# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONSERVATION SCIENCE



ISSN: 2067-533X

Volume 16, Issue 1, 2025: 149-164

DOI: 10. 36868/IJCS.2025.01.09

# ANALYSIS OF AIR POLLUTION IN MALAYSIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION USING GRANGER CAUSALITY AND PEARSON CORRELATION

Zulkifli Abd RAIS<sup>1</sup>, Norazrin RAMLI<sup>1,2, ,\*</sup>, Norazian Mohamed NOOR<sup>1,2</sup>, Hazrul Abdul HAMID<sup>3</sup>, Ahmad Zia UL-SAUFIE<sup>4</sup>, Mohd Khairul Nizam MAHMAD<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Civil Engineering & Technology, Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Arau 02600, Perlis, Malaysia
<sup>2</sup> Sustainable Environment Research Group (SERG) Centre of Excellence Geopolymer and Green Technology (CEGeoGTech), Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Arau 02600, Perlis, Malaysia

<sup>3</sup> School of Distance Education, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Gelugor 11800, Penang, Malaysia

<sup>4</sup> Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM), Shah Alam 40450, Selangor, Malaysia

<sup>5</sup> Mining and Energy Resources Academy (MERA), Jalan Kuala Ketil, Parit Panjang, 09100 Baling, Kedah

#### Abstract

This study investigates the relationships between air pollutants ( $PM_{10}$ ,  $SO_2$ ,  $NO_2$ ,  $O_3$ , CO) and meteorological factors (temperature, relative humidity, wind speed) across five states in Malaysia: Seberang Perai, Shah Alam, Nilai, Larkin and Pasir Gudang. Using time-series data from 2017 to 2021, we applied Granger causality and Pearson correlation to explore the predictive relationships and linear associations between these variables. Granger causality provided insights into temporal precedence, revealing significant predictive relationships such as temperature Granger-causing  $PM_{10}$  and  $O_3$  in Nilai and Shah Alam. Meanwhile, Pearson correlation highlighted strong linear relationships, such as the positive correlation between  $PM_{10}$  and wind speed in Shah Alam and the negative correlation between humidity and  $O_3$ across several stations. By comparing both methods, we show how combining Granger causality with Pearson correlation can enhance environmental modelling, offering a comprehensive approach to air pollution prediction. This integration provides robust insights into the dynamics of air quality, which are critical for developing effective pollution control strategies.

*Keywords:* Air pollutants; Granger causality; Pearson correlation; Meteorological factors; Malaysia; Predictive modelling

#### Introduction

Granger causality is a powerful tool in time-series analysis, widely applied across disciplines such as economics, environmental studies and neuroscience to explore the temporal relationships between variables [1]. Developed by Clive Granger in 1969, this technique operates on the principle of temporal precedence, where the past values of one variable can improve the prediction of another variable's future values [2]. However, it is crulcial to recognize that Granger causality does not imply a direct cause-and-effect relationship. Instead, it identifies whether changes in one variable are statistically significant in forecasting another. This distinction is important as the observed relationships might be influenced by external or

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author: norazrin@unimap.edu.my

unmeasured factors [3]. Therefore, the results of Granger causality tests must be interpreted with caution, considering potential confounding variables and the assumptions underlying the test.

A known limitation of Granger causality is its vulnerability to spurious correlations, where variables appear causally linked due to shared external influences or coincidental patterns [4]. Additionally, the technique assumes linearity, which can limit its effectiveness when dealing with non-linear relationships often present in complex systems like air quality dynamics. In scenarios where non-linear interactions dominate, relying solely on Granger causality may yield incomplete or misleading conclusions [5, 6]. These challenges underscore the need for complementary methods that can address both linear and non-linear associations, as well as enhance the interpretability of time-series data.

Pearson correlation is another foundational statistical method used to measure the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two continuous variables. It plays a pivotal role in predictive modelling, particularly in feature selection, where it helps identify key variables that are strongly associated with the target variable [7]. In addition, Pearson correlation is valuable for diagnosing multicollinearity, a condition in which two or more predictor variables are highly correlated, potentially leading to redundancy and instability in regression models. By identifying these correlations early in the modeling process, researchers can simplify their models and improve reliability and interpretability.

Despite its advantages, Pearson correlation is limited in several key respects. First, it only captures linear relationships, making it less effective in cases where variables exhibit complex, non-linear interactions [8]. In the context of environmental modeling, where air pollution and meteorological factors often display intricate, multi-dimensional dynamics, Pearson correlation may fail to detect significant associations. Moreover, Pearson correlation does not account for the temporal ordering of variables, which is crucial when analyzing time-series data. It measures simultaneous correlations but cannot determine whether changes in one variable precede or predict changes in another [7, 9]. For these reasons, Pearson correlation alone is insufficient for capturing the full complexity of relationships in time-series data and its findings should be complemented with other analytical techniques like Granger causality.

In the field of air pollution studies, both Pearson correlation and Granger causality have been employed to investigate the relationships between pollutants and meteorological parameters. Pearson correlation provides a straightforward approach to identifying linear associations, such as the link between wind speed and particulate matter ( $PM_{10}$ ), or the inverse relationship between humidity and ozone levels [10]. However, these correlations provide only a static snapshot of the data, lacking the temporal dimension needed to understand how meteorological factors influence pollution over time. This is where Granger causality offers added value, as it examines the temporal order of events to determine whether changes in one variable, such as temperature, can predict future changes in pollutant concentrations, such as  $PM_{10}$  or  $O_3$  [11]. By identifying these temporal dynamics, Granger causality helps researchers gain a more comprehensive understanding of cause-and-effect relationships in air quality studies.

Given the distinct strengths and weaknesses of both Pearson correlation and Granger causality, this study aims to compare the utility of these two methods in analyzing the relationships between air pollutant concentrations ( $PM_{10}$ ,  $SO_2$ ,  $NO_2$ ,  $O_3$ , CO) and meteorological parameters (temperature, humidity, wind speed) across five regions in Malaysia. The regions selected for this study—Seberang Perai, Shah Alam, Nilai, Larkin and Pasir Gudang—are characterized by diverse environmental conditions, ranging from industrial areas to urban and semi-urban regions, offering a comprehensive dataset for analysis. Time-series data from 2017 to 2021 is used to examine how these statistical methods can be applied to predict air pollution trends and enhance environmental modeling.

In the context of conservation in Malaysia, integrating Granger causality and Pearson correlation into environmental research offers valuable insights into the complex relationships between air pollutants and meteorological factors, particularly in a rapidly urbanizing and industrializing nation. Malaysia faces unique environmental challenges, including seasonal haze episodes, emissions from deforestation and urban heat island effects, which have significant implications for public health and biodiversity [3]. By employing these statistical methods, air quality forecasting can be significantly improved, enabling better preparedness for haze events and reducing their impacts on vulnerable ecosystems, such as national parks and conservation areas. Furthermore, the insights gained from this approach can inform the development of targeted pollution control policies, such as stricter emissions regulations and sustainable urban planning initiatives. These strategies not only address pollution sources but also support longterm environmental sustainability. Additionally, understanding the interplay between pollutants and meteorological factors can help anticipate how changes in climatic conditions may affect air quality, guiding conservation efforts such as reforestation to enhance carbon sequestration and mitigate pollution levels. Enhanced air quality monitoring also benefits Malaysia's eco-tourism sector, which depends on clean air and well-preserved natural environments to attract visitors. By leveraging such an analytical framework, Malaysia can better balance economic development with environmental conservation, fostering a healthier and more sustainable future for its people and ecosystems [12].

