

Indoor PM_{2.5} forecasting and the association with outdoor air pollution: a modelling study based on sensor data in Australia

Wenhua Yu¹, Bahareh Nakisa², Seng W. Loke², Svetlana Stevanovic³, Yuming Guo¹, Mohammad Naim Rastgoo²,

Affiliations:

¹Climate, Air Quality Research Unit, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Level 2, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, VIC 3004, Australia.

²School of IT, Faculty of Science and Built Environment, Deakin University, Australia

³School of Engineering, Deakin University, Waurn Ponds 3216, Australia

***Corresponding authors:**

Bahareh Nakisa, bahar.nakisa@deakin.edu.au

School of IT, Faculty of Science and Built Environment, Deakin University, Australia

Declaration of competing financial interests: The authors declare that they have no actual or potential competing financial interests.

Abstract

Exposure to poor indoor air quality poses significant health risks, necessitating thorough assessment to mitigate associated dangers. This study aims to predict hourly indoor fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) concentrations and investigate their correlation with outdoor PM_{2.5} levels across 24 distinct buildings in Australia. Indoor air quality data were gathered from 91 monitoring sensors in eight Australian cities spanning 2019 to 2022. Employing an innovative three-stage deep ensemble machine learning framework (DEML), comprising three base models (Support Vector Machine, Random Forest, and eXtreme Gradient Boosting) and two meta-models (Random Forest and Generalized Linear Model),

hourly indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations were predicted. The model's accuracy was evaluated using a rolling windows approach, comparing its performance against three benchmark algorithms (SVM, RF, and XGBoost). Additionally, a correlation analysis assessed the relationship between indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations. Results indicate that the DEML model consistently outperformed benchmark models, achieving an R² ranging from 0.63 to 0.99 and RMSE from 0.01 to 0.663 µg/m³ for most sensors. Notably, outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations significantly impacted indoor air quality, particularly evident during events like bushfires. This study underscores the importance of accurate indoor air quality prediction, crucial for developing location-specific early warning systems and informing effective interventions. By promoting protective behaviors, these efforts contribute to enhanced public health outcomes.

Keywords: deep ensemble model, indoor air pollution, Machine Learning, PM_{2.5}, Australia

Introduction

Household air pollution poses substantial health risks to the public. According to the World Health Organization, it was implicated in approximately 3.2 million premature deaths in 2020 (World Health Organization 2022). Fine particulate matter, specifically those with a diameter of 2.5 micrometres or smaller (PM_{2.5}) represents one of the most harmful air pollutants to residential health. Existing evidence indicates that indoor PM_{2.5} is positively associated with asthma, acute respiratory infection, lung cancer, and tuberculosis (Lee et al. 2020). Most individuals, especially those in high-income countries, are estimated to spend approximately 90% of their time in indoor environments (Klepeis et al. 2001). The indoor air quality thus emerges as a pivotal factor influencing personal health. Prolonged exposure to poor indoor air quality intensifies the impact of air pollution on individual health. Therefore, evaluating indoor air quality is essential to minimize exposure to high levels of air pollution exposure and assess the associated health risks.

Indoor air quality can be influenced by various factors, including ventilations, energy sources, human behaviours, construction styles and materials, and cultural practices, resulting in complex relationship with ambient air pollution (Mannan and Al-Ghamdi 2021). The concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ in indoor and outdoor environments are interconnected. Outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ can infiltrate indoor spaces, especially for buildings where its locations closed to outdoor air pollution sources, such as traffic-busy roads, industrial facilities, and bushfire events. Buildings located near these air pollution sources may experience higher infiltration rates of outdoor $PM_{2.5}$, resulting in elevated indoor concentrations. Additionally, indoor levels of $PM_{2.5}$ can sometimes exceed outdoor levels, particularly when indoor air pollution sources are present. A range of indoor sources, including wood and coal fires, as well as cooking stoves, can contribute to higher indoor $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations than the outdoor level (Alastair C. Lewis 2023). Therefore, understanding the association between indoor and outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ is significant to identify the source of pollutants and further inform mitigation strategies and preventative measures.

The widespread use of low-cost smart air quality monitors provides an opportunity to monitor the indoor air quality through building automation systems (Haase et al. 2016). The long-term air quality data sets, in conjunction with advanced machine learning (ML) algorithms, offer the potential to predict future indoor air quality. Accurate prediction of indoor air quality can result in more energy-efficient operation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, and identify the sources and causes of indoor air pollution, preventing timely the onset of health issues related to poor air quality. In this study, we aim to identify the association between indoor and outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and forecast hourly indoor $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations using data from 91 sensors across 24 commercial and residential buildings in Australia. We also introduce the development of a sophisticated air quality monitoring dashboard. Designed for real-time data analysis in multi-level buildings, the dashboard integrates sensor networks to track key air quality parameters. Its notable feature is the ability to generate detailed reports on demand, offering insights into the environmental

conditions of a selected building over a specified period.

