cm core from Marmara Lake, close to this core, was dated 778 years ago (Kılıç et al., 2023).



Fig. 2: Spatial analysis of element, TOC, CDP and CO3-2concentration



Fig3: Time variation of element concentrations

Fural / IJEGEO 10(3): 139-153 (2023)



Fig. 4: Time variation of TOC, TIC, C, N, C:N, CO3-2, P and CDP concentrations

Table 1	1:	Ecological	risk	indices	evaluation	scale
I doite i	۰.	Leological	1191	marces	e variation	scure

Table 1a: Enrichment	Factor	Table 1e: Modified Hazard Quotient				
EF	(Sutherland 2000)	mHQ	(Benson et al. 2018)			
<2	Deficiency to minimal enrichment	< 0.5	Nil to low severity			
2-5	Moderate enrichment	$0.5 \le 1$	Very low severity			
5 - 20	Significant enrichment	$1 \leq 1.5$	Low severity			
20 - 40	Very high enrichment	1.5 ≤ 2	Moderate severity			
> 40	Extremely high enrichment	2 ≤ 2.5	Considerable severity			
Table 1b: Toxic Risk I	ndex	2.5 ≤ 3	High severity			
TRI	(Zhang et al. 2016).	3≤3.5	Very high severity			
$\text{TRI} \leq 5$	No toxic risk	> 3.5	Extreme severity			
$5 < \text{TRI} \le 10$	Low toxic risk	Table 1f: Ecolog	ical Contamination Index			
$10 < \text{TRI} \le 15$	Moderate toxic risk	ECI	(Benson et al. 2018)			
$15 < \text{TRI} \le 20$	Considerable toxic risk	< 2	Uncontaminated			
TRI > 20	Very high toxic risk	2 ≤3	Uncontaminated to slightly contaminated			
Table 1c: Modfy Ecolo	gical Risk Index	3 ≤4	Slightly to moderately contaminated			
mER	(Hakanson 1980).	4 ≤5	Moderately to considerably contaminated			
< 40	Low ecological risk	$5 \leq 6$	Considerably to highly contaminated			
$40 \le mER \le 80$	Moderate ecological risk	6 ≤7	Highly contaminated			
$80 \le mER \le 160$	Significant ecological risk	> 7	Extremely contaminated			
$160 \le \mathrm{mER} < 320$	High ecological risk	Table 1g: Contai	mination Severity Index			
≥ 320	Very high ecological risk	CSI	(Long et al. 1998).			
Table 1d: Modfy Pota	ntial Ecological Risk Index	< 0.5	Uncontaminated			
mPER	(Hakanson 1980)	$0.5 \le \text{CSI} \le 1$	Very low severity of contamination			
< 150	Low potential ecological risk	$1 \le \text{CSI} < 1.5$	Low severity of contamination			
$150 \le \text{mPER} < 300$	Moderate potential ecological risk	$1.5 \le \text{CSI} \le 2$	Low to moderate severity of contamination			
$300 \le \text{mPER} < 600$	Significant potential ecological risk	$2 \le CSI < 2.5$	Moderate severity of contamination			
mPER $\ge 600$	Very high potential ecological risk	$2.5 \le \text{CSI} < 3$	Moderate to high severity of contamination			
		$3 \le CSI \le 4$	High severity of contamination			
		$4 \le CSI < 5$	Very high severity of contamination			
		$CSI \ge 5$	Ultra high severity of contamination			

According to this data, the annual precipitation rate in the lake is 0.08 cm. The dating data support each other. The first slice of the core covers approximately the period when the lake was opened to the anthropogenic influence of the Gediz River. The  $15^{th}$  cm of the core represents approximately BP 187 - 249, that is, a period close to the beginning of the Anthropocene (1769). The concentration of TOC, carbon (C), nitrogen (N), and phosphate (P) is at maximum at the core surface. The total inorganic carbon (TIC) concentration is 0.18% at the core base and 0.47% at the surface slice. The N concentration which is highly effective at the trophic level (Adams et al., 2018) increased more than 2.5 times from the core bottom to the surface.

The C:N ratio is a good indicator for detecting the TOC source. If the C:N ratio is < 15, the source of TOC is planktonic organisms. If this ratio is > 15, terrestrial plants become dominant (Sampei and Matsumoto 2001). The C:N ratio in the core is between 11 and 26. The C:N ratio, which was found to be > 15 until the 15<sup>th</sup> cm, started to decrease towards the surface and decreased to 1. TOC source in the lake is terrestrial plants up to 15 cm and planktonic organisms from 15 cm to the surface. These data indicate that the TOC source changed after the onset of the Anthropocene. It is noteworthy that the P concentration is at maximum in the surface slice of the core (BP 83). P eutrophication is effective on algae and aquatic plant growth (Correll 1998; Sönmez et al. 2008; Hasançavuşoğlu and Gündoğdu 2021).

