

Meteorological Impact on Air Pollutants in Malaysia: A Causal Analysis

Zulkifli Abd Rais¹, Norazrin Ramli^{1,2,*}, Norazian Mohamed Noor^{1,2}, Hazrul Abdul Hamid³, Ahmad Zia Ul-Saufie⁴, Mohd Khairul Nizam Mahmad⁵

¹Faculty of Civil Engineering & Technology, Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Arau 02600, Perlis, Malaysia.

²Sustainable Environment Research Group (SERG) Centre of Excellence Geopolymer and Green Technology (CEGeoGTech), Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Arau 02600, Perlis, Malaysia.

³School of Distance Education, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Gelugor 11800, Penang, Malaysia.

⁴Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM), Shah Alam 40450, Selangor, Malaysia.

⁵Mining and Energy Resources Academy (MERA), Jalan Kuala Ketil, Parit Panjang, 09100 Baling, Kedah.

| KEYWORDS | Abstract |
|---|---|
| Air pollution Granger causality Meteorological Air Pollutant Relationship | This study explores the intricate relationships between air pollutants and meteorological parameters across five key locations in Malaysia—Seberang Perai, Shah Alam, Nilai, Larkin, and Pasir Gudang—over the period from 2017 to 2021. Utilizing trend analysis and Granger causality testing, the research found that in Seberang Perai, PM10 is Granger-caused by NO ₂ ($p = 0.006$) and CO ($p = 0.004$), indicating a strong causal relationship with 99% and 95% confidence levels, respectively. Temperature significantly influenced ozone levels ($p = 0.047$) with a 95% confidence level, and wind speed showed moderate effects on NO ₂ ($p = 0.086$) with a 90% confidence level. In Shah Alam, relative humidity significantly Granger-caused NO ₂ ($p = 0.033$) with a 95% confidence level. Urban environments demonstrate multifaceted dynamics involving multiple pollutants and meteorological factors. These insights are critical for air quality management and urban planning in Malaysia, offering a foundation for more targeted and effective strategies to mitigate air pollution. This research contributes to the broader objective of enhancing environmental quality in rapidly developing regions, aligning with global sustainability goals. |

1. INTRODUCTION

& TECHNOLOGY

Universiti Malaysia Perlis (UniMAP)

The contemporary era grapples with a formidable challenge as the changing atmospheric conditions, driven by escalating air pollution, demand urgent attention. Key contributors to this issue include the rapid pace of urbanization, the influence of the industrial revolution, vehicular emissions, human activities, and population growth [1]. A study by Sentian [2] ranked Malaysia as third place in Southeast Asia for pollutant emissions, after Indonesia and Thailand. The expansion of the Malaysian economy has led to pollution in a variety of areas. Air pollution from industrial activity and automobiles, for instance, is currently on the rise. The concentrations of pollution in the atmosphere fluctuate due to weather conditions, pollutant sources. and topography. Nevertheless, meteorological conditions have the greatest influence on fluctuations in ambient air pollution concentrations among these three factors [3].

The phenomena associated with climate change are those that are either directly traceable to natural processes or indirectly attributable to anthropogenic compositional changes. A substantial relationship between climate change and air quality was established. Due to this occurrence, pollutants were prone to be more concentrated in the stratosphere, the lowest layer of the atmosphere, which eventually worsens the level of air quality [4]. Hence, it is necessary to determine the causeand-effect of PM10 that may contribute to a decline in air quality. In order to overcome these challenges, a study via statistical approach which selected significant parameters as its fundamental element of research was conducted to develop the air pollution model. If the strength of correlation is higher and the causality is significant, the Granger causality will provide some significant information related to cause-and-effect relationship between air pollutants and meteorological parameters [5].

UNIVERSITI

MALAYSIA

However, with Granger causality, the idea is when the past and present parameters provide significant information to forecast the future, which is commonly used in time series analysis [6]. This study aims to determine cause-and-effect of PM10 using Granger Causality Test. Additionally, the research objectives include identifying types of causal relationships and enhance the understanding of air quality dynamics in Malaysia. This study aligns with environmental initiatives outlined in the Sustainable Malaysia 2030 agenda and contributes to broader goals of environmental sustainability in the country [7], [8].

Granger causality technique was often applied to a series data set to determine the interrelationship between variables which spans up to 150 years [9]. It's important to note that Granger causality does not imply true causation, and the observed relationships may be influenced by other factors. Additionally, the results should be interpreted cautiously, considering the assumptions and limitations of the Granger causality test. In this context, the theoretical foundation of Granger causality is grounded in the concept of temporal precedence and the ability of past values of one variable to enhance the prediction of another variable's future values [10]. The approach has found applications not only in economics but also in various fields, including environmental studies, neuroscience, and social sciences.

However, the application of Granger causality in predictive modelling is not without its challenges. One significant challenge is the potential for spurious correlations, where variables may appear to be causally linked due to shared influences or external factors [11]. Careful consideration and rigorous statistical testing are required to mitigate this risk and ensure the validity of the causal relationships identified. Another challenge lies in the assumption of linearity inherent in Granger causality testing, which may limit its applicability in cases where relationships between variables are nonlinear or involve complex interactions [12]. Moreover, Granger causality does not establish the direction of causality definitively and may only reflect statistical associations, necessitating a cautious interpretation of results.

Moreover, a study by Chen [13] further discussed, the application of Granger causality extends beyond predictive modelling to inform policy planning and intervention strategies in air quality management. In this context, understanding the causal relationships between meteorological conditions and air pollution is pivotal for designing targeted measures that address specific contributing factors. Policymakers can use this information to formulate evidence-based strategies aimed at mitigating the impact of certain meteorological conditions on air quality. Additionally, Granger causality facilitates source identification, particularly in urban environments where distinguishing between natural and anthropogenic influences on air quality is challenging [10], [14]. This capability is crucial for effective pollution control measures, aiding in the development of policies that target specific sources of pollution and contribute to sustainable environmental management.