Methods

Data collection

We collected the indoor environmental data from 91 indoor air quality monitoring sensors across 21 commercial and three residential buildings in Australia. The indoor hourly temperature, and relative humidity, PM_{2.5}, Particulate Matter 10 micrometres or less in diameter (PM₁₀), total volatile organic compounds (TVOC) were measured through the low-cost, cloud-based calibrated air monitoring sensors from the August 2019 and November 2022. The details about the installation and calibration of the sensors can be found in our previous study (Yu et al. 2023). Briefly, the monitoring sensors were strategically mounted on interior walls at a height of 1.5 to 1.7 meters from the ground. Optimal sensor placement was determined based on supply and return air on each floor, deliberately avoiding potential indoor air pollution sources and vents such as windows, mechanical HVAC systems, and kitchens. Prior to installation, professional metrology laboratories conducted inter-comparison tests on all sensors, and annual calibrations and uncertainty estimations were performed and documented. All commercial buildings had their air conditioning systems regularly operating during business hours. In contrast, the air in residential buildings was not regulated by air conditioning systems and were subject to natural fluctuations. The details about the number of sensors in each of 24 building locations and recordings periods are presented in Table 1. It should be noted that we included one building in Symonston, ACT in Australia, where it suffered a direct influence on the ‘Black Summer’ bushfire events from December 2019 to February 2020 (Yu et al. 2020).

We obtained the outdoor meteorological data from the EAR5 dataset (the fifth-generation Medium-Range Weather Forecasts European Centre for Reanalysis set) (Hersbach et al. 2020), including hourly outdoor temperature, ambient dew point temperature (2 meters above the land surface), wind

speeds at a height of 10 meters above sea level, surface pressure, solar radiation, and total precipitation in 2019 - 2022. The outdoor climate data were then linked with the geographic locations of each sensor.

The ambient monitoring station-based hourly $PM_{2.5}$ data were collected from the regional Environmental Protection Agencies (EPAs) in Australia (Centre for Air pollution energy and health Research 2021; Riley et al. 2020). Since the station based hourly $PM_{2.5}$ data were only available until December 2020, we limited the comparison analyses between outdoor and indoor hourly $PM_{2.5}$ within the period from 2019 to 2020. Ultimately, there were nine commercial buildings involved in the indoor and outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ comparison analyses.

Data analysis

We used a deep ensemble machine learning (DEML) framework to estimate the hourly indoor $PM_{2.5}$ concentration. The details of the DEML framework have been discussed in our previous study (Yu et al. 2022; Yu et al. 2023). In brief, three base models [Random Forest (RF), eXtreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost), and Support Vector Machine (SVM)] were used at the first stage to estimate the indoor hourly $PM_{2.5}$ for each sensor. In the second stage, two meta-models [RF and Generalized Linear Model (GLM)] were trained using the combination of the predictions generated in the first-stage base models. Finally, a nonnegative least squares (NNLS) algorithm was used in the third stage to obtain the optimal weights of meta-model results and to achieve the ultimate indoor $PM_{2.5}$ forecasting. We used three benchmark models including RF, SVM, and XGboost to compare the performance with the proposed DEML. The specific details of these benchmark models can be found elsewhere (Alpaydin 2020; Bishop 2006). All model establishments were developed using R software (version 3.5.3).

We established DEML model for each sensor to predict the hourly mean indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations using the collected indoor environmental indicators, including hourly indoor PM₁₀, TVOC, temperature, and relative humidity, as well as outdoor climate and air pollution measurements, such as ambient temperature and dew point temperature, wind speeds, surface pressure, solar radiation, total precipitation, and outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations at the corresponding sensor locations. Considering the potential for a robust autocorrelation between future hourly indoor PM_{2.5} and those observed in preceding hours, we also incorporated the indoor PM_{2.5} from previous 3-6 hours and from the corresponding values on the prior day. Additionally, the model integrated the geographical coordinates of the structures housing the sensors, along with temporal data, encompassing the year, month, day, day of the week, hour, and season. We assigned the last 10% of days for each sensor as the testing dataset and the remaining days as the training dataset.

For each time-series sensor data, a moving window technique was employed to assess the stability of the DEML model over time and prevent overfitting (Yu et al. 2023). To be specific, a fixed 24-hour “moving window” (referred to as the forecast horizon) was established within the testing dataset. The forecast horizon is then moved forward one day per step to fit the DEML model and predict the indoor PM_{2.5} levels within the forecast horizon. After the prediction of the indoor PM_{2.5} in the first forecast horizon, this forecast horizon data was added to the training set in the next step, and another DEML model will be refitted using the enlarged training data to predict indoor PM_{2.5} in the following forecast horizon. The process continued until predictions were generated for the entire testing data. The amalgamation of predictions within the testing dataset was computed to evaluate the model performance. We calculated the root mean square error (RMSE) and the coefficients of determination (R^2) to assess the model performance.