According to the sediment quality guide prepared by the Canadian Ministry of Environment and Energy, the pollution classes are as follows;  $N \leq 0.05\%$  uncontaminated, N > 0.48% heavily contaminated.  $P \leq 0.06\%$  uncontaminated, P > 0.2% severely contaminated (Yang et al. 2017; Dan et al. 2020; Dan, et al. 2021). The increase in N pollution, which started at the 15<sup>th</sup> cm of the core, approached a serious level in the surface slice. Pollution P exceeded the severely contaminated level (0.2%) in the surface slice by four times.

The  $CO_3^{-2}$  concentration is between 17% and 41%. The  $CO_3^{-2}$  concentration, which was 25% - 41% until the middle slices of the core, decreased up to 15 cm and tended to increase again. CDP concentration increased significantly on the core surface (Figure 4). The 5<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> cm of the core are the breaking points where TOC, N, P and CDP have a significant upward trend. According to the models made according to the sedimentation rate; 5<sup>th</sup> cm of the core corresponds to (BP 83) and the 15<sup>th</sup> cm corresponds to (BP 187 - 249). These dates correspond to the beginning of the discharge of water from the Gediz River to the lake (1940-1950) and the beginning of the Anthropocene (1784), respectively.

Mean EF value of surface sediments are as follows: Mo (1.45) > P (1.10) > As (1.08) > Ca (1.07) > Cu (1.00) > Zn (0.99) = Fe (0.99) > Pb (0.98) > Mn (0.97) > Hg (0.93) > K (0.87) > Cd (0.86) > Ni (0.85) > Cr(0.84) > Mg (0.79). Spatial analyzes showed that the GR and KSR regions, the

water discharge points of the lake, are enrichment points (Figure 5). As, Hg, Ca and P were moderately enriched and Mo was significantly enriched in the GR region. Mo and P were moderately enriched in the KSR region. Hg moderately enriched in the ICR region Spatial analyzes showed that the maximum EF values of the non-enriched elements were concentrated in the GR and KSR regions (Gediz Basin water discharge points). The high ecological risk in the Gediz River has been proven by scientific studies (Akçay et al., 2003; Küçüksezgin et al., 2008; Delibacak et al., 2007). Existing literature and spatial analyzes showed that Gediz River and Kum Stream increased the anthropogenic element load of the lake. The sources of moderately enriched As, Hg, Ca, and P are complex, but their transport processes are similar. According to statistical analysis, As is closely related to elements of lithological origin (Fe, Al, Mn). There are two possible reasons for this situation: (1) As, affected by anthropogenic sources, was discharged into the lake (stream) by similar transport processes with elements of lithogenic origin and (2) The lithological erosion processes in the volcanic rocks in the Gediz Basin (Küçüksezgin et al., 2008) cause enrichment by increasing the As concentration in the lake. Anthropogenic sources of Hg are domestic - industrial wastes and solid fuel use (Pacyna et al., 2003). The source of the Hg enrichment in the lake is most likely the anthropogenic activities carried out in the Gediz River basin (Küçüksezgin et al., 2008). The probable reason why Hg is closely related to lithophile rocks in statistical analyzes is that it is discharged into the lake with the same transport mechanism. Ca is an important macronutrient used in agriculture (Tewari et al. 2004). Therefore, the possible source of Ca was estimated to be the agricultural activities carried out in the Gediz River basin and around the lake. However, Ca and  $CO_3^{-2}$  are closely related in statistical and spatial analyses. Therefore, Ca has been identified as having lithophile origin. Anthropogenic sources of P are domestic and industrial waste and manure (Correll 1998; Sönmez et al., 2008). The probable source of P, which has a strong relationship with Hg in statistical analyzes, is agriculture and domestic-industrial wastes in the Gediz Basin and around the lake. The anthropogenic sources of Mo are industrial - domestic wastes and solid fuel consumption (Chappaz et al., 2008). The probable source of Mo, which is closely related to P in statistical analyses, is the anthropogenic activities around the lake and in the Gediz Basin. No element enrichment was detected in the core according to the average data based on the examination of the temporal variation of EF. The enrichment tendency of Cu, Pb, Zn, Mn, Fe, As, Cd, Cr, Ni and P on the core surface is remarkable (Figure 6). Cu, Zn, Mn, Fe, Cd, P are important macronutrients used in plant nutrition (Cymerman and Kempers, 2001). Therefore, the possible source of the increase in the mentioned macronutrient enrichment is the agricultural activity carried out around the lake and in the Gediz Basin.