The objective of this study is to determine the cause-andeffect of air pollutants which is PM10 using the Granger causality tests. The data was obtained from the Department of Environment (DOE) and analysed using IBM SPSS Statistical Software Version 29 for descriptive statistics. The descriptive analysis of the air pollutants concentrations, which are PM10, SO2, NO2, O3, and CO, and the meteorological parameters, which are temperature, humidity, and wind speed, was performed at five selected locations of the air monitoring stations in Malaysia between 2017 and 2021.

This research makes a significant contribution to the field of environmental science and air quality management by conducting a comprehensive analysis of air pollution trends in Malaysia over a five-year period. It offers valuable insights into the region's air quality dynamics. Utilizing Granger causality analysis, the study goes beyond simple correlations to uncover the complex causeand-effect relationships between air pollutants and weather conditions. This research aligns with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 11, which aims to minimize the environmental impact of cities by improving air quality [15], [16]. The findings provide a robust basis for developing evidence-based policies and health interventions, enhancing the accuracy of air quality forecasts, and enabling prompt actions to safeguard public health and improve environmental quality in Malaysia [17].

2. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

2.1 Materials

This study adopts a data-driven approach to examine the relationships between air pollutants and weather conditions in Malaysia from 2017 to 2021, structured into three key phases. The first phase involves collecting and preprocessing data from five selected areas that represent the northern, central, and southern regions of the country. The second phase focuses on analyzing the temporal trends and stationarity of the data. In the third phase, Granger causality tests are employed to explore the cause-and-effect dynamics between pollutants and meteorological factors.

2.2 Methods

The research begins with a descriptive analysis and trend analysis of air pollutant concentrations and meteorological parameters, where box plots and time series graphs were created to visualize the data. Following this, the study moves to the second phase, where Granger causality analysis is used to identify the relationships between air pollutants and meteorological parameters [18]. The causal relationships uncovered are then presented through graphical visualizations, providing a clear depiction of how meteorological factors influence air pollution levels across different regions of Malaysia.

2.3 Site Description

This research focuses on five strategically chosen monitoring stations in Malaysia—Perai, Shah Alam, Nilai, Larkin, and Pasir Gudang as shown in Figure 1. The research area covered the northern, central and southern region. The details and coordinates of the stations are summarized in Table 1.



Figure 1. Location of research area.

|--|

| Station ID | State | Location | Coordinate |
|------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| CA07P | Seberang Perai, Pulang Pinang | Sek. Keb. Cenderawasih, Taman Inderawasih, Perai | N05° 23.470' E100° 23.213' |
| CA20B | Shah Alam, Selangor | Sek. Keb. Taman Tun Dr. Ismail Jaya, Shah Alam | N03° 06.287' E101° 33.368' |
| CA23N | Nilai, Negeri Sembilan | Taman Semarak (Phase II), Nilai | N02° 49.246' E101° 48.877' |
| CA33J | Larkin, Johor | Teacher Education Temenggong Ibrahim Campus, Larkin, Johor Bahru | N01° 29.815' E103° 43.617' |
| CA34J | Pasir Gudang, Johor | Sek. Men. Keb. Pasir Gudang 2, Pasir Gudang, Johor Bahru | N01° 28.225' E103° 53.637' |

2.4 Data Collection and Preliminary Data Processing

The study utilized secondary data from the Department of Environment Malaysia, covering the period from 2017 to 2021. Data was collected from five air quality monitoring stations, representing urban, suburban, and industrial areas, to analyze five key air pollutants: PM10, SO2, NO2, O3, and CO. Additionally, three meteorological parameters – wind speed, temperature, and relative humidity – were included in the analysis.

To achieve the study's objectives, monthly data on these air pollutants and meteorological factors was gathered and analyzed. Descriptive analysis was conducted using SPSS software, which computed essential statistical metrics such as minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis for each parameter at each station [18]. This provided a comprehensive understanding of the data's characteristics and potential trends, laying the groundwork for further analysis.

2.5 Time Series & Descriptive Analysis

Following data collection, the acquired datasets underwent both descriptive and time series analyses to comprehensively understand their characteristics and temporal dynamics. Descriptive analysis, facilitated by SPSS software, provided key statistical metrics such as minimum and maximum values, mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis, offering an in-depth understanding of the data from each monitoring station [12]. Subsequently, time series analysis was conducted to examine the stationarity of the data using the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test in EViews software.

$$y_t = c + \beta_t + \alpha Y_{t-1} + \emptyset \Delta Y_{t-1} + \emptyset_2 \Delta Y_{t-2} \dots + \emptyset_p \Delta Y_{t-p}$$
(Eq 1)

The ADF test, applied to the level form of each series including trend and intercept, was crucial in identifying non-stationarity when p-values exceeded 0.05. In such cases, data differencing was performed to achieve stationarity, ensuring the reliability of further temporal analysis [19]. Together, these analytical steps provided a robust foundation for understanding the data and preparing it for advanced modelling.

2.6 Granger Causality Analysis

The analysis is grounded in the theoretical framework of autoregressive models, which explore how a variable's current value is influenced by its past values. In the context of Granger causality, these models are used to determine whether the past values of one variable (X) significantly improve the prediction of another variable (Y), beyond what Y's own history can predict. While Granger causality doesn't imply true causation, it serves as a powerful statistical tool for identifying predictive relationships in time series data [10], [20]. The test involves comparing models that include and exclude the past values of X to evaluate whether adding X enhances the prediction of Y. This approach is crucial in time series analysis, where understanding the temporal relationships and directional influences between variables is essential for accurate forecasting [9].

$$y_i = \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_j y_{i-j} + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j x_{i-j} + \varepsilon_i$$
 (Eq 2)

In the final phase of the study, Granger causality tests were applied to examine the causal relationships between air pollutants and meteorological parameters. Before conducting these tests, the optimal lag length for the analysis was determined using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) in EViews software, ensuring a balance between model complexity and goodness of fit. With the selected lag order, an unrestricted Vector Autoregression (VAR) model was estimated. The Granger causality tests were then used to assess whether the past values of one variable provided predictive information about another. A p-value of 0.05 or lower led to the rejection of the null hypothesis of no Granger causality, indicating a significant causal relationship [12]. The results were visualized to illustrate the direction and strength of these causal connections across different monitoring stations.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Descriptive Analysis