The Spearman correlation analysis was conducted to investigate the correlation between indoor and

outdoor PM_{2.5}. The smooth plots were used to illustrate the consistency of observed indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} in study city. To examine the variables' contribution in indoor PM_{2.5} forecasting, both RF and XGBoost models were utilized to determine the variables' importance. The loss of RMSE was calculated to measure how much a model's performance changes if the effect of a selected explanatory variable is removed. 10 permutations were selected to repeat the process 10 times to compute the mean values of RMSE loss.

Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of hourly average PM_{2.5} concentrations ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) collected from 24 buildings in Australia between 2019 and 2022. The hourly PM_{2.5} concentrations displayed considerable variations across different locations, with the minimum concentrations of $0.00 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to the maximum concentrations of $87.06 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The median PM_{2.5} concentrations in the study periods were $1.11 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and three locations in NSW (Macquarie and Sydney) and QLD (Brisbane) experienced a slightly higher indoor PM_{2.5} above $2.06 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The interquartile range (IQR) of PM_{2.5} concentrations varied between locations, with the lowest value of $0.00 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ observed in Greenway, ACT, and the highest value of $4.56 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in Curtin, ACT.

Table 2 summarizes the indoor hourly PM_{2.5} forecasting performance of the DEML model and three benchmark models (RF, XGBoost, and SVM) in the study buildings in Australia. Overall, the DEML model demonstrated superior performance in forecasting indoor hourly PM_{2.5} concentrations compared to the benchmark models. In most cases, the DEML model achieved higher R² values and lower RMSE values than the other models, with R² of 0.63 - 0.99 and RMSE of 0.01 - $0.663 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, indicating better prediction accuracy and lower prediction errors.

Table 1. The descriptive statistics for the hourly average PM_{2.5} (µg/m³) in 91 sensors in 24 buildings from 2019 to 2022 in Australia

state	suburb	Start time	End time	Sensors	Study days	Study hours	Min	Max	Median	IQR	Mean	SD
ACT	Conder	26/03/2022	21/11/2022	2	241	11,468	0.00	76.37	0.02	2.23	1.91	4.04
ACT	Curtin	19/04/2022	21/11/2022	2	216	9,621	0.95	81.57	2.48	4.56	4.85	7.60
ACT	Deakin	16/03/2020	21/11/2022	5	980	95,341	0.00	73.67	0.95	1.26	2.31	3.16
ACT	Fyshwick	9/06/2020	21/11/2022	4	895	42,741	0.92	80.99	0.95	0.88	1.91	2.56
ACT	Greenway	18/09/2022	21/11/2022	32	64	49,875	0.00	17.50	0.00	0.00	0.29	1.02
ACT	Parkes	17/03/2020	21/11/2022	5	979	134,508	0.39	62.59	0.95	0.11	1.60	2.18
ACT	Symonston	3/08/2019	2/01/2022	6	882	37,396	0.00	87.06	0.95	0.38	2.81	8.15
ACT	Symonston	28/07/2020	21/11/2022	4	846	68,216	0.00	39.10	0.95	0.68	1.64	2.00
NSW	Macquarie	1/03/2021	21/11/2022	3	630	29,226	0.95	84.86	2.17	4.42	4.47	6.07
NSW	Macquarie	13/12/2021	21/11/2022	2	343	10,598	0.95	58.40	0.95	0.27	1.44	1.59
NSW	Newcastle	9/02/2022	21/11/2022	1	285	6,396	0.00	17.74	0.95	0.14	1.37	1.21
NSW	Parramatta	27/01/2020	21/11/2022	2	1029	20,802	0.95	51.72	0.96	0.99	1.93	2.49
NSW	Sydney	14/12/2021	21/11/2022	1	342	7,279	0.00	59.94	2.06	3.62	3.58	3.96
NSW	Sydney	1/02/2020	21/11/2022	4	1025	25,626	0.83	82.77	0.98	0.99	2.14	3.42
QLD	Brisbane	13/02/2020	21/11/2022	3	1012	26,417	0.00	38.02	0.95	0.00	1.19	1.27
QLD	Brisbane	1/07/2022	21/11/2022	1	143	3,085	0.95	33.20	1.71	2.56	2.95	3.17
QLD	Brisbane	6/05/2022	21/11/2022	1	199	2,377	0.95	29.32	1.17	1.35	2.06	1.98
SA	Adelaide	3/03/2020	21/11/2022	1	993	11,655	0.00	64.63	1.00	0.84	1.71	1.89
SA	Adelaide	15/03/2022	21/11/2022	2	251	6,397	0.86	27.25	0.95	0.07	1.22	0.84
VIC	Bendigo	18/05/2022	21/11/2022	1	187	3,018	0.87	30.39	0.95	0.66	1.82	2.06
VIC	Melbourne	5/09/2019	1/11/2022	4	1152	63,911	0.05	84.72	1.11	1.81	2.63	3.72
VIC	Melbourne	2/02/2022	21/11/2022	1	292	6,597	0.95	26.06	1.18	1.21	2.25	2.62
VIC	Melbourne	3/02/2022	21/11/2022	2	291	10,619	0.00	26.14	0.95	0.40	1.94	2.67
VIC	Rowville	23/05/2022	21/11/2022	2	182	6,183	0.00	59.05	1.46	3.90	3.22	4.83

Note: PM_{2.5}: particles with a diameter of < 2.5 µm; SD: Standard deviation; IQR: the interquartile range of PM_{2.5} concentrations in the study period.