The mean mER values in the surface sediments are Hg (37.17) > Cd (25.86) > As (10.83) > Cu (5.02) > Pb (4.88) > Ni (4.25) > Cr (1.69) > Zn (0.99) > Mn (0.97).

According to the average values, none of the elements creates an ecological risk. Spatial analyzes point to GR as the most risky region in terms of ecological risk (Figure 7). In the GR region, Hg caused significant ecological risk, while Cd caused moderate ecological risk. These two toxic elements are responsible for 68% of the ecological risk in the lake. According to the spatial analysis of the elements that do not pose an ecological risk; GR and KSR regions are the areas where the maximum values are concentrated. This supports the hypothesis that the water discharged from the Gediz Basin increases the ecological risk hazard. According to the temporal change of ecological risk, the risk level of Hg, which creates a moderate ecological risk in the core, tends to decrease today. Cd is the second risky element after Hg, with an ecological risk level approaching the medium level. The ecological risk level of Cd, Cr, Cu, Mn tends to increase, while the ecological risk level of other elements tends to decrease (Figure 8).

The mean mHQ value of the surface deposits is as follows: Ni (3.41) > As (3.32) > Cr (2.08) > Cu (1.21) >Pb (0.94) > Zn (0.90) > Hg (0.80) > Cd (0.61). According to the average values, Ni and As cause pollution at very high severity level, and Cr causes pollution at considerable severity level. GR and KSR, which are risky regions according to EF, mER, and PER, are defined as risk-free regions in other indexes (mHQ, ECI, CSI and TRI). There are two possible reasons for this: (1) Increased grain size of the sediment and decreased element uptake by the discharge of water from the GR and KSR regions to the lake and (2) Contamination analysis without particle size normalization in mHQ , ECI, CSI and TRI indices.

According to spatial analysis element contamination is concentrated in the NR, RR and ICR region (Figure 9). These areas have no water discharge. Marmara Lake is located near the Kula - Adala Volcanic Geopark (Westavay et al., 2004; Ulusoy et al., 2019). Lithophile elements such as Cr, Fe, Mn may create ecological risks in streams in volcanic areas (Mariyanto et al., 2019). Previous studies in the field confirm that Cr, Ni and As, which are closely related in statistical analyzes, are of lithophilic origin (Küçüksezgin et al., 2008). Mean mHQ value in core is as follows: Ni (3.50) > As (3.40) > Cr(2.08) > Cu (1.22) > Pb (0.95) > Zn (0.89) > Hg (0.82) >Cd (0.60). As and Ni are contaminated at very high severity, Cr at considerably severity, Cu at low severity level. A general decreasing trend has been observed in the mHQ level from past to present (Figure 10).

According to the average mPER data (91.67), there is no potential ecological risk problem in the lake. According to spatial analysis, the potential ecological risk in the GR and ICR regions is moderate (Figure 11). Hg and Cd, of anthropogenic origin, discharged from the Gediz River are responsible for the potential ecological risk in these regions. None of the elements in the core posed potential ecological risk. However, the ecological risk level tends to increase after the 25<sup>th</sup> cm of the core (Figure 12). Moderate toxic risk was detected according to mean TRI (11.11).



Fig. 5: Spatial analysis of EF

Fural / IJEGEO 10(3): 139-153 (2023)



Fig. 6: Temporal variation of enrichment factor



Fig. 7: Spatial analysis of mER



Fig. 8: Temporal variation of mER

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Mo	-0.235	-0.230	0.862	-0.015
Cu	0.880	0.151	0.081	-0.080
Pb	0.954	0.189	-0.023	-0.150
Zn	0.980	0.018	0.014	0.002
Ni	0.864	0.144	-0.147	0.097
Mn	0.899	0.009	-0.128	0.067
Fe	0.977	-0.006	0.040	0.028
As	0.685	0.228	0.479	-0.178
Cd	0.877	0.301	0.123	0.078
Ca	0.159	0.949	-0.040	-0.027
Р	0.435	0.087	0.050	0.760
Cr	0.979	-0.066	0.020	0.032
Mg	0.797	0.418	-0.345	0.029
Al	0.974	-0.103	0.071	-0.029
K	0.976	0.029	-0.078	0.046
Hg	0.325	0.262	-0.123	-0.749
CO3-2	-0.024	0.962	0.085	-0.002
TOC	-0.091	0.237	0.513	0.526
CDP	0.232	0.171	0.764	0.303