A comprehensive analysis of air pollutants and meteorological parameters across five key Malaysian locations-Seberang Perai, Shah Alam, Nilai, Larkin, and Pasir Gudang-reveals distinct patterns and variations that underscore the complex interplay between urbanization, industrial activity, and environmental conditions. Urban areas, particularly Shah Alam and Larkin, consistently exhibit higher mean concentrations of air pollutants such as PM10, SO2, NO2, and O3, reflecting the significant air quality challenges posed by heavy traffic and industrial emissions. In contrast, Pasir Gudang and Larkin recorded some of the lowest minimum concentrations for pollutants like PM10 and SO₂, suggesting variability in exposure to pollution sources even within urban and industrial settings. Notably, Larkin also experiences the highest ambient temperatures, indicative of the urban heat island effect, while Pasir Gudang demonstrates better air quality overall, potentially due to effective local environmental management [21].

| Station | Seberang Perai | Shah Alam | Nilai | Larkin | Pasir Gudang |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------|--------|--------------|
| | | PM ₁₀ | | | |
| N | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| Minimum, µg/m ³ | 16.185 | 20.991 | 20.905 | 17.579 | 15.502 |
| Maximum, µg/m ³ | 43.696 | 89.365 | 102.887 | 72.508 | 63.236 |
| Mean, µg/m ³ | 25.387 | 32.667 | 34.234 | 28.194 | 26.039 |
| Standard Deviation, µg/m ³ | 6.758 | 10.138 | 12.615 | 8.336 | 8.497 |
| Coefficient of variation | 0.266 | 0.310 | 0.368 | 0.296 | 0.326 |
| Skewness | 1.153 | 3.570 | 3.379 | 3.005 | 1.787 |
| Kurtosis | 1.089 | 18.262 | 16.227 | 14.350 | 5.600 |

Table 2 The descriptive analysis of the concentrations from 2017 to 2021

| SO_2 | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|
| N | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| Minimum, ppm | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Maximum, ppm | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.004 | 0.003 | 0.010 |
| Mean, ppm | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.002 |
| Standard Deviation, ppm | 0.0003 | 0.0002 | 0.0005 | 0.0005 | 0.0013 |
| Coefficient of variation | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.25 | 0.65 |
| Skewness | 0.473 | 0.187 | 4.234 | 0.063 | 4.269 |
| Kurtosis | -0.757 | 0.746 | 23.370 | 0.223 | 23.504 |
| | | NO ₂ | | | |
| N | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| Minimum, ppm | 0.005 | 0.007 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.004 |
| Maximum, ppm | 0.015 | 0.022 | 0.018 | 0.018 | 0.018 |
| Mean, ppm | 0.009 | 0.016 | 0.013 | 0.012 | 0.011 |
| Standard Deviation, ppm | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.004 |
| Coefficient of variation | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.23 | 0.25 | 0.36 |
| Skewness | 0.483 | -0.408 | 0.040 | 0.036 | -0.495 |
| Kurtosis | 1.314 | 0.290 | -0.845 | -0.788 | -0.863 |
| | | O 3 | | | |
| Ν | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| Minimum, ppm | 0.004 | 0.014 | 0.005 | 0.009 | 0.008 |
| Maximum, ppm | 0.031 | 0.038 | 0.024 | 0.026 | 0.025 |
| Mean, ppm | 0.016 | 0.020 | 0.010 | 0.015 | 0.014 |
| Standard Deviation, ppm | 0.007 | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.004 | 0.004 |
| Coefficient of variation | 0.44 | 0.25 | 0.4 | 0.27 | 0.29 |
| Skewness | 0.075 | 1.306 | 1.451 | 0.667 | 0.517 |
| Kurtosis | -0.734 | 1.860 | 2.074 | 0.863 | -0.032 |
| | СО | | | | |
| Ν | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| Minimum, ppm | 0.473 | 0.531 | 0.372 | 0.188 | 0.410 |
| Maximum, ppm | 1.023 | 1.263 | 1.184 | 0.975 | 0.905 |
| Mean, ppm | 0.715 | 0.829 | 0.594 | 0.601 | 0.657 |
| Standard Deviation, ppm | 0.101 | 0.150 | 0.127 | 0.218 | 0.122 |
| Coefficient of variation | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.36 | 0.19 |
| Skewness | 0.348 | 0.240 | 1.888 | -0.152 | 0.080 |
| Kurtosis | 0.678 | -0.158 | 7.703 | -1.313 | -0.871 |

The descriptive statistics for these locations from 2017 to 2021 further illustrate in the Table 2 is the impact of broader environmental factors on air quality. For instance, the 2020 Movement Control Order (MCO) led to a significant decrease in NO₂ levels across urban areas like Shah Alam, as reduced transportation and industrial activities resulted in lower emissions [22], [23]. However, the data also highlight the vulnerability of these areas to extreme pollution events, such as the spikes in PM₁₀ and SO₂ concentrations observed in October 2019, largely driven by seasonal weather changes and industrial activities. These findings emphasize the importance of

continuous monitoring and targeted interventions to manage air pollution, particularly in industrial and urban areas [24]. The variability in pollutant concentrations across different locations and time periods underscores the need for localized strategies to address specific pollution sources and mitigate the impact of extreme events on the environment.

3.2 Trend Analysis

From 2017 to 2021, air quality in Malaysia generally remained within acceptable limits, with occasional fluctuations influenced by both seasonal variations and human activities. Particulate matter (PM10) levels were predominantly in the "Good" to "Moderate" range, except during the 2019 haze episode, which saw a significant spike in concentrations. This event highlighted the vulnerability of the region to transboundary pollution. Conversely, the Movement Control Order (MCO) implemented in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic led to a notable decrease in PM₁₀ levels, underscoring the impact of reduced industrial activities and vehicular emissions on air quality. Sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations remained consistently low throughout this period, well below the Malaysian Ambient Air Quality Guidelines (MAAQG) limits [25]. These findings reflect the effectiveness of ongoing regulatory measures and industrial controls in managing these pollutants. However, ozone (O₃) levels, while still within permissible limits, emerged as a pollutant of concern, particularly during periods of high solar radiation, which is known to catalyze ozone formation [9].