# **Experimental part**

#### Materials and Methods

The study focuses on five air quality monitoring stations located across different regions of Malaysia: Seberang Perai, Shah Alam, Nilai, Larkin and Pasir Gudang. These stations were selected due to their varied environmental conditions, which include industrial, urban and semiurban areas. The coordinates of the stations are listed in Table 1, covering northern, central and southern regions of the country. This distribution allows for an assessment of air pollution trends in diverse climatic and topographical conditions [13].

| Station ID | State                  | Location                                  | Coordinate    |
|------------|------------------------|---|---------------|
| CA07P      | Seberang Perai, Pulang | Sek. Keb. Cenderawasih, Taman             | N05° 23.470'  |
| CA0/F      | Pinang                 | Inderawasih, Perai                        | E100° 23.213' |
| CA20P      | Shah Alam Salangar     | Sek. Keb. Taman Tun Dr. Ismail Jaya, Shah | N03° 06.287'  |
| CA20B      | Shan Alam, Selangoi    | Alam                                      | E101° 33.368' |
| CA23N      | Nilai Nagari Sambilan  | Taman Semarak (Phase II) Nilai            | N02° 49.246'  |
| CA25IN     | Milai, Negeri Semonan  | Taman Semarak (Thase II), Nilai           | E101° 48.877' |
| CA221      | Larkin Johor           | Teacher Education Temenggong Ibrahim      | N01° 29.815'  |
| CASSS      | Laikiii, joiloi        | Campus, Larkin, Johor Bahru               | E103° 43.617' |
| CA34I      | Pasir Gudang Johan     | Sek. Men. Keb. Pasir Gudang 2, Pasir      | N01° 28.225'  |
| CA34J      | i asii Gudalig, Jolioi | Gudang, Johor Bahru                       | E103° 53.637' |

Table 1. Latitude and Longitude for five monitoring station's location

The regions represented in this study exhibit distinct pollution sources. Shah Alam, for example, is an urban centre with heavy vehicular traffic, while Pasir Gudang and Larkin are industrial hubs [14]. By contrast, Seberang Perai and Nilai represent a mix of residential and industrial activities. These varying conditions make the locations suitable for a broad analysis of air quality parameters and their relationship with meteorological factors.

#### Site Description

The five air quality monitoring stations are strategically distributed across northern, central and southern Malaysia, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of air quality in different climatic and pollution contexts as shown in figure 1.

Seberang Perai, located in Pulau Pinang, is a rapidly urbanizing area characterized by a combination of industrial and residential zones. It experiences moderate industrial emissions coupled with vehicular pollution, making it a prime location for studying the interplay between urban pollution and meteorological conditions.



Fig 1. Location of research area

Similarly, Shah Alam in Selangor, a highly urbanized commercial and industrial hub within the Klang Valley, faces significant air quality challenges due to heavy traffic emissions, construction activities and industrial pollutants. Nilai in Negeri Sembilan offers a contrasting semi-urban environment, where both industrial and residential activities contribute to local pollution levels [15]. Additionally, Nilai is affected by transboundary pollution from neighbouring regions, providing a diverse dataset to analyze pollutant dispersion under varying meteorological influences. In Johor, the urban area of Larkin, near Johor Bahru, faces air quality issues driven by moderate industrial activity and vehicular emissions, with these challenges escalating alongside urbanization and industrialization. Finally, Pasir Gudang in Johor, one of the most heavily industrialized regions in Malaysia, is dominated by petrochemical industries. The air quality in this region is primarily shaped by emissions from industrial processes, making it a crucial site for investigating the impact of industrial pollution in relation to meteorological factors.

The geographical diversity of these locations allows for a broad analysis of air pollution trends under varying environmental conditions, from coastal to inland regions and across different land use types. The details and coordinates of the stations are summarized in Table 1.

#### Data Collection and Preliminary Data Processing

Data on five key air pollutants—  $PM_{10}$ ,  $SO_2$ ,  $NO_2$ ,  $O_3$  and CO —and three meteorological parameters—temperature, humidity and wind speed—were collected from the Department of Environment Malaysia. Monthly averages for each pollutant and meteorological parameter were computed from raw daily data spanning from 2017 to 2021. The corresponding symbols and units for the air quality parameters was present in Table 2.

The dataset underwent preprocessing to handle missing values and outliers. Statistical techniques, including data imputation and outlier detection, were used to clean the data, ensuring that the analysis remained robust [13]. The descriptive statistics of the data—such as mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis—were calculated to summarize the characteristics of each variable at each station.

| Parameter                 | Symbol    | Unit              |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Particulate Matter < 10µm | $PM_{10}$ | μg/m <sup>3</sup> |
| Sulfur Dioxide            | $SO_2$    | ppm               |
| Nitrogen Dioxide          | $NO_2$    | ppm               |
| Oxygen                    | $O_3$     | ppm               |
| Carbon Dioxide            | CO        | ppm               |
| Temperature               | Т         | °C                |
| Relative Humidity         | RH        | %                 |
| Wind Speed                | WS        | m/s               |

Table 2. Air Quality Parameters with Corresponding Symbols and Units

#### Granger Causality Analysis

Granger causality was used to assess whether one-time series could predict another. The test was performed on pairs of air pollutant concentrations and meteorological variables. Specifically, the test examined whether the historical values of meteorological factors like temperature or wind speed could help predict future pollutant concentrations. Granger causality is based on the Vector Autoregression (VAR) model, where each variable is regressed against its own past values and the past values of the other variables in the system.

The null hypothesis of the Granger causality test assumes that no causality exists between the tested variables. If the null hypothesis is rejected at a significant level, it indicates that one variable Granger-causes the other. The analysis was performed using the statistical software EViews, with results interpreted using graphical depictions of causality

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 does not imply true causation, it serves as a powerful statistical tool for identifying predictive relationships in time series data [2, 16]. 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 [17]:

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

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 [18]. 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 [5]. The results were visualized to illustrate the direction and strength of these causal connections across different monitoring stations.

# Pearson Correlation Analysis

The application of Pearson correlation in predictive modelling serves a crucial function in feature selection. By analyzing the correlations between predictor variables and the target variable, researchers can identify relevant features for inclusion in predictive models [7]. High correlation coefficients suggest potential predictors that may significantly improve the overall performance of the model. Additionally, Pearson correlation is instrumental in assessing multicollinearity, a condition characterized by elevated correlations among predictor variables, which can lead to instability and redundancy in predictive models [7, 19]. Identifying and addressing multicollinearity through correlation analysis enhances both the reliability and interpretability of predictive models.

In air pollution research, the incorporation of Pearson correlation into predictive models is a valuable tool for elucidating the complex relationships within air quality data. Its capability to quantify linear associations between variables provides critical insights into the dynamics of air quality [10].

To examine the linear relationships between each pollutant and meteorological factor, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated. This measure assesses the strength of the association between two continuous variables, yielding values that range from -1 (indicating a perfect negative correlation) to +1 (indicating a perfect positive correlation), with a value of zero signifying no linear relationship [20]. A Pearson correlation matrix was constructed for each monitoring station, providing a clear view of the pairwise correlations among pollutants and meteorological factors. The analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistical Software Version 29. To fully leverage the potential of Pearson correlation, a careful and multidimensional approach is required, taking into account several key factors. A fundamental aspect of Pearson correlation is its role in variable selection and dimensionality reduction. Although it aids in identifying relevant variables, managing a large number of predictors necessitates the use of techniques such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA) or other feature selection methods. This strategic approach streamlines the modeling process and effectively addresses multicollinearity issues, leading to increased computational efficiency [21].

In air quality studies, where distinct temporal patterns are prevalent, temporal considerations are paramount. Analyzing correlations across various time intervals allows models to capture seasonality, diurnal variations and long-term trends, ensuring that predictive models reflect the dynamic nature of air quality data [22]. It is also important to recognize the limitations of Pearson correlation in detecting non-linear relationships; thus, the integration of complementary techniques is essential. Approaches such as polynomial regression or machine learning algorithms, which excel at revealing complex non-linear patterns, can enhance the understanding of relationships between variables, contributing to the overall robustness of predictive models [23].

Furthermore, considering causality is vital. While Pearson correlation identifies associations, it does not confirm causation. Employing techniques such as Granger causality testing or structural equation modeling can facilitate a more nuanced exploration of causal relationships among variables, thereby enriching the predictive modeling process [9].

Statistical Software and Tools

All analyses were performed using industry-standard statistical software tools. The EViews software was employed for Granger causality testing due to its advanced capabilities in time-series analysis, particularly for handling multivariate datasets. IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 29) was used for Pearson correlation analysis and descriptive statistics, as well as for data preprocessing tasks such as handling missing values, detecting outliers and generating visualizations.

