

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACY & LIFE SCIENCES

# Cationic contamination in lake's water situated South area at

Ahmedabad, Gujarat

**S. D. Vediya\* and S. S. Patel** P.G. Center in Botany, Sir P.T. Science Collage, Modasa, (Gujarat) - India.

#### Abstract

Ahmedabad is unique in the whole of India in matter of environmental neatness and flourishing conditions and it is superior to other cites in the excellence of its monuments. Ahmedabad Urban Development Authority (AUDA) proposes to undertake work for revival, development of catchments areas and beatification of few lakes under the present project of these Makarba and Sarkhej Lake's waters were analyzed for cationic contaminations. The results values of the metals estimated through 2 lakes during monthly Analysis of the January-2009 to December -2009. Their ranges of concentration were comparing to permissible limit of BIS. Calcium content of water samples from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no.1 January-2009 and locality no.2 in November -2009. Magnesium content of water samples from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no.1 January-2009 and locality no.1 and 2 July -2009. Ammonia Content of water samples from locality no.1April And locality no.2 May-2009, Phosphate content of water samples from all localities were within the permissible from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no.1 May and no.2 is December-2009. The results suggested that water was suitable for drinking purpose. Nitrite content of water samples from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no, 1 and 2 in May and no.2 is December-2009. The results suggested that water was suitable for drinking purpose. Nitrite content of water samples from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no, 1 and 2 in May and no.2 is December-2009. The results suggested that water was suitable for drinking purpose.

Key-Words: Cation, AUDA, Calcium, magnesium, Sulphate, Ammonia, Phosphate, Nitrite, Lake.

#### Introduction

Limnology is a discipline that concerns the study of inland waters (both saline and Fresh) specifically lakes, ponds and river (both natural and man made) including their biological, physical, chemical and hydrological aspects. The term' limnology' stem from Greek' limne (lake)' and '*logos*'(study)'. In ecology the environment of a lake is referred to as *lacustrine*. The lakes are quiet large bodies of fresh water usually deep enough that their beds lie much beyond the photosynthetic zone<sup>1</sup> fluctuations in the lake level are because of climate conditions and human requirements of water. The rate of water replacement of a lake also depends upon the season. A lake may be occasionally created by digging a basin that intercepts the water table. Such a lake is in a sense nothing but a wide shallow well. Most man made lakes are created by damming a stream at a strategic point, so that the the water backed up the dam can be contained in a natural valley or basin<sup>2-5</sup>

\* Corresponding Author:

E-mail: drsanjuvediya@rediffmail.com

Many lakes are artificial and constructed for hydroelectric power supply, recreational purposes, industrial, agricultural use and domestic water supply. Ahmedabad is unique in the whole of India in matter of environmental neatness and flourishing conditions and it is superior to other cities in the excellence of its monuments. Ahmedabad Urban development Authority (AUDA) carried out a survey of 645 lakes and identified 22 lakes which have been severely degraded. AUDA proposes to undertake works for revival, development of catchments area and beautification of lakes under the present project. Of these, 4 lakes were studied which are located at Makarba and Sarkhej villages, Makarba lake is located at Makarba village near famous Sarkhej Rosa Mosque, Ahmedabad. Its total storage capacity is 26.5 Corer liters. Lake Desilting area is 1461 m<sup>3</sup> and peripheral development Works including landscaping; Sarkhej Lake is located at Sarkhej Village near National Highway No.8, Ahmedabad its total storage capacity is 67.0 Corer liters. Lake Desilting Area is 4309 m<sup>3</sup> and peripheral development works including landscaping: recreation facilities are such as Amphi theatre, children park and Boating facilities and percolation wells to recharge

ground water table. AUDA has commenced work on this lake also through own resources.

## Material and Methods

Water samples were collected from Tow lakes (Makarba, Sarkhej). Samples were collected in these month January-2009 to December -2009. Following cations were analyzed using standard methods given<sup>6</sup> Ca<sup>++</sup> and Mg<sup>++</sup> Titrimetrically by EDTA  $SO_4^{2^-}$ , NH<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>N, PO<sub>4</sub> <sup>-</sup>P and NO<sup>-</sup><sub>2</sub> N was determine by spectrophotometric method: Distilled water was used as control for comparison and their results were compared with the desirable limit and permissible limit<sup>7-8</sup>.