Meteorological parameters exhibited distinct seasonal patterns shown in Table 3. Wind speeds increased significantly during monsoonal periods, especially at coastal monitoring stations, contributing to the dispersion of pollutants. Relative humidity consistently remained high, ranging between 80-90%, with slight decreases during the Northeast Monsoon, possibly due to drier air masses. Ambient temperatures followed a predictable seasonal cycle, with higher temperatures observed during the Southwest Monsoon and cooler temperatures during the Northeast Monsoon [26]. The 2020 MCO period provided a unique case study, where significant improvements in air quality were observed across all monitored pollutants. This period of reduced human activity, including limited industrial operations and transportation, offered a glimpse into the potential for sustained air quality improvements with concerted efforts in pollution control [4].

These findings underscore the need for continuous monitoring and adaptive policy-making to address the dynamic nature of air quality in Malaysia, particularly in the context of seasonal changes and episodic events such as haze. Future strategies should focus on maintaining low levels of key pollutants while addressing emerging concerns like ozone, ensuring that air quality remains within safe limits for public health and the environment [21].







3.3 Granger Causality Analysis

Granger causality occurs when the past and present values of a specific characteristic provide valuable information for predicting its future behavior in a time series. To explore the causal relationships among the parameters PM_{10} , SO_2 , NO_2 , CO and O_3 , a Granger causality test was conducted. The results of these tests for each monitoring station are presented in Tables 4-8.

| Monitoring Station: Seberang Perai, Pulau Pinang | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | Dependent Parameter: PM ₁₀ | | | |
| Independent Parameter | Chi-Sq | p-value | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.27548 | 0.600 | | |
| NO ₂ | 7.46433 | 0.006* | | |
| O ₃ | 0.05908 | 0.808 | | |
| СО | 8.33552 | 0.004* | | |
| Temperature | 0.06056 | 0.806 | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.37567 | 0.540 | | |
| Humidity | 0.04410 | 0.834 | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: SO ₂ | | | |
| PM10 | 0.70308 | 0.402 | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.75367 | 0.385 | | |
| O ₃ | 0.58565 | 0.444 | | |
| СО | 0.81203 | 0.368 | | |
| Temperature | 0.09796 | 0.754 | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.38388 | 0.536 | | |
| Humidity | 0.20211 | 0.653 | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: NO ₂ | | | |
| PM ₁₀ | 0.56086 | 0.454 | | |
| SO ₂ | 8.32492 | 0.004* | | |
| O ₃ | 0.38846 | 0.533 | | |
| СО | 0.07306 | 0.787 | | |
| Temperature | 0.19442 | 0.659 | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.86435 | 0.353 | | |
| Humidity | 0.00803 | 0.929 | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: O ₃ | | | |
| PM10 | 10.3228 | 0.001* | | |
| SO ₂ | 1.17158 | 0.279 | | |
| NO ₂ | 10.6869 | 0.001* | | |
| СО | 2.83435 | 0.092** | | |
| Temperature | 3.94086 | 0.047* | | |
| Wind Speed | 2.7845 | 0.095** | | |
| Humidity | 0.17181 | 0.679 | | |
| Dependent Parameter: CO | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ | 0.43881 | 0.508 | | |
| SO ₂ | 1.23403 | 0.267 | | |
| NO ₂ | 2.38014 | 0.123*** | | |
| O3 | 0.63427 | 0.426 | | |
| Temperature | 0.7021 | 0.402 | | |
| Wind Speed | 5.13726 | 0.023* | | |
| Humidity | 0.36855 | 0.544 | | |
| Dependent Parameter: Temperature | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ | 0.3439 | 0.558 | | |

Table 4 Granger causality for Seberang Perai monitoring station

| SO_2 | 0.70477 | 0.401 | | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| NO ₂ | 1.91067 | 0.167 | | |
| O ₃ | 2.02246 | 0.155 | | |
| СО | 0.82515 | 0.364 | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.53066 | 0.466 | | |
| Humidity | 0.46584 | 0.495 | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: Wind Speed | | | |
| PM ₁₀ | 1.52507 | 0.217 | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.36673 | 0.545 | | |
| NO ₂ | 2.94965 | 0.086** | | |
| O3 | 4.26101 | 0.039* | | |
| СО | 2.70516 | 0.100** | | |
| Temperature | 2.59238 | 0.107*** | | |
| Humidity | 3.08547 | 0.079** | | |
| Dependent Parameter: Humidity | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ | 6.05225 | 0.014* | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.45877 | 0.498 | | |
| NO ₂ | 7.67461 | 0.006* | | |
| O3 | 1.37195 | 0.242 | | |
| СО | 2.55233 | 0.110*** | | |
| Temperature | 10.4196 | 0.001* | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.11611 | 0.733 | | |
| * Indicates significant at 5% level ** Indicates significant at 10% level *** Indicates significant at 15% level | | | | |

| Table 5 | Granger | causality f | for | Shah | Alam | monitoring | station |
|---------|---------|-------------|-----|------|------|------------|---------|
| | 0 | | | | | 0 | |

| Monitoring Station: Shah Alam, Selangor | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------|--|--|
| | Dependent Parameter: PM ₁₀ | | | |
| Independent Parameter | Chi-Sq | p-value | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.265915 | 0.6061 | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.36214 | 0.5473 | | |
| O3 | 0.7682 | 0.3808 | | |
| СО | 0.13059 | 0.7178 | | |
| Temperature | 0.8573 | 0.3545 | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.25011 | 0.617 | | |
| Humidity | 1.30993 | 0.2524 | | |
| Dependent Parameter: SO ₂ | | | | |
| PM_{10} | 0.93613 | 0.3333 | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.47725 | 0.4897 | | |
| O ₃ | 6.49885 | 0.0108* | | |
| СО | 0.81203 | 0.368 | | |
| Temperature | 0.09796 | 0.754 | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.04149 | 0.8386 | | |
| Humidity | 5.25909 | 0.0218* | | |