According to spatial analysis, the most problematic areas of the lake in terms of toxic risk are RR and NR. According to mean ECI (2.23), the risk level is between uncontaminated to slightly contaminated. Regions at risk for ECI are NR > RR > ICR, respectively. The risk level according to mean CSI (1.68) is low to moderate severity of contamination. The most risky region for CSI is NR. The highway in RR and settlements in NR are possible sources of high TRI, ECI and CSI values. Mean data according to temporal variation indicate risk at ECI (uncontaminated to slightly contaminated), CSI (very low severity of contamination) and TRI (moderate). TRI, ECI and CSI tend to move very similarly in core. For TRI, ECI and CSI, the increase after the 50<sup>th</sup> cm of the core and the decreasing trend after the 15<sup>th</sup> cm are the striking breaking points.

Factor analysis consists of 4 classes that explain 86.50% of the total variance. Factor 1 explains 55.67% of the variance. In factor 1, lithophile is included together with elements of anthropogenic origin and elements that create ecological risk. Factor 2 explains 12.53% of the variance and consists of lithophilic  $CO_3^{-2}$  and Ca. Factor 3, which explains 11.64% of the variance, includes Mo and CDP of anthropogenic origin. Factor 4 explains 6.65% of the variance and consists of P (of anthropogenic origin) and TOC. Factor analysis shows common transport processes rather than common sources of elements (Table 2).

According to Spearman Rank Correlations Analysis data, there is a strong negative correlation between Mo and Mg of lithological origin. This supported the view that Mo was of anthropogenic origin. The positive correlation between Mo and As and P was remarkable. P of anthropogenic origin had the strongest correlation with Mo. Hg of anthropogenic origin and Mg and Pb of lithological origin showed a positive correlation. This situation revealed the possibility that lithological factors in the Gediz basin may have a share in the Hg enrichment (Table 3). The view that Ni, As and Cr, which are moderately to highly contaminated according to mHQ, are of lithological origin was supported by the findings of statistical analyses. Hg, P and Mo of anthropogenic origin were clearly separated from other elements in the cluster analysis (Figure 13). In the cluster analysis, moderately enriched As was in the same cluster with the lithophile elements and Ca was included in a cluster close to it. This supported the possibility that As and Ca were enriched by the effect of lithological sedimentation processes. TOC and CDP were in the same cluster, but  $CO_3^{-2}$  was in different cluster. This showed that the source of TOC and CDP was in the lake, while the source of  $CO_3^{-2}$  was carried by rivers.

## Conclusion

This study was based on the hypothesis that "water discharged from the Gediz River Basin causes ecological deterioration in Marmara Lake". Within the scope of the research, the validity of the hypothesis was tested by using ecological risk indices, spatial analyzes and multivariate statistical analyzes. Research findings showed that the areas with the highest level of ecological risk based on anthropogenic effects in Marmara Lake are the points where water is discharged into the lake (GR and KSR regions). Hg, P and Mo were defined as risky elements based on the EF, ER and PER data, which are sensitive to the grain size of the sediment and calculated with regional background values. According to MHQ, which works according to the threshold effect level, As, Ni, Cr, Cu were identified as contaminated elements. Research findings demonstrated that anthropogenic and lithophile elements have a combined effect on the level of contamination and ecological risk.

The temporal variation of the ecological risk analyzes based on the elements did not present ecological traces of water discharge into the lake from the Gediz River and Kum Stream. However, a regional ecological risk problem was detected in the areas where water was discharged from two rivers. The temporal variation of TOC, N, P and CDP clearly reflected the negative ecological effects of water discharge into the lake from the Gediz River and Kum Stream. The mentioned variables reached their maximum value in the surface slice of the core. This situation accelerated ecological degradation and expanded the distribution area of aquatic plants. Aquatic plants accelerated the drying of the lake by consuming water. According to the findings, it was determined that organic pollutants, nitrogen and Table 3: Spearman's rank correlation