### **Results and Conclusion**

Comparison of the measured parameters and the cation concentration with the water quality shows in Table no.1 to 6. While the values of  $Ca^{++}$ ,  $Mg^{++}$ ,  $SO_4^{2^-}$ ,  $NH_3^{-1}$ N,  $PO_4 P$ ,  $NO_2 N$  Biodegradable organic matter such as contributed by industries or domestic pet excreta and mixed with lake water . The used of fertilizer in agriculture and detergents including phosphate are supposed to increase phosphate concentration. The exceeding amounts of the ammonia nitrogen and nitrite are through to be mainly a result of the fertilizer and sewerage waste. Than Calcium continent of water samples from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS Except locality No. 1,2 in January-2009 to December -2009. The highest concentration of calcium in water was record at locality no.1 in January-2009 (200mg/l). The lowest concentration of calcium in water was recorded at locality no.1 April -2009(40 mg/l), (Table -1).

Magnesium content of water samples from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no1, 2 in January-2009 to December-2009. The highest concentration of magnesium in water was recorded at locality no.2 in April-2009(260 mg/l). The lowest concentration in water was recorded at locality no.2. August 2009. (40 mg/l) show on Table -2 .similar studies was conducted<sup>3</sup>.

Sulphate  $(SO_4^{2^-})$  Content of water samples from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no.1,2 in January-2009 to Decmber-2009. The highest concentration of Sulphate in water was recorded at locality no.1 July-2009 (8.5mg/l). The lowest concentration in water was recorded at locality no.2 March-2009, (0.001 mg/l); (Table-3)

Ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>N) Content of water samples from all localities was within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no.1, 2 in January-2009 to December-2009. The highest concentration of Ammonia in water was recorded at locality no.1 April-2009; (15.0 mg/l). The lowest concentration in water was recorded at locality no.1 February -2009 (0.01 mg/l) , Shown in

# [Vediya & Patel, 2(2):Feb., 2011] ISSN: 0976-7126

Table-4 clearly depicts that Ammonia Decreased .The progressive increase in water quality to Ammonia could be due to Heavy Growth of Aquatic weeds which efficiently utilize the Ammonia in the lake  $^{9-11}$ .

Phosphate (PO<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup>P) Content of water samples from all localities was within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no.1, 2 in January-2009 to December-2009. The highest concentration of Phosphate in water was recorded at locality no.2 December-2009 (3.6 mg/l). The lowest concentration in water was recorded at locality no.1 Jun and December-2009 (0.6 mg/l), (Table-5).

Nitrite (NO<sub>2</sub>N) Content of water samples from all localities were within the permissible limit of BIS except locality no.1, 2 in January-2009 to December-2009. The highest concentration of Nitrate in water was recorded at locality no.1 August-2009 (32.0 mg/l) of 2009 (Table-6). The lowest concentration in water was recorded at locality no.1 July -2009 (0.2 mg/l) of 2009 (Table-6)

Nitrite is more toxic and nitrogen indicates the recent pollution from lake water. Maximum permissible limit of WHO for both is 1.0 mg/l. The nitrite nitrogen was also observed within the permissible limits of WHO<sup>12</sup> (Table-6).

Ahmedabad city is situated on the river bank of Sabarmati at Gujarat. The Water samples were collected from two lakes. The Cationic Contamination like Calcium, Magnesium, Ammonia, Sulphate, Phosphate and Nitrite were studied comparatively during January-2009 to December-2009. The results suggested that water was not suitable for Drinking Purpose.