| Dependent Parameter: NO ₂ | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| PM10 | 0.04903 | 0.8248 | | |
| SO ₂ | 1.14396 0.2848 | | | |
| O3 | 2.16246 0.1414*** | | | |
| СО | 0.00000 | 0.9988 | | |
| Temperature | 4.16959 | 0.0412* | | |
| Wind Speed | 1.48254 | 0.2234 | | |
| Humidity | 3.42587 | 0.0642** | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: O ₃ | | | |
| PM10 | 0.03081 | 0.8607 | | |
| SO ₂ | 4.11517 | 0.0425* | | |
| NO ₂ | 2.45781 | 0.1169*** | | |
| СО | 0.03068 | 0.861 | | |
| Temperature | 9.75627 | 0.0018* | | |
| Wind Speed | 8.92796 | 0.0028* | | |
| Humidity | 1.50687 | 0.2196 | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: CO | | | |
| PM ₁₀ | 0.25866 | 0.611 | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.00017 | 0.9897 | | |
| NO ₂ | 4.00726 | 0.0453* | | |
| O3 | 1.25323 | 0.2629 | | |
| Temperature | 1.76683 | 0.1838 | | |
| Wind Speed | 1.75085 | 0.1858 | | |
| Humidity | 1.55784 | 0.212 | | |
| Dependent Parameter: Temperature | | | | |
| PM10 | 2.61517 | 0.1058*** | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.38199 | 0.5365 | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.05352 | 0.8170 | | |
| O3 | 0.06365 | 0.8008 | | |
| СО | 0.55323 | 0.4570 | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.79587 | 0.3723 | | |
| Humidity | 0.44362 | 0.5054 | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: Wind Speed | | | |
| PM10 | 0.50807 | 0.4760 | | |
| SO ₂ | 1.94103 | 0.1636 | | |
| NO ₂ | 2.49409 | 0.1143*** | | |
| O ₃ | 1.43348 | 0.2312 | | |
| СО | 0.84585 0.3577 | | | |
| Temperature | 0.61697 | 0.4322 | | |
| Humidity | 3.63526 | 0.0566** | | |
| Dependent Parameter: Humidity | | | | |
| PM_{10} | 4.54342 | 0.033* | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.75312 | 0.3855 | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.38076 | 0.5372 | | |
| O ₃ | 0.3154 | 0.5744 | | |
| СО | 2.58462 | 0.1079*** | | |

| Temperature | 0.78545 | 0.3755 |
|--|---------|---------|
| Wind Speed | 4.02767 | 0.0448* |
| * Indicates significant at 5% level ** Indicates significant at 10% level *** Indicates significant at 15% level | | |

Table 6 Granger causality for Nilai monitoring station

| Monitoring Station: Nilai, Seremban | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Dependent Parameter: PM ₁₀ | | | | |
| Independent Parameter | Chi-Sq | p-value | | | |
| SO ₂ | 17.3825 | 0.0000* | | | |
| NO ₂ | 2.65213 | 0.1034 | | | |
| O ₃ | 0.12296 | 0.7258 | | | |
| СО | 0.08302 | 0.7732 | | | |
| Temperature | 0.93289 | 0.3341 | | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.02122 | 0.8842 | | | |
| Humidity | 0.02725 | 0.8689 | | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: SO ₂ | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ | 0.29853 | 0.5848 | | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.00926 | 0.9233 | | | |
| O ₃ | 1.05435 | 0.3045 | | | |
| СО | 0.10762 | 0.7429 | | | |
| Temperature | 0.0836 | 0.7725 | | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.10636 | 0.7443 | | | |
| Humidity | 0.22171 | 0.6377 | | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: NO ₂ | | | | |
| PM10 | 0.05751 | 0.8105 | | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.3871 | 0.5338 | | | |
| O ₃ | 4.31398 | 0.0378* | | | |
| СО | 1.27003 | 0.2598 | | | |
| Temperature | 3.97136 | 0.0463* | | | |
| Wind Speed | 2.50175 | 0.1137*** | | | |
| Humidity | 2.17022 | 0.1407*** | | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: O ₃ | | | | |
| PM10 | 0.85759 | 0.3544 | | | |
| SO ₂ | 0.65904 | 0.4169 | | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.19946 | 0.6552 | | | |
| СО | 0.46569 | 0.495 | | | |
| Temperature | 6.39771 | 0.0114* | | | |
| Wind Speed | 0.05283 | 0.8182 | | | |
| Humidity | 1.21675 | 0.27 | | | |
| | Dependent Parameter: CO | | | | |
| PM10 | 10.1566 | 0.0014* | | | |
| SO ₂ | 4.14503 | 0.0418* | | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.43911 | 0.5076 | | | |

| O ₃ | 0.032 | 0.858 |
|--|---------|-----------|
| Temperature | 1.28169 | 0.2576 |
| Wind Speed | 0.18107 | 0.6705 |
| Humidity | 0.21399 | 0.6437 |
| Dependent Parameter: Temperature | | |
| PM_{10} | 1.07442 | 0.2999 |
| SO_2 | 0.5214 | 0.4702 |
| NO ₂ | 5.10253 | 0.0239* |
| O3 | 0.72542 | 0.3944 |
| СО | 0.12099 | 0.728 |
| Wind Speed | 1.57351 | 0.2097 |
| Humidity | 5.49687 | 0.0191* |
| Dependent Parameter: Wind Speed | | |
| PM_{10} | 0.20797 | 0.6484 |
| SO_2 | 0.15761 | 0.6914 |
| NO ₂ | 2.15878 | 0.1418*** |
| O3 | 10.4632 | 0.0012* |
| СО | 1.3272 | 0.2493 |
| Temperature | 20.0355 | 0.0000* |
| Humidity | 2.18803 | 0.1391*** |
| Dependent Parameter: Humidity | | |
| PM_{10} | 5.04776 | 0.0247* |
| SO ₂ | 1.09402 | 0.2956 |
| NO ₂ | 0.71872 | 0.3966 |
| O3 | 5.41697 | 0.0199* |
| СО | 0.1454 | 0.703 |
| Temperature | 11.116 | 0.0009* |
| Wind Speed | 0.00193 | 0.9649 |
| * Indicates significant at 5% level ** Indicates significant at 10% level *** Indicates significant at 15% level | | |