Table 2. Indoor hourly PM_{2.5} forecasting performance of DEML model and three benchmark models from 24 buildings in Australia.

State	Suburb	Test hours	RF		XGBoost		SVM		DEML ^a	
			R2	RMSE	R2	RMSE	R2	RMSE	R2	RMSE
ACT	Symonston*	843	0.956	0.392	0.976	0.309	0.840	0.745	0.974	0.299
ACT	Parkes*	535	0.995	0.073	0.996	0.070	0.989	0.128	0.997	0.057
ACT	Deakin*	420	0.987	0.051	0.997	0.033	0.941	0.155	0.998	0.020
ACT	Fyshwick	465	0.959	0.435	0.983	0.403	0.986	0.350	0.977	0.394
ACT	Symonston*	336	0.999	0.007	0.999	0.013	0.931	0.124	0.999	0.010
ACT	Greenway*	2768	0.503	0.045	0.621	0.033	0.140	0.091	0.631	0.030
ACT	Conder*	318	0.508	0.113	0.938	0.039	0.164	0.289	0.931	0.037
ACT	Curtin*	313	0.969	0.817	0.996	0.384	0.984	0.636	0.994	0.355
NSW	Sydney	391	0.888	0.286	0.992	0.078	0.918	0.227	0.987	0.091
NSW	Parramatta	154	0.914	0.049	0.943	0.036	0.315	0.160	0.927	0.044
NSW	Macquarie*	252	0.991	0.380	0.995	0.268	0.987	0.382	0.995	0.244
NSW	Sydney	82	0.985	0.164	0.993	0.109	0.982	0.221	0.992	0.127
NSW	Macquarie*	241	0.977	0.073	0.984	0.067	0.969	0.087	0.985	0.058
NSW	Newcastle*	83	0.951	0.025	0.986	0.016	0.420	0.094	0.987	0.013
QLD	Brisbane	322	0.959	0.164	0.907	0.255	0.949	0.197	0.924	0.232
QLD	Brisbane*	83	0.921	1.552	0.988	0.692	0.989	0.859	0.990	0.626
QLD	Brisbane*	82	0.980	0.307	0.993	0.253	0.988	0.324	0.994	0.190
SA	Adelaide*	86	0.983	0.021	0.994	0.018	0.704	0.093	0.983	0.021
SA	Adelaide	166	0.608	0.052	0.997	0.014	0.330	0.073	0.910	0.021
VIC	Melbourne	586	0.958	1.003	0.999	0.378	0.974	0.870	0.995	0.413
VIC	Melbourne*	84	0.985	0.059	0.987	0.069	0.739	0.246	0.990	0.049
VIC	Melbourne*	244	0.990	0.232	0.997	0.154	0.993	0.192	0.997	0.111
VIC	Bendigo	83	0.249	0.018	0.999	0.013	0.004	0.151	0.415	0.024
VIC	Rowville	290	0.952	0.227	0.982	0.133	0.930	0.286	0.978	0.145

Note: PM_{2.5}: particles with a diameter of < 2.5 μm; R² is the coefficients of determination for unseen independent data; RMSE: the root-mean-square error; SVM: support vector machine; RF: Random Forest; XGBoost: extreme gradient boosting; DEML: the three-stage stacked deep ensemble machine learning method. ^a was a three-level structure where four base models (GBM, SVM, RF, and XGBoost) and three second-level models (RF, XGBoost, and GLM) were constructed with an NNLS algorithm at the third level. “*” and bold font indicate the DEML achieved the highest model performance compared with the other five benchmarks.

Table 3 displays the distribution and correlation between hourly mean indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} in nine buildings across Australia from 2019 to 2020. We observed that the mean concentrations of outdoor hourly PM_{2.5} were more than two times higher than the corresponding indoor concentrations, ranging from $4.80 \pm 2.56 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to $9.91 \pm 19.61 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The highest mean indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} values were recorded in Symonston, ACT ($4.83 \pm 12.65 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ VS. $9.91 \pm 19.61 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), which experienced a bushfire event in 2019-2020. The correlation between indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} levels varied across the different locations. The strongest correlations were observed in Parramatta, NSW ($r = 0.70$), Symonston, ACT ($r = 0.69$), and Melbourne, VIC ($r = 0.69$), while the weakest correlation was identified in Brisbane, QLD ($r = 0.23$). Our analysis revealed that high outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations (hourly mean PM_{2.5} above $6 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) tended to correspond with stronger correlation coefficients ($r \geq 0.69$), suggesting a more pronounced influence of outdoor PM_{2.5} levels on indoor air quality under elevated outdoor pollution conditions. Figure 1 displays the temporal trends of sensor-based indoor PM_{2.5} and station-based outdoor PM_{2.5} in nine involved buildings in Australia. We observed that indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations generally exhibited highly consistent temporal trends with outdoor PM_{2.5}, with the exception of the building in Brisbane, QLD (Figure 1).