## References

- 1. Agrwal S.C. (1999) *Limnology*, A.P.H. Pub. Corporation, New Delhi.
- Agarkar S.V. (1998). Physico-chemical aspects of ground water quality in Chikhli town of Buldan District. *Poll. Res.*, 17(3):291-292.
- 3. Anonymous. (1984). *Guidelines for drinking water quality*. (Health criteria and other supporting Information). Geneva, World Health Organization.
- Kapla R.D., Patode H.S and Panaskar D.B. (1998).Ground water quality in an industrial area of Tuppa, Nanded. Maharastra. *Poll.Res.*, 17(3):251-254.
- Khuhawar M.Y. and Mirza M. Aslam (2009). Limnological study of baghsar lake District Himber Azad Kashmir, *Pak .J. Bot.*, 41(4): 1903-1915.
- 6. American Public Health Association (APHA) (1998). *Standard methods for the examination*

Int. J. of Pharm. & Life Sci. (IJPLS), Vol. 2, Issue 2: Feb: 2011, 568-570

of water And waste water, 20<sup>th</sup> edition, Clesceri, Arnold L.S., Greenberg E. and Eaton A.D. (Ed.), American Public Health Association, Washington.

- World Health Organisation (WHO) (1992) . World Health Organisation, International Standards for Drinking water, Geneva, Switzerland.
- 8. National Environmental Engineering Research Institute (NEERI) (1998). Manual on Water and Wastewater analysis, Nagpur, 31-80.
- 9. Yesim Kara, Izzet Kara and Davut Basaran (2004). Investigation of some physical and chemical parameters of water in the lake Islali in Denizli,Turkey. *International Journal of Agriculture & Biology*, 1560.

10. Kaloo Z.A., Pandit A.K. and Zutsh D.P (1995). Nutrient status and phytoplankton [Vediya & Patel, 2(2):Feb., 2011] ISSN: 0976-7126

dynamites of dal lake under salvainia natans and obnoxious weed growth. *Original science* 1:74-85.

- 11. Vediya S.D. and Shrivastava Anil Kumar (2004).Cationic contamination in lake's water situated at Ahmedabad, Gujarat. *Plant. Archives*, 8(2): 1011-1014.
- 12. World Health Organization (WHO) (1968). Technical series no 404, Water pollution control in Developing countries.