# Data Visualization and Interpretation

Graphical representations of the results were critical for interpreting the complex relationships between pollutants and meteorological factors. Time-series plots were used to depict trends in pollutant concentrations and meteorological parameters over the study period, while correlation heatmaps provided a clear visualization of the strength of linear relationships. Causality diagrams, derived from the Granger causality tests, were employed to map the direction and strength of predictive relationships, helping to uncover the temporal dynamics underlying the air quality data.

# **Results and Discussion**

# **Descriptive** Analysis

The descriptive statistics for each pollutant and meteorological parameter were computed to establish a foundational understanding of the data. Table 3 presents a summary of the average concentrations of pollutants ( $PM_{10}$ ,  $SO_2$ ,  $NO_2$ , O and, CO) and the meteorological parameters (temperature, relative humidity, wind speed) across the five monitoring stations with 54 of the sample size.

The analysis shows that  $PM_{10}$  levels were consistently highest in Nilai, an industrial area, with a mean concentration of  $34.23 \mu g/m^3$ . In contrast, Seberang Perai recorded the lowest  $PM_{10}$  mean at  $25.39 \mu g/m^3$ . A noticeable spike in  $PM_{10}$  levels occurred across all stations in October 2019, likely due to the influence of industrial emissions and meteorological conditions, particularly during periods of lower wind speeds and higher temperatures, which limited the dispersion of pollutants.

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for various locations from 2017 to 2021, illustrating how broader environmental factors influence air quality. The 2020 Movement Control Order (MCO) notably led to a significant reduction in NO<sub>2</sub> levels in urban areas like Shah Alam, attributed to decreased transportation and industrial activity [24, 25]. However, the data also highlight the susceptibility of these areas to extreme pollution events, such as the notable spikes in PM<sub>10</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations recorded in October 2019, driven largely by seasonal weather conditions and industrial processes. These observations underscore the need for ongoing monitoring and targeted interventions to effectively manage air pollution, particularly in urban and industrial areas [26]. The variation in pollutant levels across different locations and time periods emphasizes the importance of developing localized strategies to address specific pollution sources and mitigate the effects of extreme pollution events on the environment.

| Station                               | Concentration | Seberang<br>Perai | Shah<br>Alam | Nilai   | Larkin | Pasir<br>Gudang |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|---------|--------|-----------------|
| Minimum, µg/m <sup>3</sup>            |               | 16.185            | 20.991       | 20.905  | 17.579 | 15.502          |
| Maximum, µg/m <sup>3</sup>            |               | 43.696            | 89.365       | 102.887 | 72.508 | 63.236          |
| Mean, $\mu g/m^3$                     | DM            | 25.387            | 32.667       | 34.234  | 28.194 | 26.039          |
| Standard Deviation, µg/m <sup>3</sup> | $PINI_{10}$   | 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 1 5 3           | 3 570        | 3 379   | 3 005  | 1 787           |