In addition, we assessed the contributions of various factors within the RF and XGboost models. We found that the most important variables for hourly indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations include PM₁₀, indoor PM_{2.5} from the preceding one and two hours, and the building locations. The outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations had the fifth ranking in indoor PM_{2.5} estimations in the XGboost Model. Details on the contributions of the top 15 variables can be observed in Figure 2.

Table 3. The correlation between hourly mean indoor PM_{2.5} and station-based outdoor hourly PM_{2.5} in 9 involved buildings from 2019 to 2020 in Australia.

State	Suburb	Start time	End time	Indoor PM _{2.5}		Outdoor PM _{2.5}		r ^a
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
ACT	Symonston ^b	2019-08-03	2021-01-01	4.83	12.65	9.91	19.61	0.69
ACT	Parkes	2020-03-17	2021-01-01	1.76	1.64	5.10	2.85	0.42
ACT	Deakin	2020-03-16	2021-01-01	2.57	2.93	5.13	2.86	0.55
ACT	Fyshwick	2020-06-09	2020-11-20	2.17	2.31	5.17	2.80	0.46
ACT	Symonston	2020-07-28	2021-01-01	1.82	1.49	4.80	2.56	0.50
NSW	Sydney	2020-02-01	2021-01-01	1.63	2.03	5.57	5.37	0.52
NSW	Parramatta	2020-01-27	2021-01-01	2.70	3.56	6.26	5.67	0.70
QLD	Brisbane	2020-02-13	2020-03-23	0.91	0.24	5.48	1.70	0.23
VIC	Melbourne	2019-09-05	2021-01-01	2.57	5.54	6.63	6.28	0.69

Notes: PM_{2.5}: particles with a diameter of < 2.5 µm; SD: SD: Standard deviation.

a the coefficient of Spearman correlation analysis

b indoor PM_{2.5} were monitored in this building in Symonston during bushfire event in 2019-2020.




Figure 1. The comparison between sensor-based indoor $PM_{2.5}$ and station-based outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ in 9 involved buildings in Australia. The X-axis indicates the observed period for both valid monitor stations and indoor sensors; Y-axis indicates the hourly mean $PM_{2.5}$ observed by sensors or air quality monitors; The solid line represents a regression line for observed $PM_{2.5}$ with a smooth of 0.2. $PM_{2.5}$: particles with a diameter of $< 2.5 \mu m$.




Figure 2. The contributions of 15 most important explanatory variables in indoor PM_{2.5} estimation by RF and XGBoost in Australia.

Note: The loss of root mean square error was calculated to measure how much a model's performance change if the effect of a selected explanatory variable is removed. 10 permutations were selected to repeat the process 10 times to compute the mean values of RMSE loss. The RF and XGBoost models were used to calculate the variable importance. RF: Random Forest; XGBoost: extreme gradient boosting. PM_{2.5}: particles with a diameter of < 2.5 μm.

A Real-time Air-Quality Monitoring Dashboard

We developed an innovative dashboard tailored for the real-time monitoring and visualization of air quality indicators within a multi-tiered building structure. In selecting a platform for the dashboard development, Power BI was chosen due to its robust data processing capabilities and advanced visualization tools. Power BI's ability to seamlessly handle large datasets was crucial, given the volume and complexity of the air quality data collected from multiple sensors.

The developed dashboard integrates a graphical representation of each floor's plan, enhanced by the strategic deployment of air quality sensors across the building. These sensors are tasked with the measurement of a range of parameters, namely TVOC, PM10, PM2.5, CO2, as well as environmental factors like Temperature, Humidity, and Air Pressure. The dashboard presents these air quality metrics using a color-coded schema within a table format, which is based on established thresholds

for each parameter. This design facilitates immediate recognition and interpretation of air quality data, enabling users to efficiently identify and address any deviations from standard air quality levels. This system thus provides an essential tool for maintaining and managing indoor air quality, ensuring compliance with health and safety standards.



Figure 3. The developed air quality monitoring dashboard for a multi-tier building.

With this dashboard, we have improved the functionality of an air quality monitoring system by adding a feature for generating comprehensive reports. Users can access a list of sensor-equipped buildings and monitor their air quality through the dashboard. By choosing a particular building and setting specific start and end dates, the dashboard fetches and processes sensor data from the cloud, creating an in-depth report. This report offers critical insights into the air quality within the chosen building for the selected period.

Discussion

In this study, we deployed a cutting-edge DEML model to predict hourly indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations, using data from 91 indoor air quality sensors distributed across 24 buildings throughout Australia. The DEML model demonstrated superior performance in predicting indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations compared to the established benchmark models. The primary determinants for predicting indoor PM_{2.5} included indoor PM₁₀, historical indoor PM_{2.5} from preceding hours, geographical locations of the buildings, and outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations. Outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations were found to exert significant influence on the indoor air quality, especially in scenarios characterized by high outdoor air pollution.