	Мо	Cu	Pb	Zn	Ni	Mn	Fe	As	Cd	Ca	Р	Cr	Mg	Al	К	Hg	CO3 <sup>-2</sup>	TOC
Мо																		
Cu	-0.333																	
Pb	-0.072	0.719																
Zn	-0.051	0.639	0.789															
Ni	-0.165	0.167	0.367	0.647														
Mn	-0.138	0.413	0.777	0.729	0.613													
Fe	-0.043	0.594	0.801	0.929	0.607	0.792												
As	0.381	0.208	0.592	0.426	0.201	0.428	0.381											
Cd	0.063	0.583	0.816	0.604	0.237	0.708	0.646	0.524										
Ca	-0.169	-0.008	0.005	-0.352	-0.229	-0.148	-0.349	0.172	0.119									
Р	0.315	-0.081	0.003	0.23	0.375	0.242	0.185	0.115	0.247	-0.193								
Cr	0.015	0.532	0.794	0.925	0.735	0.776	0.899	0.521	0.633	-0.316	0.237							
Mg	-0.507	0.166	0.302	0.359	0.514	0.488	0.278	0.028	0.163	0.253	0.112	0.259						
Al	0.061	0.587	0.871	0.912	0.658	0.829	0.932	0.535	0.728	-0.244	0.239	0.945	0.268					
К	-0.165	0.605	0.696	0.949	0.706	0.733	0.916	0.337	0.521	-0.451	0.197	0.905	0.375	0.868				
Hg	-0.306	0.401	0.549	0.272	0.118	0.299	0.177	0.161	0.334	0.331	-0.304	0.175	0.558	0.291	0.151			
CO3 <sup>-2</sup>	-0.09	-0.142	-0.206	-0.413	-0.181	-0.266	-0.387	0.118	-0.036	0.852	-0.143	-0.406	0.225	-0.354	-0.424	0.106		
TOC	0.426	-0.018	-0.141	-0.064	-0.105	-0.257	-0.103	0.146	0.118	0.129	0.332	-0.096	-0.423	-0.083	-0.169	-0.303	0.218	
CDP	0.409	0.065	0.312	0.332	0.146	0.262	0.361	0.542	0.549	0.145	0.284	0.391	-0.017	0.424	0.274	-0.117	0.256	0.223

phosphate pollution, were responsible for the ecological deterioration in Marmara Lake rather than elements. The findings proved the validity of the research hypothesis. The recommendations are presented below to solve the ecological risk problems in the lake:

- National and international protection status of Lake Marmara should be increased.
- The decision to discharge water from the Gediz River basin to the lake should be reviewed. Projects should be developed to analyze the water resources near the lake and to discharge water from a clean source.
- All anthropogenic activities in the Gediz River basin should be inspected.
- Agricultural activities in the closed basin of Lake Marmara should be supervised and organic farming practices should be encouraged.
- The cultivation of plants with low water needs in the basin should be encouraged to reduce agricultural irrigation from the lake.
- Infrastructure projects should be developed to provide more income from fisheries and ecotourism besides agriculture from Lake Marmara



Fig. 9: Spatial analysis of MHQ



Fig. 10: Temporal variation of mHQ



Fig. 11: Spatial analysis of mPER, ECI, CSI and TRI



Fig12: Temporal variation of mPER, ECI, CSI and TRI





### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Serkan Kükrer and Prof. Dr. Ahmet Evren Erginal for his contributions in developing the project. I would also like to thank to Dr. Dilek Aykır, Msc Furkan İnan and Dr. Yunus Emre Mutlu for their support in the field work conducted in the framework of this project.

### References

- Adams, T. S., Sterner, R. W. (2000). The effect of dietary nitrogen content on trophic level 15N enrichment. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 45: 601-607. doi.org/10.4319/lo.2000.45.3.0601.
- Akçay, H., Oğuz, A., Karapire, C. (2003). Study of heavy metal pollution and speciation in Büyük Menderes and Gediz river sediments. *Water Research*, 37: 813-822. doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(02)00392-5.