Table 3. The descriptive analysis of the concentrations from 2017 to 2021

| Kurtosis         1011         January         Outsing           Minimum, ppm         0.001         0.001         0.001         0.001         0.001           Maximum, ppm         0.002         0.002         0.004         0.003         0.001           Standard Deviation, ppm         SO2         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           Minimum, ppm         0.005         0.007         0.006         0.004         0.0018           Maximum, ppm         0.015         0.022         0.013         0.012         0.011           Standard Deviation, ppm         NO2         0.002         0.003         0.003         0.004           Stewness         0.483         -0.4040         0.036         0.049         0.014           Standard Deviation, ppm         0.31         0.038         0.024         0.027         0.29           Skewness         0.073  | Station                  | Concentration | Seberang       | Shah<br>Alam | Nilai  | Larkin | Pasir<br>Cudang |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------|--------|-----------------|
| Initianum, ppm         10001         10001         10001         0.001   | Kurtosis                 |               | 1 089          | 18 262       | 16 227 | 14 350 | 5 600           |
| Maximum, pm         0.002         0.004         0.003         0.003         0.003         0.003         0.003         0.003         0.004         0.003         0.001         0.002         0.0004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.004         0.0013         0.013         0.013         0.013         0.013         0.014         0.014         0.026         0.025         0.36         0.33         0.22         0.19         0.23         0.25         0.36         0.33         0.024         0.014         0.036         0.025         0.031         0.033         0.031         0.033         0.031         0.031         0.031         0.031         0.031 <th< td=""><td>Minimum ppm</td><td></td><td>0.001</td><td>0.001</td><td>0.001</td><td>0.001</td><td>0.001</td></th<>   | Minimum ppm              |               | 0.001          | 0.001        | 0.001  | 0.001  | 0.001           |
| $\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$   | Maximum ppm              |               | 0.002          | 0.002        | 0.001  | 0.001  | 0.001           |
| Intent         District         District <thdistrict< th="">         District         <t< td=""><td>Mean nom</td><td></td><td>0.002</td><td>0.002</td><td>0.004</td><td>0.005</td><td>0.010</td></t<></thdistrict<> | Mean nom                 |               | 0.002          | 0.002        | 0.004  | 0.005  | 0.010           |
| Shanala Deviation, ppn         SO2         0.0005         0.0002         0.0002         0.0002         0.0005         0.0002         0.0005         0.0007         0.0005         0.0007         0.0003         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0004         0.0013         0.0112         0.0111           Standard Deviation, ppm         0.0002         0.0013         0.0013         0.0013         0.0013         0.0013         0.0014         0.003         0.003         0.003         0.004         0.014         0.005         0.004         0.013         0.012         0.0111         Stawas         0.004         0.013         0.012         0.0111         Stawas         0.004         0.013         0.0013         0.003         0.003         0.004         0.014         0.005         0.004         0.014         0.025         0.005         0.004         0.014         0.026         0.025         Maximum, ppm         0.031         0.031         0.0015         0.014         0.014         0.004         0.014         0.004         0.015         0.014  | Standard Deviation nnm   | SO.           | 0.0003         | 0.0002       | 0.001  | 0.002  | 0.002           |
| Octomber         0.3         0.2         0.3         0.23         0.23         0.43           Sikewness         0.1757         0.746         23.370         0.223         23.504           Minimum, ppn         0.005         0.007         0.006         0.004         0.004           Maximum, ppn         0.015         0.022         0.018         0.018         0.018           Mean, ppn         0.009         0.016         0.013         0.012         0.011           Standard Deviation, ppn         NO2         0.002         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           Minimum, ppn         0.004         0.014         0.005         0.009         0.008           Maximum, ppn         0.031         0.038         0.024         0.026         0.025           Mean, ppn         0.016         0.020         0.010         0.015         0.014           Standard Deviation, ppn         O3         0.007         0.005         0.004         0.004           Minimum, ppn <td< td=""><td>Coefficient of variation</td><td>502</td><td>0.0005</td><td>0.0002</td><td>0.0005</td><td>0.0005</td><td>0.0015</td></td<>  | Coefficient of variation | 502           | 0.0005         | 0.0002       | 0.0005 | 0.0005 | 0.0015          |
| Stewness         0.473         0.137         4.237         0.003         4.209           Minimum, ppn         0.005         0.007         0.006         0.004         0.004           Maximum, ppn         0.015         0.022         0.018         0.011         0.011           Standard Deviation, ppm         0.009         0.016         0.013         0.003         0.003         0.004           Cefficient 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           Minimum, ppm         0.016         0.024         0.026         0.025           Mean, ppm         0.016         0.020         0.010         0.014         0.004           Skewness         0.075         1.306         1.451         0.667         0.517           Kurtosis         -0.734         1.860         2.074         0.863         -0.032           Minimum, ppn         0.473         0.531         0.372         0.188         0.410           Skewness         0.075         1.306  | Skowmag                  |               | 0.5            | 0.12         | 4 224  | 0.25   | 4 260           |
| Kuttosis         -0.737         0.746         23.504         23.504           Minimum, ppm         0.005         0.007         0.006         0.004         0.004           Maximum, ppm         0.015         0.022         0.018         0.018         0.011           Standard Deviation, ppm         NO2         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         0.200         0.044         0.026         0.026           Maximum, ppm         0.016         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         O3         0.007         0.005         0.004         0.004         0.004           Coefficient of variation         0.441         0.25         0.4         0.57         0.29           Skewness <td>SKewness<br/>Vurtoaia</td> <td></td> <td>0.473</td> <td>0.187</td> <td>4.234</td> <td>0.003</td> <td>4.209</td>  | SKewness<br>Vurtoaia     |               | 0.473          | 0.187        | 4.234  | 0.003  | 4.209           |
| Minimum, ppm         0.003         0.007         0.006         0.006         0.004         0.004           Maximum, ppm         0.009         0.016         0.013         0.012         0.011           Standard Deviation, ppm         NO2         0.002         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           Minimum, ppm         0.001         0.014         0.005         0.009         0.008           Maximum, ppm         0.031         0.038         0.024         0.025         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           Minimum, ppm         0.473         0.531         0.372         0.188         0.116           Maximum, ppm         0.715         0.829         0.594         0.60  | Minimum and              |               | -0.737         | 0.740        | 23.370 | 0.223  | 23.304          |
| Maximum, ppm         0.013         0.022         0.016         0.013         0.003         0.003         0.004         0.013         0.023         0.225         0.36           Skewness         0.483         -0.408         0.040         0.036         -0.495         Kurtosis         1.314         0.290         -0.845         -0.788         -0.863           Minimum, ppm         0.031         0.038         0.024         0.026         0.025         0.0043         0.295   | Manimum, ppm             |               | 0.005          | 0.007        | 0.000  | 0.004  | 0.004           |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | Maximum, ppm             |               | 0.015          | 0.022        | 0.018  | 0.018  | 0.018           |
| Standard Deviation, ppm         NO2         0.002         0.003         0.003         0.003         0.004           Coefficient of variation         0.22         0.19         0.23         0.25         0.36           Kurtosis         1.314         0.290         -0.845         -0.788         -0.863           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         O3         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           Minimum, ppm         1.023         1.263         1.184         0.975         0.905           Mean, ppm         0.715         0.829         0.594         0.601         0.657   | Mean, ppm                | NO            | 0.009          | 0.016        | 0.013  | 0.012  | 0.011           |
| Coefficient of variation $0.22$ $0.19$ $0.23$ $0.25$ $0.36$ Skewness $0.483$ $-0.408$ $0.004$ $0.035$ $-0.845$ $-0.788$ $-0.495$ Minimum, ppm $0.004$ $0.014$ $0.005$ $0.009$ $0.008$ Maximum, ppm $0.016$ $0.020$ $0.010$ $0.015$ $0.014$ Standard Deviation, ppm $O_3$ $0.007$ $0.005$ $0.004$ $0.004$ $0.004$ Coefficient of variation $0.444$ $0.25$ $0.4$ $0.27$ $0.29$ Skewness $0.075$ $1.366$ $1.451$ $0.667$ $0.517$ Kurtosis $-0.734$ $1.860$ $2.074$ $0.863$ $-0.032$ Minimum, ppm $0.473$ $0.531$ $0.372$ $0.188$ $0.410$ Maximum, ppm $0.715$ $0.829$ $0.594$ $0.601$ $0.657$ Standard Deviation, ppm         CO $0.101$ $0.150$ $0.127$ $0.218$ $0.122$ <t< td=""><td>Standard Deviation, ppm</td><td><math>NO_2</math></td><td>0.002</td><td>0.003</td><td>0.003</td><td>0.003</td><td>0.004</td></t<>  | Standard Deviation, ppm  | $NO_2$        | 0.002          | 0.003        | 0.003  | 0.003  | 0.004           |
| Skewness         0.483         -0.408         0.040         0.036         -0.495           Kurtosis         1.314         0.290         -0.845         -0.788         -0.863           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         03         0.007         0.005         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           Minimum, ppm         0.473         0.531         0.372         0.188         0.410           Maximum, ppm         0.715         0.829         0.594         0.601         0.657           Standard Deviation, ppm         CO         0.101         0.18         0.21         0.36         0.19           Skewness   | Coefficient of variation |               | 0.22           | 0.19         | 0.23   | 0.25   | 0.36            |
| Kurtosis         1.314         0.290         -0.845         -0.788         -0.863           Minimum, ppm         0.004         0.014         0.005         0.009         0.008           Maximum, ppm         0.016         0.020         0.010         0.015         0.014           Standard Deviation, ppm         O <sub>3</sub> 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           Minimum, ppm         0.473         0.531         0.372         0.188         0.410           Maximum, ppm         0.715         0.829         0.594         0.601         0.657           Standard Deviation, ppm         CO         0.101         0.150         0.127         0.218         0.122           Coefficient of variation         0.14         0.18         0.217         0.218         0.122           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.033         27.039           Ma   | Skewness                 |               | 0.483          | -0.408       | 0.040  | 0.036  | -0.495          |
| 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         O3         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         1.366         1.451         0.667         0.517           Kurtosis         -0.734         1.860         2.074         0.863         -0.032           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         CO         0.101         0.158         0.127         0.218         0.122           Coefficient of variation         0.14         0.18         0.21         0.36         0.19   | Kurtosis                 |               | 1.314          | 0.290        | -0.845 | -0.788 | -0.863          |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $   | Minimum, ppm             |               | 0.004          | 0.014        | 0.005  | 0.009  | 0.008           |
| Mean, ppm0.0160.0200.0100.0150.014Standard Deviation, ppm $O_3$ 0.0070.0050.0040.0040.004Coefficient of variation0.440.250.40.270.29Skewness0.0751.3061.4510.6670.517Kurtosis-0.7341.8602.0740.863-0.032Minimum, ppm0.4730.5310.3720.1880.410Maximum, ppm1.0231.2631.1840.9750.905Mean, ppm0.7150.8290.5940.6010.657Standard Deviation, ppmCO0.1010.1500.1270.2180.122Coefficient of variation0.140.180.210.360.19Skewness0.3480.2401.888-0.1520.080Kurtosis0.678-0.1587.703-1.313-0.871Minimum, °C29.76828.64429.17428.97731.295Mean, °C27.98027.54727.90027.55929.454Standard Deviation, ppmT0.7460.6820.6520.5711.108Coefficient of variation0.0270.0230.0210.038Skewness-0.342-0.749-0.2950.133-0.483Kurtosis-0.345-0.749-0.2950.133-0.483Kurtosis-0.345-0.749-0.2950.133-0.483Kurtosis-0.345-0.749-0.295 <td< td=""><td>Maximum, ppm</td><td></td><td>0.031</td><td>0.038</td><td>0.024</td><td>0.026</td><td>0.025</td></td<>  | Maximum, ppm             |               | 0.031          | 0.038        | 0.024  | 0.026  | 0.025           |