A large body of studies has used machine learning and statistical models to predict indoor air quality (Bellinger et al. 2017; Wei et al. 2019). According a literature review, the most frequently used models to predict indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations include artificial neural networks (ANN), various regression models, and decision trees-based algorithms (Wei et al. 2019). For example, Jorge Loy-Benitez and colleagues used a standard RNN, long short-term memory (LSTM), and a gated recurrent unit (GRU) structure of RNN separately to forecast hourly indoor PM_{2.5} in subway stations in South Korea. They demonstrated superior performance with the GRU structure, achieving a RMSE of 21.05 ug/m³ and $R^2 = 0.65$ (Loy-Benitez et al. 2019). Qi and colleagues used an exponential regression model to estimate indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations in 13 households in Beijing, China. The authors used outdoor PM_{2.5} with 80 minutes of lag time as the primary variable. The model reached a notable R² of 0.861 in heating season (Qi et al. 2017). Yuchi et al used the random forest model and multiple linear regression for estimating indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations from 342 apartments in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia. The two model demonstrated comparable performance, with R² of 0.50 and 0.49 respectively (Yuchi et al. 2019). In comparison to previous studies, our DEML model achieved a notable high degree of accuracy in the prediction of hourly indoor PM_{2.5} across most of the locations,

with R^2 ranging from 0.63 to 0.99.

To improve the performance of models in indoor air quality prediction, one of the primary challenges encountered lies in the appropriate model selection. Given the diversity in ML algorithms, each model presents its own strengths and weaknesses, how to select the most suitable approach can be a complex task, and it often hinges heavily on empirical experience. A practical alternative strategy involves training a variety of models and subsequently integrating their predictive results, thereby deriving a more robust overall estimation (Wei et al. 2019). Hybrid modelling, such as the ensemble model, emerges as a promising technique, permitting the integration of various models to bolster the overall performance of the resultant model (Zhang et al. 2022). A wealth of studies in environmental exposure estimation have indicated that the ensemble approach by integrating multiple models can yield superior model performance compared to any individual ML used in isolation (Di et al. 2019; Yu et al. 2022). A particular study used a hybrid approach, blending a GLM model with RF predictions to forecast indoor $PM_{2.5}$ concentration. This innovative combination results in a better performance than the original GLM model alone, improving R^2 from 0.50 to a significant 0.82 (Yuchi et al. 2019). In our DEML model, we used a three-level stacked ensemble model (Yu et al. 2022), incorporating the capabilities of RF, XGBoost, SVM, and GLM algorithms to achieve optimal predictive indoor $PM_{2.5}$ performance. In line with previous studies, our findings indicated that the ensemble model surpass any constructed single model.

The model performance largely relies on the selection of predictors. According to a well-conducted literature review, indoor environmental indicators, including previous indoor $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , indoor relative humidity, CO_2 and NO_x , as well as outdoor $pm_{2.5-10}$ and outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ are the most popular inputs for studies of indoor PM concentration predictions (Wei et al. 2019). Consistent with previous studies (Wei et al. 2019), we examined the most important variables in our study including indoor PM_{10} , previous indoor $PM_{2.5}$, and current outdoor $PM_{2.5}$.

The relationship between indoor and outdoor PM concentrations varies based on many factors including ventilation, construction type and age, infiltration rate of outdoor PM_{2.5} into the indoor environment, weather patterns and meteorological conditions, and internal emission sources (Qi et al. 2017). Good ventilation system such as using central AC operation or window Fan operation is significantly associated with outdoor-to-indoor air exchange rate and the proportion of outdoor PM_{2.5} in the indoor environment (F_{INF}) (Meng et al. 2009). In addition, outdoor temperatures and seasonal variation also related to the association between indoor and outdoor air pollution. A study found that the largest F_{INF} was observed for the outdoor temperature with approximately 20 °C. Long et al found a seasonal pattern for indoor-outdoor air pollution fraction, with higher F_{INF} in summer and lower in winter, when people tend to keep windows and doors closed to conserve heat (Long et al. 2001). Similarly, Qi et al also found significant differences in the correlation between indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} for the non-heating and heating season in China. In our study, we investigated the association between indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} in nine commercial buildings with regular AC operation. We found that the indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations were generally lower than the outdoor concentrations, indicating the relatively reduced indoor PM_{2.5} emissions. Moreover, we observed a variety of relationships between indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} across different locations, which experience distinct climate and weather conditions.