- Arı, Y., Derinöz, B. (2011). How not to manage a wetland? The case of Lake Marmara (Manisa) with a cultural ecological perspective. *Journal of Geographical Sciences*, 9: 41-60.
- Bat, L., Özkan, E. Y., Büyükişik, H. B., Öztekin, H. C. (2017). Assessment of Metal Pollution in Sediments along Sinop peninsula of the Black Sea. *International Journal of Marine Science*, doi.org/205-213. 10.5376/ijms.2017.07.0022.
- Bo, L., Wang, D., Li, T., Li, Y., Zhang, G., Wang, C., et al. (2015). Accumulation and risk assessment of heavy metals in water, sediments, and aquatic organisms in rural rivers in the Taihu Lake region, China. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 22: 6721-6731. doi.org/10.1007/s11356-014-3798-3.
- Bulkan, Ö., Yalçın, M. N., Wilkes, H. (2018). Geochemistry of Marmara Lake sediments-Implications for Holocene environmental changes in Western Turkey. *Quaternary International*, 486: 199-214. doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2017.12.045.
- Brady J.P, Ayoko G.A, Martens W.N, Goonetilleke A. (2015). Development of a hybrid pollution index for heavy metals in marine and estuarine sediments. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 187, doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-4563-x.
- Benson, N.U, Adedapo A.E, Fred-Ahmadu O.H, Williams A.B, Udosen, E.D, Ayejuyo O.O, Olajire A.A. (2018). New ecological risk indices for evaluating heavy metals contamination in aquatic sediment: A case study of the Gulf of Guinea. Regional Studies in Marine Science 18: 44–56. doi.org/10.1016/j.rsma.2018.01.004.
- Chappaz, A., Gobeil, C., Tessier, A. (2008). Geochemical and anthropogenic enrichments of Mo in sediments from perennially oxic and seasonally anoxic lakes in Eastern Canada. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 72: 170-184. doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2007.10.014.
- Chen, Z., Huang, B., Hu, W., Wang, W. (2021). Ecological-health risks assessment and source identification of heavy metals in typical greenhouse vegetable production systems in Northwest China. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-13679-y.
- Correll, D. L. (1998). The Role of Phosphorus in the Eutrophication of Receiving Waters: A Review. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 27: 261-266. doi.org/10.2134/jeq1998.00472425002700020004x.
- Crutzen, P. J. (2006). The "Anthropocene". *Earth System Science in the Anthropocene* (13-16). in Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Cürebal, İ., Efe, R., Soykan, A., Sönmez, S. (2015). Impacts of anthropogenic factors on land degradation during the anthropocene in Turkey. *Journal of Environmental Biology*, 36: 51-58.
- Cüce, H., Kalıpçı E., Ustaoğlu F., Dereli M.A. (2022). Integrated Spatial Distribution and Multivariate Statistical Analysis for Assessment of Ecotoxicological and Health Risks of Sediment Metal Contamination, Ömerli Dam (Istanbul, Turkey), Water, Air & Soil Pollution, 233. doi.org/10.1007/s11270-022-05670-1.
- Cymerman, A., Kempers, A. J. (2001). Concentrations of heavy metals and plant nutrients in water, sediments

and aquatic macrophytes of anthropogenic lakes (former open cut brown coal mines) differing in stage of acidification. *Science of The Total Environment*, 28: 87-98. doi.org/10.1016/s0048-9697(01)00838-5.

- Dan, S. F., Li, S., Yang, B., Cui, D., Ning, Z., Huang, H., et al. (2021). Influence of sedimentary organic matter sources on the distribution characteristics and preservation status of organic carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, and biogenic silica in the Daya Bay, northern South China Sea. 783, doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146899.
- Dan, S. F., Liu, M. S., Yang, B. (2020). Geochemical fractionation, potential bioavailability and ecological risk of phosphorus in surface sediments of the Cross River estuary system and adjacent shelf, South East Nigeria (West Africa). *Journal of Marine Systems*, 201, doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2019.103244.
- Delibacak, S., Elmacı, M., Seçer, M., Bodur, A. (2007). Trace elements and heavy metal concentrations in fruit and vegetables of the Gediz River region. *International Journal of Water, 2: 196-211.*
- Derinöz, B. (2022). Cultural Ecology Human, Culture and Space in Marmara Lake. Çanakkale: Paradigma Academy Publications.
- Ertek, A. (2017). Anthropogenic Geomorphology: Subject, origin and purpose. *Turkish Journal of Geography*, 69: 69-79.
- Fural, Ş., Kükrer, S., Cürebal, İ., Aykır, D. (2021). Spatial distribution, environmental risk assessment, and source identification of potentially toxic metals in Atikhisar dam, Turkey. *Environmental Monitoring* and Assessment volume, 193, doi.org/10.1007/s10661-021-09062-6.
- Fural, Ş., Kükrer, S., Aykır, D., Cürebal, İ. (2022). Ecological degradation and non-carcinogenic health risks of potential toxic elements: a GIS-based spatial analysis for Doganci Dam (Turkey). *Environmental Monitoring* and Assessment, 194, doi.org/10.1007/s10661-022-09870-4.
- Gaudette, H. E., Flight, W. R., Toner, L., Folger, W. (1974). An inexpensive titration method for the 451 determination of organic carbon in recent sediments. *Journal of Sedimentary Petrology*, 44: 249-253.
- Girgin, M. (2000). Marmara Lake. *Eastern Geography Journal*, 6: 78-102.
- Gül, O., Onmuş, O., Sıkı, M. (2013). Significant Impacts of the Water Level and HumanIntervention on the Natural Habitats and Breeding Waterbirds in Marmara Lake. *Ecology*, 22: 29-39.
- Gülersoy, A. E. (2013). Temporal Change of Land Use Activities in Marmara Lake's Immediate Surrounding (1975- 2011) and Effects on Ecosystem of the Lake. *Turkish journal of Geography*, 61: 31-44.
- Hakanson L. (1980). An ecological risk index for aquatic pollution control: A sedimentological approach. Water Research, 8:975-1001. doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(80)90143-8.
- Hasançavuşoğlu, Z., Gündoğdu, A. (2021). Investigation of Some Nutritional Salts and Physicochemical Parameters Causing Eutrophication in Sarıkum Lake (Sinop). *Sinop University Journal of Natural Sciences*, 6: 115-129. doi.org/10.33484/sinopfbd. 912499.