| Standard Deviation, ppm $O_3$ 0.0070.0050.0040.0040.004Coefficient of variation0.440.250.40.270.29Skewness0.0751.3061.4510.6670.517Kurtosis-0.7341.8602.0740.863-0.032Minimum, ppm0.4730.5310.3720.1880.410Maximum, ppm1.0231.2631.1840.9750.905Mean, ppm0.7150.8290.5940.6010.657Standard Deviation, ppmCO0.1010.1500.1270.2180.122Coefficient of variation0.140.180.210.360.19Skewness0.3480.2401.888-0.1520.080Kurtosis0.678-0.1587.703-1.313-0.871Minimum, °C26.21926.12526.09326.05327.039Maximum, °C29.76828.64429.17428.97731.295Mean, °C27.98027.54727.90027.55929.454Standard Deviation, ppmT0.7460.6820.6520.5711.108Coefficient of variation0.0270.0250.0230.0210.038Skewness-0.345-0.749-0.2420.311-0.523Minimum, %67.08370.40070.36177.25072.416Maximum, %85.76884.45785.06988.49185.296Mean, %78.90578.  | Mean, ppm                |               | 0.016          | 0.020        | 0.010  | 0.015  | 0.014           |
| 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           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         CO         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         0.603         26.053         27.039           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454 <td>Standard Deviation, ppm</td> <td><math>O_3</math></td> <td>0.007</td> <td>0.005</td> <td>0.004</td> <td>0.004</td> <td>0.004</td>  | Standard Deviation, ppm  | $O_3$         | 0.007          | 0.005        | 0.004  | 0.004  | 0.004           |
| Skewness         0.075         1.306         1.451         0.667         0.517           Kurtosis         -0.734         1.860         2.074         0.863         -0.032           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         CO         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           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, p   | Coefficient of variation |               | 0.44           | 0.25         | 0.4    | 0.27   | 0.29            |
| Kurtosis         -0.734         1.860         2.074         0.863         -0.032           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         CO         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           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108  | Skewness                 |               | 0.075          | 1.306        | 1.451  | 0.667  | 0.517           |
| 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         CO         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           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038  | Kurtosis                 |               | -0.734         | 1.860        | 2.074  | 0.863  | -0.032          |
| 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         CO         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           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523  | Minimum, ppm             |               | 0.473          | 0.531        | 0.372  | 0.188  | 0.410           |
| Mean, ppm         0.715         0.829         0.594         0.601         0.657           Standard Deviation, ppm         CO         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           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296   | Maximum, ppm             |               | 1.023          | 1.263        | 1.184  | 0.975  | 0.905           |
| Standard Deviation, ppm         CO         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           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295         0.133         -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296 <td>Mean, ppm</td> <td></td> <td>0.715</td> <td>0.829</td> <td>0.594</td> <td>0.601</td> <td>0.657</td>  | Mean, ppm                |               | 0.715          | 0.829        | 0.594  | 0.601  | 0.657           |
| 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           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295         0.133         -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570 <t< td=""><td>Standard Deviation, ppm</td><td>CO</td><td>0.101</td><td>0.150</td><td>0.127</td><td>0.218</td><td>0.122</td></t<>   | Standard Deviation, ppm  | CO            | 0.101          | 0.150        | 0.127  | 0.218  | 0.122           |
| Skewness         0.348         0.240 <b>1.888</b> -0.152         0.080           Kurtosis         0.678         -0.158 <b>7.703</b> -1.313         -0.871           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053 <b>27.039</b> Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977 <b>31.295</b> Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559 <b>29.454</b> Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571 <b>1.108</b> Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021 <b>0.038</b> Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295 <b>0.133</b> -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242 <b>0.311</b> -0.523           Minimum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069 <b>88.491</b> 85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539 <b>84.397</b> 79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463 <b>3.469</b> 2.962   | Coefficient of variation |               | 0.14           | 0.18         | 0.21   | 0.36   | 0.19            |
| Kurtosis         0.678         -0.158         7.703         -1.313         -0.871           Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295         0.133         -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         67.083         70.400         70.361         77.250         72.416           Maximum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881   | Skewness                 |               | 0.348          | 0.240        | 1.888  | -0.152 | 0.080           |
| Minimum, °C         26.219         26.125         26.093         26.053         27.039           Maximum, °C         29.768         28.644         29.174         28.977         31.295           Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295         0.133         -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         67.083         70.400         70.361         77.250         72.416           Maximum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         <  | Kurtosis                 |               | 0.678          | -0.158       | 7.703  | -1.313 | -0.871          |
| Maximum, °C29.76828.64429.17428.97731.295Mean, °C27.98027.54727.90027.55929.454Standard Deviation, ppmT0.7460.6820.6520.5711.108Coefficient of variation0.0270.0250.0230.0210.038Skewness-0.032-0.549-0.2950.133-0.483Kurtosis-0.345-0.749-0.2420.311-0.523Minimum, %67.08370.40070.36177.25072.416Maximum, %85.76884.45785.06988.49185.296Mean, %78.90578.76878.53984.39779.570Standard Deviation, ppmRH3.9783.4633.4692.9622.881Coefficient of variation0.0500.0440.0440.0350.036Skewness-0.877-0.301-0.451-0.796-0.278Kurtosis0.782-0.600-0.205-0.308-0.253Minimum, m/s0.9730.6380.4080.5890.710Maximum m/s1.5501.2042.9211.6791.659  | Minimum, °C              |               | 26.219         | 26.125       | 26.093 | 26.053 | 27.039          |
| Mean, °C         27.980         27.547         27.900         27.559         29.454           Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295         0.133         -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         67.083         70.400         70.361         77.250         72.416           Maximum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.25  | Maximum, °C              |               | 29.768         | 28.644       | 29.174 | 28.977 | 31.295          |
| Standard Deviation, ppm         T         0.746         0.682         0.652         0.571         1.108           Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295         0.133         -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         67.083         70.400         70.361         77.250         72.416           Maximum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710  | Mean. °C                 |               | 27.980         | 27.547       | 27,900 | 27.559 | 29,454          |
| Coefficient of variation         0.027         0.025         0.023         0.021         0.038           Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295         0.133         -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         67.083         70.400         70.361         77.250         72.416           Maximum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710  | Standard Deviation, ppm  | Т             | 0.746          | 0.682        | 0.652  | 0.571  | 1.108           |
| Skewness         -0.032         -0.549         -0.295         0.131         -0.483           Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimun, %         67.083         70.400         70.361         77.250         72.416           Maximun, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710   | Coefficient of variation | -             | 0.027          | 0.025        | 0.023  | 0.021  | 0.038           |
| Kurtosis         -0.345         -0.749         -0.242         0.311         -0.523           Minimum, %         67.083         70.400         70.361         77.250         72.416           Maximum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710  | Skewness                 |               | -0.032         | -0 549       | -0.295 | 0.133  | -0.483          |
| Minimum, %         67.083         70.400         70.361         77.250         72.416           Maximum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710   | Kurtosis                 |               | -0.345         | -0 749       | -0.242 | 0.311  | -0.523          |
| Maximum, %         85.768         84.457         85.069         88.491         85.296           Mean, %         78.905         78.768         78.539         84.397         79.570           Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710   | Minimum %                |               | 67.083         | 70 400       | 70 361 | 77 250 | 72 416          |
| Maximum, %         80.100         81.107         80.007         80.107         80.  | Maximum %                |               | 85 768         | 84 457       | 85.069 | 88 491 | 85 296          |
| Standard Deviation, ppm         RH         3.978         3.463         3.469         2.962         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710  | Mean %                   |               | 78 905         | 78 768       | 78 539 | 84 397 | 79 570          |
| Standard Deviation, ppin         Kir         5.976         5.469         2.902         2.881           Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.035         0.036           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710  | Standard Deviation nnm   | DП            | 3 078          | 3 163        | 3 460  | 2 962  | 2 881           |
| Coefficient of variation         0.050         0.044         0.044         0.055         0.056           Skewness         -0.877         -0.301         -0.451         -0.796         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710   | Coefficient of variation | KII           | 3.978<br>0.050 | 0.044        | 0.044  | 2.902  | 2.001           |
| Skewiless         -0.6/7         -0.301         -0.431         -0.790         -0.278           Kurtosis         0.782         -0.600         -0.205         -0.308         -0.253           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710           Maximum m/s         1.550         1.204         2.021         1.972         1.620   | Skawnoss                 |               | 0.030          | 0.044        | 0.044  | 0.035  | 0.030           |
| Kurtosis         0.782         -0.000         -0.205         -0.308         -0.235           Minimum, m/s         0.973         0.638         0.408         0.589         0.710           Maximum m/s         1.550         1.204         2.021         1.972         1.620  | SKewness<br>Vurtosis     |               | -0.8//         | -0.301       | -0.431 | -0./90 | -0.270          |
| viininuin, m/s U.975 U.058 U.408 U.389 U.710<br>Maximum m/s 1550 1.207 <b>2.021</b> 1.079 1.690  | Kurtosis                 |               | 0.072          | -0.000       | -0.203 | -0.508 | -0.233          |
|  | Minimum, m/s             |               | 0.973          | 0.638        | 0.408  | 0.589  | 0./10           |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | Maan m/s                 |               | 1.330          | 1.204        | 2.021  | 1.9/8  | 1.089           |
| wear, in/s 1.343 0.804 0.945 0.900 1.151   | Iviean, m/s              | WC            | 1.545          | 0.864        | 0.945  | 0.900  | 1.131           |
| Standard Deviation, ppin ws 0.155 0.150 0.303 0.305 0.246  | Coefficient of viewing   | VV S          | 0.155          | 0.150        | 0.303  | 0.303  | 0.240           |
| Coefficient of variation 0.115 0.157 0.304 0.557 0.214   | Skewness                 |               | 0.115          | 0.137        | 1 587  | 0.337  | 0.214           |
| Kutosie – 0,510 0,405 1,507 1,707 0,004  | Kurtosis                 |               | -0.510         | -0 270       | 2/11   | 2 504  | -0 545          |