Indoor human activities such as smoking, heating, combustion, and cleaning have been reported as significant determinants of indoor PM_{2.5} concentration (Meng et al. 2009). For example, smoking is considered one of the main sources of indoor air pollution, especially in high-income country (Ni et al. 2020). Indoor PM_{2.5} concentration in dwellings with smoker were significantly higher than those in non-smoking buildings (Meng et al. 2009). Aside from actions that can pollute indoor air, there are preventive measures to reduce indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations, such as opening windows and doors, utilizing fans and air conditioners, and implementing air freshener or filter. In this study, we did not take into account the individual activities variables on indoor air quality due to the lack of relevant

data. Additionally, it is important to note that our study took place in Australia during the COVID-19 pandemic, a time when domestic human activities were substantially limited due to lockdowns and stay-at-home orders. As a result, people might have altered their usual home or working activities. For example, there could have been less time working in the office, more cooking as opposed to eating out or ordering takeout, more cleaning activities to reduce the potential spread of the virus, or no guests due to social distancing rules. All these changes could influence the indoor environment, including potential sources of indoor air pollution. However, further analysis is warranted to explore how COVID-19 restrictions have impacted indoor PM_{2.5} levels.

Numerous studies have established that outdoor air pollution is the principal determinant and the largest contributor to indoor PM_{2.5} levels, particularly in environments with limited internal emission sources. A study that analysed 374 non-smoking households in the USA found that outdoor PM_{2.5} significantly contributed to indoor concentrations, accounting for 20% to 90% of the indoor levels. (Meng et al. 2009). Another study examined indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations simultaneously using on-line particulate counters across 13 households in Haidian, Beijing. Their findings revealed a high degree of correlations (> 0.9) between indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} (Qi et al. 2017). In our study, we also found that outdoor PM_{2.5} was one of the most substantial factors in predicting indoor PM_{2.5}. In addition, environments with elevated levels of outdoor air pollution, such as during bushfire events, can lead to increased infiltration rates of outdoor PM_{2.5}, thereby affecting indoor air quality more significantly. Rajagopalan and Goodman found that bushfire smoke in Australia can substantially increase the levels of pollutants within residential buildings (Rajagopalan and Goodman 2021). Consistent with previous findings, our study also observed a consistent trend and higher correlations for buildings exposed to higher outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations. Among the buildings in this study, the one directly impacted by a bushfire event exhibited the greatest impact, with a correlation of 0.7.

Our study has many strengths. First, we included a large dataset which is sufficiently representative, encompassing a wide array of climate zones and indoor environmental conditions in numerous Australian urban areas. Our data come from 91 sensors in 24 buildings covering eight cities in Australia with a high temporal resolution (hourly) over a period of three years from 2019-2022. It considered not only the commercial and residential types of buildings, but also certain specific situations such as bushfire events. The DEML models achieved consistently high accuracy across different scenarios. Furthermore, we made several innovations in the indoor $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations prediction: 1) It is the first to implement an innovative DEML framework combining several ML approaches for future indoor $PM_{2.5}$ prediction. 2) We proposed a sliding windows approach in time-series data to improve temporal generalization and avoid over-fitting. 3) We used every sensor itself for indoor monitoring data and the corresponding outdoor environmental exposure data as inputs to establish the DEML model for each sensor, making our approach independent for different sensor locations. Finally, we examined the potential impact of ambient $PM_{2.5}$ on indoor air quality in various locations.

Several limitations in our study are warranted to discuss. First, even though we examined the building types, location, and the use of the AC operations, other building features such as building materials, surrounding greenery or air pollution resources may impact the variations of the indoor air pollution. Additionally, the efficiency of the ventilation system and human activities could also influence the indoor air variations and are warranted for further analysis. Furthermore, even though we installed several sensors even in the same building, spatial variability in indoor $PM_{2.5}$ levels may still exist from one room to another, which pose challenges for the representation of indoor $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations. Moreover, we collected the hourly outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ data from the nearest monitoring stations, while hourly monitoring station data after 2020 was unavailable. The actual outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ around the buildings may be different from the monitoring stations, which may lead to potential bias for the estimated associations between indoor and outdoor $PM_{2.5}$. In addition, the sensor-based indoor

air quality data were mainly collected during the COVID-19 pandemic period in Australia, when the indoor and outdoor air quality may be influenced by the modified human behaviours. Last, this study only focuses on the buildings in the metropolitan environments in Australia and the association between indoor and outdoor PM_{2.5} may be different in rural or outskirts areas, where buildings are subject to distinct microclimate environments and ventilation conditions.

Conclusion

This study used a DEML model to predict the hourly indoor PM_{2.5} concentrations across 24 buildings in eight Australian cities. Our results indicated that incorporating the capabilities of multiple levels of ML algorithms could achieve optimal predictive indoor PM_{2.5} performance. We also observed that outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations significantly impact on indoor air quality, particularly for environments with elevated levels of outdoor air pollution, such as during bushfire events. These findings could help to develop location-specific indoor air quality early warning systems and inform more effective interventions or protective behaviours such as avoiding smoking indoors, using exhaust fans when cooking, or using air purifiers to reduce indoor PM_{2.5} exposure and protect residential health. In addition, the variations across locations and times in pollution levels suggest the need for localized (fine-grained) sensor-based air pollution monitoring in real-time, indoors and outdoors.