$\textbf{Table 7} \ \textbf{Granger causality for Pasir Gudang monitoring station}$

| Monitoring Station: Pasir Gudang, Johor | | |
|---|---------|----------|
| Dependent Parameter: PM ₁₀ | | |
| Independent Parameter | Chi-Sq | p-value |
| SO_2 | 0.34408 | 0.8419 |
| NO ₂ | 2.40257 | 0.3008 |
| O3 | 2.12515 | 0.3456 |
| СО | 3.14377 | 0.2077 |
| Temperature | 1.35877 | 0.5069 |
| Wind Speed | 1.07842 | 0.5832 |
| Humidity | 0.1096 | 0.9467 |
| Dependent Parameter: SO ₂ | | |
| PM10 | 4.82275 | 0.0897** |

| NO ₂ | 3.21985 | 0.1999 |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| O3 | 2.2273 | 0.3284 |
| СО | 8.51814 | 0.0141* |
| Temperature | 7.58611 | 0.0225* |
| Wind Speed | 2.68239 | 0.2615 |
| Humidity | 2.6471 | 0.2662 |
| | Dependent Parameter: NO ₂ | |
| PM ₁₀ | 5.08789 | 0.0786** |
| SO ₂ | 1.80519 | 0.4055 |
| O ₃ | 0.89026 | 0.6407 |
| СО | 5.32211 | 0.0699** |
| Temperature | 7.71731 | 0.0211* |
| Wind Speed | 1.05749 | 0.5893 |
| Humidity | 1.11196 | 0.5735 |
| | Dependent Parameter: O ₃ | |
| PM10 | 3.673 | 0.1594 |
| SO ₂ | 0.16266 | 0.9219 |
| NO ₂ | 2.52949 | 0.2823 |
| СО | 7.76301 | 0.0206* |
| Temperature | 1.7852 | 0.4096 |
| Wind Speed | 6.05544 | 0.0484* |
| Humidity | 4.19207 | 0.1229*** |
| | Dependent Parameter: CO | |
| PM10 | 1.24136 | 0.5376 |
| SO ₂ | 4.16605 | 0.1246*** |
| NO ₂ | 7.35129 | 0.0253* |
| O3 | 7.07622 | 0.0291* |
| Temperature | 3.32216 | 0.1899 |
| Wind Speed | 0.89244 | 0.64 |
| Humidity | 11.565 | 0.0031* |
| | Dependent Parameter: Temperature | |
| PM10 | 0.04821 | 0.9762 |
| SO ₂ | 1.36199 | 0.5061 |
| NO ₂ | 2.0086 | 0.3663 |
| O3 | 0.62318 | 0.7323 |
| СО | 0.11285 | 0.9451 |
| Wind Speed | 1.61012 | 0.4471 |
| Humidity | 3.0286 | 0.22 |
| | Dependent Parameter: Wind Speed | |
| PM ₁₀ | 2.71378 | 0.2575 |
| SO ₂ | 7.91984 | 0.0191* |
| NO ₂ | 9.66931 | 0.0079* |
| O3 | 6.00789 | 0.0496* |
| СО | 9.16854 | 0.0102* |
| Temperature | 2.61201 | 0.2709 |
| Humidity | 3.11237 | 0.2109 |
| • | | |

| Dependent Parameter: Humidity | | |
|--|---------|-----------|
| PM10 | 0.70876 | 0.7016 |
| SO ₂ | 0.45195 | 0.7977 |
| NO ₂ | 4.39832 | 0.1109*** |
| O ₃ | 8.44162 | 0.0147* |
| СО | 0.85217 | 0.6531 |
| Temperature | 5.29491 | 0.0708** |
| Wind Speed | 7.87386 | 0.0195* |
| * Indicates significant at 5% level ** Indicates significant at 10% level *** Indicates significant at 15% level | | |

Table 8 Granger causality for Larkin monitoring station

| Monitoring Station: Larkin, Johor | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Dependent Parameter: PM ₁₀ | | |
| Independent Parameter | Chi-Sq | p-value |
| SO ₂ | 0.15787 | 0.9241 |
| NO ₂ | 7.40993 | 0.0246* |
| O_3 | 0.48319 | 0.7854 |
| СО | 6.85545 | 0.0325* |
| Temperature | 2.72915 | 0.2555 |
| Wind Speed | 0.59571 | 0.7424 |
| Humidity | 10.1513 | 0.0062* |
| Dependent Parameter: SO ₂ | | |
| PM10 | 1.19689 | 0.5497 |
| NO ₂ | 0.14098 | 0.9319 |
| O ₃ | 3.53898 | 0.1704 |
| СО | 0.00484 | 0.9976 |
| Temperature | 2.69656 | 0.2597 |
| Wind Speed | 1.16637 | 0.5581 |
| Humidity | 4.1847 | 0.1234*** |
| Dependent Parameter: NO ₂ | | |
| PM_{10} | 1.98644 | 0.3704 |
| SO ₂ | 1.21659 | 0.5443 |
| O ₃ | 2.98602 | 0.2247 |
| СО | 0.754 | 0.6859 |
| Temperature | 2.04233 | 0.3602 |
| Wind Speed | 0.63395 | 0.7283 |
| Humidity | 4.27402 | 0.118*** |
| Dependent Parameter: O ₃ | | |
| PM ₁₀ | 8.04246 | 0.0179* |
| SO ₂ | 1.1476 | 0.5634 |
| NO ₂ | 12.4574 | 0.002* |
| СО | 8.15554 | 0.0169* |
| Temperature | 5.91208 | 0.052* |