\*\*Note: Bold denotes referred to the significant of the concentration

#### 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  $PM_{10}$ ,  $SO_2$ ,  $NO_2$ ,  $O_3$  and CO, a Granger causality test was conducted. The results of these tests for each monitoring station are presented in Table 4.





| Monitoring<br>Stations | Granger Causality Diagram   |
|------------------------|---|
| Pasir Gudang,<br>Johor | PM <sub>10</sub><br>SO <sub>2</sub><br>NO <sub>2</sub><br>NO <sub>2</sub><br>NO <sub>2</sub><br>CO<br>Significant at 5% level<br>Significant at 5% level<br>Significant at 5% level<br>Significant at 15% level |
| Larkin, Johor          | PM <sub>10</sub><br>T<br>NO <sub>2</sub><br>O <sub>3</sub><br>CO<br>WS<br>Sufficient at 35 level<br>Sufficient at 196 level<br>Sufficient at 196 level<br>Sufficient at 196 level<br>Sufficient at 196 level    |
| *Red lines represent   | causanty relationships with p-values less than 0.05<br>relationships with p-values between 0.05 and 0.10  |
| "Blue lines indicate c | ausality relationships with p-value more than 0.10  |

In the context of conservation efforts in Malaysia, the findings on the relationship between meteorological conditions and pollutant levels in suburban, urban and industrial regions underscore the importance of location-specific strategies for air quality management. In Seberang Perai, where ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) levels are strongly influenced by temperature, addressing heat-related pollution could be critical for safeguarding agricultural activities and local ecosystems. Similarly, the moderate influence of temperature on SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations suggests that mitigating temperature fluctuations through urban greening or improved land-use planning could contribute to better air quality [27]. Shah Alam, an urbanized area, exhibits a strong link between relative humidity and NO<sub>2</sub> levels, as well as a moderate relationship between humidity and O<sub>3</sub>. These findings suggest that increasing vegetation cover to regulate local humidity levels could not only improve air quality but also support urban biodiversity [28].

In industrial areas such as Nilai, Larkin and Pasir Gudang, the intricate interactions between pollutants and meteorological factors highlight the need for targeted pollution control measures. For instance, in Nilai, the two-way relationship between SO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, influenced by wind speed, calls for stricter emissions regulations for industries and better urban planning to optimize air circulation. In Larkin, where NO<sub>2</sub> and CO drive changes in PM<sub>10</sub> and relative humidity influences both PM<sub>10</sub> and O<sub>3</sub>, strategies like afforestation and improved public transportation could help reduce pollutant levels and enhance air quality. Pasir Gudang presents even more complex dynamics, with pollutants such as PM<sub>10</sub> impacting multiple others, including NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub> and CO, alongside the influence of wind speed and O<sub>3</sub> on SO<sub>2</sub> levels [29]. This underscores the need for integrated air quality monitoring systems and adaptive pollution control policies to address the multifaceted interactions in such industrial hubs.

By incorporating these insights into conservation planning, Malaysia can tailor its environmental management strategies to the unique challenges of each location, ensuring the protection of its ecosystems and promoting sustainable urban and industrial development [3].

# **Pearson Correlation Analysis**

In Malaysia, air pollution is a significant concern in both urban and industrial areas, where various sources of emissions adversely affect air quality and the surrounding ecosystems as shown in Table 5. Urban areas like Shah Alam and Seberang Perai exhibit distinct challenges due to the high volume of vehicular emissions and urban activities. In Shah Alam, the strong correlations between carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) (r = 0.815) and particulate matter ( $PM_{10}$ ) with CO (r = 0.638) indicate that traffic-related pollutants are a major contributor to the region's air quality issues [30]. These pollutants pose a threat to urban green spaces and water bodies, which are essential for regulating temperatures and supporting biodiversity. To address these concerns, increasing urban tree cover, enhancing public transportation systems and promoting the use of low-emission vehicles can significantly reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Similarly, in Seberang Perai, moderate correlations between  $PM_{10}$  and  $NO_2$  (r = 0.604) and a strong relationship between ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and  $NO_2$  (r = 0.642) underscore the impact of both vehicular and industrial emissions on air quality. These pollutants endanger the region's mangrove ecosystems and agricultural lands, which are critical for biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration. Sustainable transportation and cleaner industrial practices are necessary to reduce NO<sub>2</sub> emissions and safeguard these vital ecosystems.

In contrast, industrial areas such as Nilai, Larkin and Pasir Gudang face pollution challenges stemming primarily from industrial and vehicular emissions. In Nilai, the exceptionally strong correlation between CO and  $PM_{10}$  (r = 0.850) reflects the significant influence of both industrial and vehicular emissions on the region's air quality. The pollution from these sources threatens nearby forests and rivers, which are important habitats for a wide range of species. To mitigate these effects, stricter regulations on industrial emissions and the establishment of green buffers around industrial zones would not only reduce air pollution but also help preserve these ecosystems. Larkin exhibits moderate correlations between PM10 and  $NO_2$  (r = 0.632) and CO (r = 0.475), indicating that urban emissions significantly contribute to air pollution. These pollutants degrade nearby green spaces and biodiversity, emphasizing the need for sustainable urban planning, such as the creation of low-emission zones and the expansion of green infrastructure. Finally, Pasir Gudang shows moderate correlations between PM10 and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) (r = 0.576) and NO<sub>2</sub> (r = 0.569), highlighting the influence of industrial activities on air quality. The region's coastal and marine ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to pollution, which can disrupt biodiversity and weaken natural coastal defenses. Strengthening air quality monitoring systems and implementing sustainable industrial practices are essential to protect these ecosystems and ensure their long-term resilience.

Overall, the findings across these urban and industrial areas demonstrate the complex relationship between air pollution, human activities and environmental degradation. Tailored interventions that address the specific sources of pollution in each region are essential to reduce

emissions, protect ecosystem and promote sustainable development across Malaysia's urban and industrial landscapes.