No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     200     70     50     40     70     50     50     50     50     80     100     70       02     Sarkhej     120     150     110     100     100     50     50     100     100     120     180     120       Table 2: Analysis of Mg <sup>++</sup> (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     130     160     80     110     100     190     90     80     80     130     90       02     Sarkhej     180     240     240     260     200     200     150     40     170     160     210     170       Table: 3 Analysis of SO4 <sup>2-2</sup> (mg/l)in     water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution     160 <th></th> <th colspan="14">Table 1: Analysis of Ca (mg/1) in water of various takes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution</th>		Table 1: Analysis of Ca (mg/1) in water of various takes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution														
01     Makarba     200     70     50     40     70     50     50     50     80     100     70       02     Sarkhej     120     150     110     100     100     50     50     100     100     120     180     120       Table 2: Analysis of Mg <sup>++</sup> (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution       No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dec       01     Makarba     130     130     160     80     110     100     190     90     80     80     130     90       02     Sarkhej     180     240     240     260     200     200     150     40     170     160     210     170       No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dec       01	No	Lake name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Ma	y Ju	n	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
02     Sarkhej     120     150     110     100     100     50     50     100     100     120     180     120       Table 2: Analysis of Mg <sup>++</sup> (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution     Nov     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     130     130     160     80     110     100     190     90     80     80     130     90       02     Sarkhej     180     240     260     200     200     150     40     170     160     210     170       Table: 3Analysis of SO4 <sup>2+2</sup> (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution     Nov     Dect     Nov     Dect     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     0     0     2.0     3.0     2.0     5.3     8.5     6.0     3.6     3.2     2.54     4.5       02     Sarkhej	01	Makarba	200	70	50	40	70	50	)	50	50	50	80	100	70	
Table 2: Analysis of $Mg^{++}$ (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollutionNoLake nameJanFebMarAprMayJunJulAugSepOctNovDect01Makarba130130160801101001909080801309002Sarkhej18024024026020020015040170160210170Table: 3 Analysis of SO4 <sup>2-</sup> (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollutionNoLake nameJanFebMarAprMayJunJulAugSepOctNovDect01Makarba002.03.02.05.38.56.03.63.22.544.502Sarkhej000.0012.01.24.16.36.53.71.34.372.8NoLake nameJanFebMarAprMayJunJulAugSepOctNovDect01Makarba000.0012.01.24.16.36.53.71.34.372.8Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollutionNoLake nameJanFebMarAprMayJunJulAugSepOc	02	Sarkhej	120	150	110	100	100	50	)	50	100	100	120	180	120	
No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     130     130     160     80     110     100     190     90     80     80     130     90       02     Sarkhej     180     240     240     260     200     200     150     40     170     160     210     170       Table: 3 Analysis of SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (mg/1)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution       No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     0     0     2.0     3.0     2.0     5.3     8.5     6.0     3.6     3.2     2.54     4.5       02     Sarkhej     0     0     0.001     2.0     1.2     4.1     6.3     6.5     3.7     1.3     4.37     2.8 <td colspan="15"><b>Table 2:</b> Analysis of <math>Mg^{++}</math> (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution</td>	<b>Table 2:</b> Analysis of $Mg^{++}$ (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution															
01   Makarba   130   130   160   80   110   100   190   90   80   80   130   90     02   Sarkhej   180   240   240   260   200   200   150   40   170   160   210   170     Table: 3 Analysis of SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution     No   Lake name   Jan   Feb   Mar   Apr   May   Jun   Jul   Aug   Sep   Oct   Nov   Decc     01   Makarba   0   0   2.0   3.0   2.0   5.3   8.5   6.0   3.6   3.2   2.54   4.5     02   Sarkhej   0   0   0.001   2.0   1.2   4.1   6.3   6.5   3.7   1.3   4.37   2.8     Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution   Nov   Decc     No   Lake name   Jan   Feb   Mar   Apr   May   Jun   Jul   Aug   Sep   Oct	No	Lake name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	y Ju	n	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
02   Sarkhej   180   240   240   260   200   200   150   40   170   160   210   170     Table: 3 Analysis of SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution     No   Lake name   Jan   Feb   Mar   Apr   May   Jun   Jul   Aug   Sep   Oct   Nov   Dect     01   Makarba   0   0   2.0   3.0   2.0   5.3   8.5   6.0   3.6   3.2   2.54   4.5     02   Sarkhej   0   0   0.001   2.0   1.2   4.1   6.3   6.5   3.7   1.3   4.37   2.8     Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution   Nov   Dect     No   Lake name   Jan   Feb   Mar   Apr   May   Jun   Jul   Aug   Sep   Oct   Nov   Dect     01   Makarba   0   0.01   0   15.0   9.0   2.54   4.4   0   1.3   1.1	01	Makarba	130	130	160	80	110	10	0	190	90	80	80	130	90	