| Wind Speed | 5.00742 | 0.0818** | |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------|--|
| Humidity | 19.7155 | 0.0001* | |
| | Dependent Parameter: CO | | |
| PM_{10} | 1.07 | 0.5857 | |
| SO ₂ | 2.29789 | 0.317 | |
| NO ₂ | 9.19884 | 0.0101* | |
| O ₃ | 2.32634 | 0.3125 | |
| Temperature | 5.03124 | 0.0808** | |
| Wind Speed | 6.26311 | 0.0436* | |
| Humidity | 4.05392 | 0.1317*** | |
| | Dependent Parameter: Temperature | | |
| PM_{10} | 1.05693 | 0.5895 | |
| SO_2 | 0.9288 | 0.6285 | |
| NO ₂ | 1.1508 | 0.5625 | |
| O ₃ | 4.49174 | 0.1058*** | |
| СО | 2.06483 | 0.3561 | |
| Wind Speed | 0.69235 | 0.7074 | |
| Humidity | 9.18115 | 0.0101* | |
| | Dependent Parameter: Wind Speed | | |
| PM_{10} | 1.38829 | 0.4995 | |
| SO_2 | 0.65156 | 0.722 | |
| NO ₂ | 7.33653 | 0.0255* | |
| O ₃ | 1.96176 | 0.375 | |
| СО | 13.0422 | 0.0015* | |
| Temperature | 10.9037 | 0.0043* | |
| Humidity | 3.37888 | 0.1846 | |
| Dependent Parameter: Humidity | | | |
| PM_{10} | 2.30743 | 0.3155 | |
| SO ₂ | 0.08511 | 0.9583 | |
| NO ₂ | 2.62454 | 0.2692 | |
| O ₃ | 5.72441 | 0.0571** | |
| СО | 8.91539 | 0.0116* | |
| Temperature | 8.99964 | 0.0111* | |
| Wind Speed | 0.84879 | 0.6542 | |
| * Indicates significant at 5% level ** Indicates significant at 10% level *** Indicates significant at 15% level | | | |

| Monitoring Stations | Granger Causality Diagram |
|---|---|
| Seberang Perai, Pulau Pinang | |
| Shah Alam, Selangor | |
| Nilai, Seremban | |
| Pasir Gudang, Johor | |
| Larkin, Johor | |
| *Black lines indicate causa *Red lines represent relation *Blue lines indicate causal | lity relationships with p-values less than 0.05 onships with p-values between 0.05 and 0.10 ity relationships with p-value more than 0.10 |

Table 9 The result Granger Causality Diagram for all the monitoring stations

In sub-urban and urban areas, meteorological factors significantly influenced pollutant levels, revealing distinct interaction patterns across various locations. In Seberang Perai, ambient temperature exhibited a strong relationship with ozone (O₃), while SO₂ and NO₂ showed moderate correlations with temperature. Shah Alam demonstrated that relative humidity Granger-caused NO₂ and moderately influenced O₃, while temperature was a moderate cause of NO₂ levels [27]. These findings align with Table 9, existing research that underscores the

crucial role of temperature and humidity in shaping air quality dynamics, particularly in ozone formation and nitrogen dioxide concentrations [28].

In industrial and urban areas, more complex pollutant interactions were observed. Nilai displayed a bidirectional causality between SO_2 and PM_{10} , with wind speed also playing a significant role in SO_2 levels. Larkin, an urban center, showed that NO_2 and CO Granger-caused PM_{10} , while relative humidity influenced both PM_{10} and O_3

concentrations. Pasir Gudang revealed diverse interactions, where O_3 influenced SO_2 , wind speed affected SO_2 , and PM_{10} had an impact on NO_2 , O_3 , and CO levels [2]. These findings highlight the intricate dynamics of air pollution in urban and industrial settings, emphasizing the importance of understanding the multifaceted relationships between pollutants and meteorological factors for effective air quality management.

4. CONCLUSION

This study provides critical insights into the relationships between air pollutants and meteorological parameters across various regions in Malaysia. Descriptive analysis reveals that urban areas, such as Shah Alam and Larkin, consistently exhibit higher pollutant concentrations, particularly PM₁₀ and NO₂, due to industrial activities and traffic emissions. In contrast, Pasir Gudang recorded lower levels of PM₁₀ and SO₂, reflecting effective local management. The trend analysis from 2017 to 2021 highlights key events such as the 2019 haze, which caused significant PM₁₀ spikes, and the 2020 Movement Control Order (MCO), which led to a noticeable reduction in NO₂ and PM₁₀ due to decreased industrial and vehicular activities.

The Granger causality analysis uncovers significant cause-and-effect relationships, particularly in Seberang Perai, where NO₂ (p = 0.006) and CO (p = 0.004) significantly influence PM₁₀, and ozone (O₃) is affected by temperature (p = 0.047). In Shah Alam, relative humidity (p = 0.033) significantly impacts NO₂ levels. These findings highlight the pivotal role of meteorological factors in influencing air quality dynamics. The study underscores the importance of targeted interventions based on regional characteristics to mitigate air pollution, supporting broader goals of environmental sustainability and public health protection in Malaysia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was supported by Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE) through the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS/1/2023/TK08/UNIMAP/02/24). We also want to thank to the Department of Environment (DOE) Malaysia for granting access to the comprehensive and detailed datasets and Mining and Energy Resources Academy (MERA) for the consultancy that were essential to the project.