|                     |                                    |                         | Seberang                 | g Perai, Pula            | au Pinang                 |                             |             |     |   |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----|---|
|                     | $PM_{10}$                          | $SO_2$                  | $NO_2$                   | O <sub>3</sub>           | CO                        | Т                           | RH          | WS  |   |
| $PM_{10}$           | 1                                  |                         |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $SO_2$              | 0.343                              | 1                       |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $NO_2$              | 0.604                              | 0.499                   | 1                        |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| O3                  | 0.572                              | 0.533                   | 0.642                    | 1                        |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| CO                  | 0.353                              | 0.423                   | 0.681                    | 0.430                    | 1                         |                             |             |     |   |
| Т                   | 0.554                              | 0.338                   | 0.420                    | 0.770                    | 0.229                     | 1                           |             |     |   |
| RH                  | -0.426                             | 0.018                   | -0.034                   | -0.491                   | 0.098                     | -0.592                      | 1           |     |   |
| WS                  | 0.464                              | -0.040                  | 0.140                    | 0.403                    | -0.100                    | 0.581                       | -0.540      | 1   |   |
|                     |                                    |                         | Shah                     | Alam Sal                 | ngor                      |                             |             |     |   |
|                     | PM <sub>10</sub>                   | SO                      | NO                       |                          |                           | Т                           | RH          | WS  |   |
| PM <sub>10</sub>    | 1 10110                            | 502                     | 1102                     | 03                       | 00                        |                             | 1011        |     |   |
| SO                  | 0.285                              |                         |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| NO <sub>2</sub>     | 0.589                              | 0.577                   | 1                        |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $O_2$               | 0.332                              | -0.063                  | -0.004                   |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| CO                  | 0.638                              | 0.420                   | 0.815                    | 0.038                    | 1                         |                             |             |     |   |
| Т                   | 0.243                              | 0.185                   | 0.209                    | -0.096                   | 0.178                     | 1                           |             |     |   |
| RH                  | -0.401                             | -0.533                  | -0.341                   | -0.312                   | -0 188                    | -0.173                      | 1           |     |   |
| WS                  | 0.240                              | 0.316                   | -0.016                   | 0.293                    | -0.147                    | 0.165                       | -0.688      |     |   |
|                     | 0.210                              |                         | Nilei                    | Negeri Car               | nhilan                    | 0.105                       | 0.000       |     | _ |
|                     | DM.                                | 50.                     | NO.                      | O.                       |                           | т                           | DП          | WS  |   |
| PM.                 | r 1V110                            | $SO_2$                  | $1NO_2$                  | $O_3$                    | 0                         | 1                           | КП          | W 2 |   |
| SO.                 | 0.240                              |                         |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $SO_2$              | 0.249                              | 0.011                   |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
|                     | 0.499                              | -0.011                  | 0.422                    | 1                        |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $C_3$               | 0.125                              | -0.025                  | 0.422                    | 0.208                    |                           |                             |             |     | _ |
| т                   | 0.850                              | 0.524                   | 0.044                    | 0.208                    | 0.216                     | 1                           |             |     | _ |
|                     | -0.227                             | 0.023                   | -0.307                   | 0.204                    | -0.310                    | 0.529                       |             |     |   |
| KH                  | -0.181                             | -0.148                  | 0.233                    | -0.333                   | -0.041                    | -0.538                      | 0.400       |     |   |
| ws                  | 0.047                              | 0.000                   | -0.423                   | -0.149                   | -0.105                    | 0.018                       | -0.499      |     |   |
|                     |                                    |                         | Pasi                     | r Gudang, J              | ohor                      |                             |             |     |   |
|                     | $PM_{10}$                          | $SO_2$                  | $NO_2$                   | $O_3$                    | CO                        | Т                           | RH          | WS  |   |
| $PM_{10}$           | 1                                  |                         |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| SO.                 | 0.576                              | 1                       |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $30_2$              | 0.570                              | 0.000                   |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $NO_2$              | 0.569                              | 0.602                   | 1                        |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $O_3$               | 0.201                              | -0.168                  | -0.520                   | 1                        |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| CO                  | 0.498                              | 0.423                   | 0.710                    | -0.146                   | 1                         |                             |             |     |   |
| Т                   | 0.013                              | -0.142                  | -0.686                   | 0.684                    | -0.521                    | 1                           |             |     |   |
| יות                 | 0.572                              | 0.297                   | 0.007                    | 0.521                    | 0.0(2)                    | 0.462                       |             |     |   |
| КП                  | -0.575                             | -0.387                  | 0.007                    | -0.321                   | 0.062                     | -0.403                      |             |     |   |
| WS                  | 0.222                              | -0.115                  | 0.056                    | 0.011                    | -0.172                    | 0.218                       | -0.286      | 1   |   |
|                     |                                    |                         |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
|                     |                                    |                         | Ι                        | Larkin, Joho             | or                        |                             |             |     |   |
|                     | PM <sub>10</sub>                   | $SO_2$                  | NO <sub>2</sub>          | O <sub>3</sub>           | CO                        | Т                           | RH          | WS  |   |
| PM10                | 1                                  |                         |                          | -                        |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| 1 1110<br>CO        | 0.221                              |                         |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     | _ |
| $SO_2$              | 0.231                              |                         |                          |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| $NO_2$              | 0.632                              | 0.229                   | 1                        |                          |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| O3                  | 0.341                              | -0.059                  | -0.286                   | 1                        |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| -                   | 0.475                              | -0.127                  | 0.710                    | -0.134                   |                           |                             |             |     |   |
| CO                  | 114/2                              |                         | 0./10                    | -0.154                   |                           |                             | _           |     |   |
| СО                  | 0.4/5                              | 0.020                   | 0.420                    | 0.500                    | 0.242                     | <u> </u>                    |             |     |   |
| CO<br>T             | -0.057                             | 0.039                   | -0.430                   | 0.590                    | -0.242                    | 1                           |             | I   |   |
| CO<br>T<br>RH       | -0.475<br>-0.057<br>-0.408         | 0.039<br>0.031          | -0.430<br>0.133          | 0.590<br>-0.756          | -0.242<br>-0.011          | 1<br>-0.489                 | 1           |     |   |
| CO<br>T<br>RH<br>WS | 0.475<br>-0.057<br>-0.408<br>0.370 | 0.039<br>0.031<br>0.397 | -0.430<br>0.133<br>0.158 | 0.590<br>-0.756<br>0.279 | -0.242<br>-0.011<br>0.054 | 1<br>-0.489<br><u>0.234</u> | 1<br>-0.490 | 1   |   |

Table 5. Correlation coefficient matrix of air pollutants concentration and meteorological parameters

#### Comparison of Granger Causality and Pearson Correlation

Granger causality and Pearson correlation are widely used tools in analyzing relationships between variables, but they serve different purposes. Pearson correlation measures the strength and direction of linear relationships between two variables at a given moment. For instance, in Shah Alam, a significant positive correlation was found between temperature and  $PM_{10}$  concentrations, suggesting that higher temperatures are linked with increased particulate matter. However, Pearson correlation does not indicate whether one variable influences the other or if time-dependent relationships exist.

Granger causality focuses on identifying temporal relationships by testing whether past values of one variable can predict future values of another. This makes it particularly valuable for understanding dynamic environmental interactions. In the Shah Alam study, Granger causality revealed that temperature could predict future  $PM_{10}$  concentrations. This method provides insights into how changes in one factor precede changes in another, which is critical for timeseries data, though it does not measure the strength of the relationship.

By integrating both approaches, a more comprehensive understanding of air quality dynamics is achieved. Pearson correlation highlights immediate linear relationships, while Granger causality identifies predictive temporal links [31]. This dual perspective is crucial for areas like Shah Alam, where air quality is influenced by complex interactions between meteorological factors and pollutants.

Applying these methods in Malaysia can significantly enhance strategies for addressing air pollution. Understanding both the present and predictive relationships between weather patterns and pollutants allows for better forecasting and management [20]. This is especially important during haze episodes, where proactive measures can mitigate public health impacts and support environmental conservation efforts.

#### Conclusions

In conclusion, this study effectively illustrates the utility of combining Granger causality and Pearson correlation to explore the complex interactions between air pollutants and meteorological factors across five regions in Malaysia from 2017 to 2021. The Granger causality analysis revealed significant predictive relationships, such as temperature Granger-causing  $PM_{10}$ and  $O_3$  in Nilai and Shah Alam and relative humidity Granger-causing  $NO_2$  in Shah Alam. These temporal dynamics highlight how changes in meteorological factors can precede and influence air pollutant levels.

The Pearson correlation analysis provided valuable linear associations, such as the strong positive correlation between wind speed and  $PM_{10}$  (r = 0.75) in Shah Alam and the inverse relationship between humidity and  $O_3$  across multiple stations, with r-values ranging from -0.49 to -0.76. These correlations emphasize how meteorological conditions directly affect pollutant concentrations.

The integration of Granger causality and Pearson correlation provides a more nuanced understanding of air quality dynamics across Malaysia's diverse regions, including urban centers like Shah Alam and industrial areas such as Pasir Gudang. For example, historical data reveals significant spikes in PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations during haze episodes, with one notable incident occurring in October 2019, where several monitoring stations recorded levels exceeding 150  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup>, a level classified as unhealthy by the Department of Environment Malaysia. By using Granger causality, it was possible to identify temporal patterns and potential predictors of such events, while Pearson correlation highlighted immediate relationships between meteorological variables like temperature and humidity with particulate matter concentrations.

This dual-method approach underscores the importance of continuous air quality monitoring and tailored intervention strategies. The predictive insights from Granger causality are particularly valuable for proactive air pollution management, enabling policymakers to anticipate and mitigate extreme pollution events. For instance, localized strategies, such as stricter emissions controls in industrial zones or public advisories during peak pollution periods, can be developed based on region-specific data.

Overall, this integrated analytical framework serves as a foundation for enhancing Malaysia's air quality management efforts. It aligns with the nation's goals for sustainable development and public health protection by providing actionable insights into the complex interplay of environmental and meteorological factors. Such an approach not only improves current mitigation strategies but also supports long-term planning to address the growing challenges of air pollution in Malaysia's rapidly urbanizing and industrializing landscape.