- İlhan, A., Sarı, H. M. (2015). Length-weight relationships of fish species in Marmara lake, West Anatolia, Turkey. *Croatian Journal of Fisheries*, 73: 30-32. doi.org/10.14798/73.1.784.
- Kaya, H., Erginal, G., Çakır, Ç., Gazioğlu, C., Erginal, E. (2017). Ecological risk evaluation of sediment core samples, Lake Tortum (Erzurum, NE Turkey) using environmental indices. *International Journal of Environment and Geoinformatics*, 4: 227-239. doi.org/10.30897/ijegeo.348826.
- Kocataş, A. (2002). Ecology and Environmental Biology. Izmir: Ege University Press.
- Küçüksezgin, F., Uluturhan, E., Batki, H. (2008). Distribution of heavy metals in water, particulate matter and sediments of Gediz River (Eastern Aegean). *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 143: 213-225. doi.org/10.1007/s10661-007-9889-6.
- Kükrer, S., Erginal, A. E., Şeker, S., Karabıyıkoğlu, M. (2015). Distribution and environmental risk evaluation of heavy metal in core sediments from Lake Çıldır (NE Turkey). *Environ. Monit. Assess*, 7, doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-4685-1.
- Kükrer, S., Tunç, İ. O., Erginal, A. E., Bay, Ö., Kılıç, Ş. (2021). Distribution, sources and ecological risk assessment of metals in Kura river sediments along a human disturbance gradient. *Environmental Forensics*. doi.org/10.1080/15275922.2021.1940378.
- Kılıç. N.K., Dağdeviren R.Y., Fural Ş., Kükrer S., Makaraoğlu Ö. (2023). Vegetation History of Lake Marmara (W. Türkiye) and Surrounding Area During The Last 700 Years, *Comptes rendus de l'Acad emie bulgare des Sciences*, 76:7, 1028 – 1037. doi.org/10.7546/CRABS.2023.07.06.
- Lorenzen, C. (1971). Chlorophyll-degradation products in sediments of Black Sea. *Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Contribution*, 28; 426-428.
- Long, E., Field, L., Mac Donald, D. (1998). Predicting toxicity in marine sediments with numerical sediment quality guidelines. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 17: 714-727. doi.org/10.1002/etc. 5620170428.
- MacDonald, DD, Ingersoll CG, Berger TA (2000) Development and Evaluation of Consensus-Based Sediment Quality Guidelines for Freshwater Ecosystems. Archives of Environmental *Contamination* and Toxicology 39: 20-31. doi.org/10.1007/s002440010075.
- Mariyanto, M., Amir, M. F., Utama, W., Hamdan, A. M., Bijaksana, S., Pratama, A., et al. (2019). Heavy metal contents and magnetic properties of surface sediments in volcanic and tropical environment from Brantas River, Jawa Timur Province, Indonesia. *Science of The Total Environment*, 675: 632-641. doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.04.244.
- Nawab, J., Khan, S., Xiaoping, W. (2018). Ecological and health risk assessment of potentially toxic elements in the major rivers of Pakistan: General population vs. Fishermen. *Chemosphere*, 202: 154-164.
- Özkan, E. Y., Fural, Ş., Kükrer, S., Büyükışık, H. B. (2022). Seasonal and spatial variations of ecological risk from potantial toxic elements in the southern littoral zone of İzmir Inner Gulf. *Environmental*

Science and Pollution Reseach. doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-19987-1.