Table: 3 Analysis of SO42- (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollutionNoLake nameJanFebMarAprMayJunJulAugSepOctNovDect01Makarba002.03.02.05.38.56.03.63.22.544.502Sarkhej000.0012.01.24.16.36.53.71.34.372.8Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollutionNoLake nameJanFebMarAprMayJunJulAugSepOctNovDect01Makarba00.01015.09.02.544.401.31.11.812.502Sarkhej0001.013.56.012.00.248.28.710.212.7Table 5: Analysis of PO4 P (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	02	Sarkhej	180	240	240	260	200	20	0	150	40	170	160	210	170	
No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     0     0     2.0     3.0     2.0     5.3     8.5     6.0     3.6     3.2     2.54     4.5       02     Sarkhej     0     0     0.001     2.0     1.2     4.1     6.3     6.5     3.7     1.3     4.37     2.8       Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution       No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     0     0.01     0     15.0     9.0     2.54     4.4     0     1.3     1.1     1.81     2.5       02     Sarkhej     0     0     0.1.0     13.5     6.0     12.0     0.24     8.2     8.7     10.21     2.7	<b>Table: 3</b> Analysis of SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution															
01   Makarba   0   0   2.0   3.0   2.0   5.3   8.5   6.0   3.6   3.2   2.54   4.5     02   Sarkhej   0   0   0.001   2.0   1.2   4.1   6.3   6.5   3.7   1.3   4.37   2.8     Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution     No   Lake name   Jan   Feb   Mar   Apr   May   Jun   Jul   Aug   Sep   Oct   Nov   Dect     01   Makarba   0   0.01   0   15.0   9.0   2.54   4.4   0   1.3   1.1   1.81   2.5     02   Sarkhej   0   0   0   1.0   13.5   6.0   12.0   0.24   8.2   8.7   10.21   2.7     Table 5: Analysis of PO <sub>4</sub> P (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	No	Lake name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Ap	r Ma	y Ju	un	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
02     Sarkhej     0     0     0.001     2.0     1.2     4.1     6.3     6.5     3.7     1.3     4.37     2.8       Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution       No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dec       01     Makarba     0     0.01     0     15.0     9.0     2.54     4.4     0     1.3     1.1     1.81     2.5       02     Sarkhej     0     0     0     1.0     13.5     6.0     12.0     0.24     8.2     8.7     10.21     2.7       Table 5: Analysis of PO <sub>4</sub> P (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	01	Makarba	0	0	2.0	3.0	2.0	) 5	.3	8.5	6.0	3.6	3.2	2.54	4.5	
Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollutionNoLake nameJanFebMarAprMayJunJulAugSepOctNovDec01Makarba00.01015.09.02.544.401.31.11.812.502Sarkhej0001.013.56.012.00.248.28.710.212.7Table 5: Analysis of PO <sub>4</sub> P (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	02	Sarkhej	0	0	0.001	2.0	1.2	2 4	.1	6.3	6.5	3.7	1.3	4.37	2.8	
No     Lake name     Jan     Feb     Mar     Apr     May     Jun     Jul     Aug     Sep     Oct     Nov     Dect       01     Makarba     0     0.01     0     15.0     9.0     2.54     4.4     0     1.3     1.1     1.81     2.5       02     Sarkhej     0     0     0     1.0     13.5     6.0     12.0     0.24     8.2     8.7     10.21     2.7       Table 5: Analysis of PO <sub>4</sub> P (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	Tab	Table 4: Analysis of NH <sub>3</sub> N (mg/l) in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution														
01     Makarba     0     0.01     0     15.0     9.0     2.54     4.4     0     1.3     1.1     1.81     2.5       02     Sarkhej     0     0     0     1.0     13.5     6.0     12.0     0.24     8.2     8.7     10.21     2.7       Table 5: Analysis of PO <sub>4</sub> P (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	No	Lake name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Ju	n	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
02Sarkhej0001.013.56.012.00.248.28.710.212.7Table 5: Analysis of $PO_4$ P (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	01	Makarba	0	0.01	0	15.0	9.0	2.5	54	4.4	0	1.3	1.1	1.81	2.5	
Table 5: Analysis of PO <sub>4</sub> P (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	02	Sarkhej	0	0	0	1.0	13.5	6.	0	12.0	0.24	8.2	8.7	10.21	2.7	
No Lakename Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec	No	Lake name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Ma	y Jı	ın	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
01 Makarba 0 0 0 1.0 2.6 0.6 1.1 0.7 1.9 0.98 0.34 0.6	01	Makarba	0	0	0	1.0	2.6	0.	.6	1.1	0.7	1.9	0.98	0.34	0.6	
02 Sarkhej 0 0 0 2.0 1.5 1.98 1.6 1.2 2.5 2.0 1.24 3.6	02	Sarkhej	0	0	0	2.0	1.5	1.	98	1.6	1.2	2.5	2.0	1.24	3.6	
Table 6: Analysis of NO2 (mg/l)in water of various lakes during the year 2009 for comparative study of pollution	Tal															
No Lake name Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec	No	Lake name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	J	ul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
01 Makarba 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.2 32.0 5.5 11.22 18.33 1.5	01	Makarba	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2	32.0	5.5	11.22	18.33	1.5	
02 Sarkhei 0 0 0 0 0 133 0 61 42 155 16		a	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	0	(1	10	1 55	110	