REFERENCE

- E. Sesana, A. S. Gagnon, C. Ciantelli, J. A. Cassar, and J. J. Hughes, "Climate change impacts on cultural heritage: A literature review," Jul. 01, 2021, John Wiley and Sons Inc. doi: 10.1002/wcc.710.
- [2] J. Sentian, F. Herman, C. Y. Yih, and J. C. H. Wui, "Long-term air pollution trend analysis in Malaysia," International Journal of Environmental Impacts, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 309–324, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.2495/EI-V2-N4-309-324.
- [3] A. Tella and A.-L. Balogun, "GIS-based air quality modelling: spatial prediction of PM10 for Selangor State, Malaysia using machine learning algorithms," Environmental Science and Pollution Research, vol. 29, no. 57, pp. 86109–86125, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s11356-021-16150-0.
- [4] N. Ramli, M. Rubini, and N. M. Noor, "Relationships between Air Pollutants and Meteorological Factors during Southwest and Northeast Monsoon at Urban Areas in Peninsular Malaysia," IOP Conf Ser Earth Environ Sci, vol. 1303, no. 1, p. 012041, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/1303/1/012041.
- [5] A. Lim, L. Kah, C. Loo, P. Kuan, and W. Kang Xian, "Determinants of climate change: is financial development a significant contributor to climate change?" 2020.
- [6] C. Li Long, Y. Guleria, and S. Alam, "Air passenger forecasting using Neural Granger causal Google trend queries," J Air Transp Manag, vol. 95, p. 102083, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.JAIRTRAMAN.2021.102083.
- [7] R. Munsif, M. Zubair, A. Aziz, and M. Nadeem Zafar, "Industrial Air Emission Pollution: Potential Sources and Sustainable Mitigation," in Environmental Emissions, IntechOpen, 2021. doi: 10.5772/intechopen.93104.
- [8] A. R. Honarvar and A. Sami, "Towards Sustainable Smart City by Particulate Matter Prediction Using Urban Big Data, Excluding Expensive Air Pollution Infrastructures," Big Data Research, vol. 17, pp. 56– 65, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.bdr.2018.05.006.
- [9] D. I. Stern, "From Correlation to Granger Causality," 2021. [Online]. Available: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1959624http://ssrn.com/ab stract=19596241.
- [10] L. Barnett and A. K. Seth, "The MVGC multivariate Granger causality toolbox: A new approach to Granger-causal inference," J Neurosci Methods, vol. 223, pp. 50–68, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2013.10.018.
- [11] J. M. Rohrer, "Thinking Clearly About Correlations and Causation: Graphical Causal Models for Observational Data," Adv Methods Pract Psychol Sci, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 27–42, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1177/2515245917745629.

- [12] A. Shojaie and E. B. Fox, "Granger Causality: A Review and Recent Advances," Annu Rev Stat Appl, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 289–319, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1146/annurev-statistics-040120-010930.
- [13] S. Chen and Y. Ding, "Tackling Heavy Metal Pollution: Evaluating Governance Models and Frameworks," Sustainability 2023, Vol. 15, Page 15863, vol. 15, no. 22, p. 15863, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.3390/SU152215863.
- [14] H. Liu, W. Cui, and M. Zhang, "Exploring the causal relationship between urbanization and air pollution: Evidence from China," Sustain Cities Soc, vol. 80, May 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.scs.2022.103783.
- [15] L. Liang, Z. Wang, and J. Li, "The effect of urbanization on environmental pollution in rapidly developing urban agglomerations," J Clean Prod, vol. 237, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117649.
- [16] M. S. Hanoon et al., "Developing machine learning algorithms for meteorological temperature and humidity forecasting at Terengganu state in Malaysia," Sci Rep, vol. 11, no. 1, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-96872-w.
- [17] L. Bai, J. Wang, X. Ma, and H. Lu, "Air Pollution Forecasts: An Overview," International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2018, Vol. 15, Page 780, vol. 15, no. 4, p. 780, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.3390/IJERPH15040780.
- [18] F. M. Saimi, F. M. Hamzah, M. E. Toriman, O. Jaafar, and H. Tajudin, "Trend and linearity analysis of meteorological parameters in peninsular Malaysia," Sustainability (Switzerland), vol. 12, no. 22, pp. 1–19, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12229533.
- [19] M. I. Rumaling, F. P. Chee, J. Dayou, J. H. Wui Chang, S. S. Kai Kong, and J. Sentian, "Missing value imputation for PM10 concentration in sabah using nearest neighbour method (NNM) and expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm," Asian Journal of Atmospheric Environment, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 62–72, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.5572/AJAE.2020.14.1.062.
- [20] X. Song et al., "Measuring Granger Causality in Quantiles * Measuring Granger Causality in Quantiles," 2020.
- [21] M. F. Ibrahim et al., "The Impacts of Illegal Toxic Waste Dumping on Children's Health: A Review and Case Study from Pasir Gudang, Malaysia," Int J Environ Res Public Health, vol. 18, no. 5, p. 2221, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph18052221.
- [22] Z. Zhang, T. Xue, and X. Jin, "Effects of meteorological conditions and air pollution on COVID-19 transmission: Evidence from 219 Chinese cities," Science of the Total Environment, vol. 741, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140244.

- [23] M. Sarfraz, M. Mohsin, and S. Naseem, "A blessing in disguise: new insights on the effect of COVID-19 on the carbon emission, climate change, and sustainable environment," Environmental Science and Pollution Research, vol. 29, no. 20, pp. 29651– 29662, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s11356-021-17507-1.
- [24] A. Bekkar, B. Hssina, S. Douzi, and K. Douzi, "Airpollution prediction in smart city, deep learning approach," J Big Data, vol. 8, no. 1, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s40537-021-00548-1.
- [25] "Meteorological Influences on Seasonal Variations of Air Pollutants (SO2, NO2, O3, CO, PM2.5, and PM10) in the Dhaka Megacity," American Journal of Pure and Applied Biosciences, pp. 15–23, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.34104/ajpab.020.15023.
- [26] N. D. Abdul Halim, K. N. Abdul Maulud, K. C. Hwa Lun, W. S. Wan Mohd Jaafar, F. A. Mohd, and F. Khan, "Air Pollution Prediction Based on Changes in Monsoon Wind Direction by Using Trajectory-Geospatial Approach," Jurnal Kejuruteraan, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 303–316, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.17576/jkukm-2023-35(2)-04.
- [27] S. Shith, N. A. Ramli, A. Umirah, M. Nadzir, N. R. Awang, and M. R. Ismail, "Drivers of nocturnal interactions between ground-level ozone and nitrogen dioxide," Global Nest Journal, 2023, doi: 10.30955/gnj.004843.
- [28] C. T. Sousa et al., "Ozone trends on equatorial and tropical regions of South America using Dobson spectrophotometer, TOMS and OMI satellites instruments," J Atmos Sol Terr Phys, vol. 203, p. 105272, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jastp.2020.105272.