- Pejman, A., Bidhendi, N. G., Ardestani, M., Saeedi, M., Baghvand, A. (2015). A new index for assessing heavy metal contamination in sediments: A cese study. *Ecological Indicators*, 58: 365-373.
- Pacyna, J. M., Pacyna, E. G., Steenhuisen, F., Wilson, S. (2003). Mapping 1995 global anthropogenic emissions of mercury. *Atmospheric Environment*, 37: 109-117.
- Rovira, J., Mari, M., Schuhmavher, M., Nadal, M., Domingo, J. (2011). Monitoring Environmental Pollutants in the Vicinity of a Cement Plant: A Temporal Study. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 60: 372-384.
- Sampei, Y., Matsumoto, E. (2001). C/N ratios in a sediment core from Nakaumi Lagoon, southwest Japan—Usefulness as an organic source indicator—. *Geochemical Journal*, 35: 189–205.
- Sanei H., Outridge M., Oguri, K., Stern G.A., Thamdurp B., Wenzhöfer, F., Wang, F., Glud N.R. (2021). High mercury accumulation in deep-ocean hadal sediments. *Scientifc Reports*,
- Schlichting, E., Blume, H. (1966). Bodenkundliches praktikum. Hamburg und Berlin: Verlag Paul.
- Sönmez, İ., Kaplan, M., Sönmez, S. (2008). Effects of Chemical Fertilizers on Environmental Pollution and Solution Suggestions. *Journal of the Western Mediterranean Agricultural Research Institute*, 25: 24-34.
- Sutherland, R. (2000). Bed sediment associated trace metals in an urban stream, Oahu. *Hawaii Environmental Geology*, 39: 611 - 627.
- Tağıl, Ş. (2007). Monitoring Land Degradation Events via Landscape Metrics and NDVI: Gördes, Kavacık, Ilıcak, Kumcay and Marmara Lake Basins (Turkey). *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 7: 1821-1842.
- Tewari, R. K., Kumar, P., Tewari, N., Srivastava, S., Sharma, P. N. (2004). Macronutrient deficiencies and differential antioxidant responses—influence on the activity and expression of superoxide dismutase in maize. *Plant Science*, 166: 687-694.
- Ulusoy, İ., Sarıkaya, M. A., Schmitt, A. K., Şen, E., Danışık, M., Gümüş, E. (2019). Volcanic eruption eye-witnessed and recorded by prehistoric humans. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 212: 187-198.
- Ustaoğlu, F., Kükrer, S., Taş, B., Topaldemir, H. (2022). Evaluation of metal accumulation in Terme River sediments using ecological indices and a bioindicator species. Environmental Science and Pollution Research.
- Ustaoğlu, M. R. (1993). Zooplankton (Metazoa) of the Lake Marmara. *Biologia Gallo Hellenica*, 20: 259-266.
- Vardar, S. (2018). Paleogeography of Marmara Lake and Geoarchaeological Evaluations from the Bronze Age to the Present, Manisa. Journal of Geographical Sciences, 16: 217-237.
- Vitousek, P., Mooney, H., Lubchenco, J., Melillo, J. (1997). Human Domination of Earth's Ecosystems. *Science*, 277: 494-499.

- Wang, L., Dai, L., Li, L., Liang, T. (2018). Multivariable cokriging prediction and source analysis of potentially toxic elements (Cr, Cu, Cd, Pb, and Zn) in surface sediments from Dongting Lake, China. *Ecological Indicators*, 94: 312-319.
- Wang, Y., Yang, L., Kong, L., Liu, E., Wang, L., Zhu, J. (2015). Spatial distribution, ecological risk assessment and source identification for heavy metals in surface sediments from Donping Lake, Shandong, East China. *Catena*, 125: 200-205.
- Westavay, R., Pringle, M., Yurtmen, S., Demir, T., Bridgland, D., Rowbotham, G., et al. (2004). Pliocene and Quaternary regional uplift in western Turkey: the Gediz River terrace staircase and the volcanism at Kula. *Tectonophysics*, 391: 121-169.
- Yang, Y., Gao, B., Hao, H., Zhou, H., Lu, J. (2017). Nitrogen and phosphorus in sediments in China: A national-scale assessment and review. *Science of The Total Environment*, doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016. 10.136.
- Yüksel, B., Ustaoğlu, F., Tokatlı, C., Islam, S. M. (2022). Ecotoxicological risk assessment for sediments of Çavuşlu stream in Giresun, Turkey: association between garbage disposal facility and metallic accumulation. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-17023-2.
- Zhang, G., Bai, J., Zhao, Q., et al. (2016). Heavy metals in wetland soils along a wetland-forming chronosequence in the Yellow River Delta of China: Levels, sources and toxic risks. *Ecological Indicators*, 69:331–339.
- Yıldız, Ş., Altındağ, A., Ergönül, M. B. (2005). Seasonal Fluctuations in the Zooplankton Composition of a Eutrophic Lake: Lake Marmara (Manisa, Turkey). *Turkish Journal of Zoology, 31*: 121-126.