References

- Alastair C. Lewis DJCJMW. 2023. Indoor air pollution: Five ways to fight the hidden harms. *Nature* 614.
- Alpaydin E. 2020. Introduction to machine learning. US:MIT press.
- Bellinger C, Mohamed Jabbar MS, Zaïane O, Osornio-Vargas A. 2017. A systematic review of data mining and machine learning for air pollution epidemiology. *BMC public health* 17:1-19.
- Bishop CM. 2006. Pattern recognition and machine learning: springer.
- Centre for Air pollution energy and health Research. 2021. National air pollution monitoring database, derived from regulatory monitor data from nsw dpie, vic epa, qld des, sa epa, wa dewr, tas epa, nt epa, and act health.
- Di Q, Amini H, Shi L, Kloog I, Silvern R, Kelly J, et al. 2019. An ensemble-based model of pm_{2.5} concentration across the contiguous united states with high spatiotemporal resolution. *Environ Int* 130:104909.
- Haase J, Alahmad M, Nishi H, Ploennigs J, Tsang KF. The iot mediated built environment: A brief survey. In: Proceedings of the 2016 IEEE 14th international conference on industrial informatics (INDIN), 2016, IEEE, 1065-1068.
- Hersbach H, Bell B, Berrisford P, Hirahara S, Horányi A, Muñoz-Sabater J, et al. 2020. The era5 global reanalysis. *Q J R Meteorol Soc* 146:1999-2049.
- Klepeis NE, Nelson WC, Ott WR, Robinson JP, Tsang AM, Switzer P, et al. 2001. The national human activity pattern survey (nhaps): A resource for assessing exposure to environmental pollutants. *JESEE* 11:231-252.
- Lee KK, Bing R, Kiang J, Bashir S, Spath N, Stelzle D, et al. 2020. Adverse health effects associated with household air pollution: A systematic review, meta-analysis, and burden estimation study. *The Lancet Global Health* 8:e1427-e1434.
- Long CM, Suh HH, Catalano PJ, Koutrakis P. 2001. Using time- and size-resolved particulate data to quantify indoor penetration and deposition behavior. *Environmental science & technology* 35:2089-2099.
- Loy-Benitez J, Vilela P, Li Q, Yoo C. 2019. Sequential prediction of quantitative health risk assessment for the fine particulate matter in an underground facility using deep recurrent neural networks. *Ecotoxicology and environmental safety* 169:316-324.
- Mannan M, Al-Ghamdi SG. 2021. Indoor air quality in buildings: A comprehensive review on the factors influencing air pollution in residential and commercial structure. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18:3276.
- Meng QY, Spector D, Colome S, Turpin B. 2009. Determinants of indoor and personal exposure to pm_{2.5} of indoor and outdoor origin during the riopa study. *Atmospheric Environment* 43:5750-5758.
- Ni Y, Shi G, Qu J. 2020. Indoor pm_{2.5}, tobacco smoking and chronic lung diseases: A narrative review. *Environmental research* 181:108910.
- Qi M, Zhu X, Du W, Chen Y, Chen Y, Huang T, et al. 2017. Exposure and health impact evaluation based on simultaneous measurement of indoor and ambient pm_{2.5} in haidian, beijing. *Environmental Pollution* 220:704-712.
- Rajagopalan P, Goodman N. 2021. Improving the indoor air quality of residential buildings during bushfire smoke events. *Climate* 9:32.
- Riley M, Kirkwood J, Jiang N, Ross G, Scorgie Y. 2020. Air quality monitoring in nsw: From long term trend monitoring to integrated urban services. *Air Quality and Climate Change* 54:44-51.
- Wei W, Ramalho O, Malingre L, Sivanantham S, Little JC, Mandin C. 2019. Machine learning and statistical models for predicting indoor air quality. *Indoor Air* 29:704-726.

World Health Organization. 2022. Household air pollution. Available: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/household-air-pollution-and-health> [accessed May 10th 2023].

Yu P, Xu R, Abramson MJ, Li S, Guo Y. 2020. Bushfires in australia: A serious health emergency under climate change. *Lancet Planet Health* 4:e7-e8.

Yu W, Li S, Ye T, Xu R, Song J, Guo Y. 2022. Deep ensemble machine learning framework for the estimation of pm 2.5 concentrations. *Environ Health Perspect* 130:037004.

Yu W, Nakisa B, Ali E, Loke SW, Stevanovic S, Guo Y. 2023. Sensor-based indoor air temperature prediction using deep ensemble machine learning: An australian urban environment case study. *Urban Climate* 51:101599.

Yuchi W, Gombojav E, Boldbaatar B, Galsuren J, Enkhmaa S, Beejin B, et al. 2019. Evaluation of random forest regression and multiple linear regression for predicting indoor fine particulate matter concentrations in a highly polluted city. *Environmental pollution* 245:746-753.

Zhang Y, Ren G, Liu X, Gao G, Zhu M. 2022. Ensemble learning-based modeling and short-term forecasting algorithm for time series with small sample. *Eng Rep* 4:e12486.