# Acknowledgments

This research was supported by Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia (MOHE) through the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS/1/2023/TK08/UNIMAP/02/24) which made this research possible. Sincere thanks are also extended to the Department of Environment (DOE) Malaysia for granting access to the comprehensive and detailed datasets that were essential to the analysis and findings.

# References

- D. Yang, H. Chen, Y. Song, Z. Gong, *Granger Causality for Multivariate Time Series Classification*, Proceedings 2017 IEEE International Conference on Big Knowledge, ICBK 2017, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2021, pp. 103–110. DOI: 10.1109/ICBK.2017.36.
- [2] L. Barnett, A.K. Seth, The MVGC multivariate Granger causality toolbox: A new approach to Granger-causal inference, Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 223, 2021, pp. 50–68, DOI: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2013.10.018.
- [3] N. Amila, M. Ridzuan, N. Noor, N. Alis, A. Rahim, I. Amani, M. Jafri, A. Zia, U. Saufie, M. Remy, R. Mohd, A. Zainol, M. Anuar Kamaruddin, G. Deak, *Modeling of Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) During High Particulate Event (HPE) In Klang Valley, Malaysia*, International Journal of Conservation Science, 13(3), 2022, pp. 1065-1078.
- [4] J.M. Rohrer, Thinking Clearly About Correlations and Causation: Graphical Causal Models for Observational Data, Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 1(1), 2020, pp. 27–42, DOI: 10.1177/2515245917745629.
- [5] A. Shojaie, E.B. Fox, Granger Causality: A Review and Recent Advances, Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 9(1), 2022, pp. 289–319, DOI: 10.1146/annurevstatistics-040120-010930.
- [6] A. Shojaie, E.B. Fox, Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application Granger Causality: A Review and Recent Advances, Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 9(1), 2022, pp. 289-319, DOI: 10.1146/annurev-statistics-040120.
- [7] P. Schober, L.A. Schwarte, *Correlation coefficients: Appropriate use and interpretation*, Anesth Analg, 126(5), 2019, pp. 1763–1768, DOI: 10.1213/ANE.00000000002864.
- [8] Z. Rezaee, S. Aliabadi, A. Dorestani, N.J. Rezaee, Application of time series models in business research: Correlation, association, causation, Sustainability, 12(12), 2020, DOI: 10.3390/SU12124833.
- [9] P. Damos, Using multivariate cross correlations, Granger causality and graphical models to quantify spatiotemporal synchronization and causality between pest populations, BMC Ecology, 16, 2019, 33, DOI: 10.1186/s12898-016-0087-7.
- [10] M. Khudari, N. Salwati, B. Othman, The Impact Financial Development on Carbon Emissions: A Systematic Review Of The Literature, Journal of Research Administration, 6(1), 2024, pp. 1516-1545.

- [11] X. Li, X. Liu, H. Li, R. Liu, Z. Zhang, Q. Lyu, L. Wen, *Research on Sinter Quality Prediction System Based on Granger Causality Analysis and Stacking Integration Algorithm*, **Metals**, **13**(2), 2023, Article Number 419, DOI: 10.3390/met13020419.
- [12] S. Munir, M. Mayfield, D. Coca, L.S. Mihaylova, O. Osammor, Analysis of air pollution in urban areas with airviro dispersion model-A case study in the city of Sheffield, United Kingdom, Atmosphere, 11(3), 2020, Article Number 285, DOI: 10.3390/atmos11030285.
- [13] F.M. Saimi, F.M. Hamzah, M.E. Toriman, O. Jaafar, H. Tajudin, *Trend and linearity analysis of meteorological parameters in peninsular Malaysia*, Sustainability, 12(22), 2020, Article Number 9533, DOI: 10.3390/su12229533.
- [14] N.D.A. Halim, M. Latif, A. Mohamed, K. Maulud, S. Idrus, A. Azhari, M. Othman, N. Sofwan, Spatial assessment of land use impact on air quality in mega urban regions, Malaysia, Sustainable Cities and Society, 63, 2020, Article Number 102436, DOI: 10.1016/j.scs.2020.102436.
- [15] X. Zhang, L. Han, H. Wei, X. Tan, W. Zhou, W. Li, Y. Qian, Linking urbanization and air quality together: A review and a perspective on the future sustainable urban development, Journal of Cleaner Production, 346, 2022, Article Number 130988, DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.130988.
- [16] X. Song, A. Taamouti, Measuring Granger Causality in Quantiles, Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, 39(4), 2021, DOI: 10.1080/07350015.2020.1739531.
- [17] D.I. Stern, From Correlation to Granger Causality, 2021. Available: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1959624.
- [18] W. Alahamade, I. Lake, C.E. Reeves, B. De La Iglesia, *A multi-variate time series clustering approach based on intermediate fusion: A case study in air pollution data imputation,* **Neurocomputing**, **490**, 2022, pp. 229–245, DOI: 10.1016/j.neucom.2021.09.079.
- [19] M. Du, W. Liu, Y. Hao, Spatial correlation of air pollution and its causes in northeast china, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(20), 2021, DOI: 10.3390/ijerph182010619.
- [20] H. Liu, W. Cui, M. Zhang, Exploring the causal relationship between urbanization and air pollution: Evidence from China, Sustainable Cities and Society, 80, 2022, Article Number 103783, DOI: 10.1016/j.scs.2022.103783.
- [21] M.S. Callén, I. Martínez, G. Grasa, J.M. López, R. Murillo, Principal component analysis and partial least square regression models to understand sorption-enhanced biomass gasification, Biomass Convers Biorefin, 14(2), 2024, pp. 2091–2111, DOI: 10.1007/s13399-022-02496-z.
- [22] S. Pfenninger, I. Staffell, Long-term patterns of European PV output using 30 years of validated hourly reanalysis and satellite data, Energy, 114, 2021, pp. 1251–1265, DOI: 10.1016/j.energy.2016.08.060.
- [23] I. Ghosh, R.K. Jana, M.K. Sanyal, Analysis of temporal pattern, causal interaction and predictive modeling of financial markets using nonlinear dynamics, econometric models and machine learning algorithms, Applied Soft Computing, 82, 2019, Article Number 105553, DOI: 10.1016/j.asoc.2019.105553.
- [24] Z. Zhang, T. Xue, X. Jin, Effects of meteorological conditions and air pollution on COVID-19 transmission: Evidence from 219 Chinese cities, Science of The Total Environment, 741, 2020, Article Number 140244, DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140244.
- [25] M. Sarfraz, M. Mohsin, 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: ESPR, 29(20), 2022, pp. 29651–29662, DOI: 10.1007/s11356-021-17507-1.
- [26] A. Bekkar, B. Hssina, S. Douzi, K. Douzi, Air-pollution prediction in smart city, deep learning approach, Journal of Big Data, 8(1), 2021, DOI: 10.1186/s40537-021-00548-1.

- [27] S. Shith, N.A. Ramli, A. Umirah, M. Nadzir, N.R. Awang, M.R. Ismail, *Drivers of nocturnal interactions between ground-level ozone and nitrogen dioxide*, Global Nest Journal, 25(6), 2023, pp 149-155, DOI: 10.30955/gnj.004843.
- [28] C.T. Sousa, N. Leme, M. Martins, F. Silva, T. Penha, N. Rodrigues, E. Silva, J. Hoelzemann, Ozone trends on equatorial and tropical regions of South America using Dobson spectrophotometer, TOMS and OMI satellites instruments, Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 203, 2020, Article Number 105272, DOI: 10.1016/j.jastp.2020.105272.
- [29] J. Sentian, F. Herman, C.Y. Yih, J.C.H. Wui, Long-term air pollution trend analysis in Malaysia, International Journal of Environmental Impacts, 2(4), 2019, pp. 309–324, DOI: 10.2495/EI-V2-N4-309-324.
- [30] N. Ramli, M. Rubini, N.M. Noor, *Relationships between Air Pollutants and Meteorological Factors during Southwest and Northeast Monsoon at Urban Areas in Peninsular Malaysia*, **IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science**, **1303**(1), 2024, Article Number 012041, DOI: 10.1088/1755-1315/1303/1/012041.
- [31] R. Cellmer, M. Bełej, A. Cichulska, Identification of Cause-and-Effect Relationships in the Real Estate Market Using the VAR Model and the Granger Test, Real Estate Management and Valuation, 27(4), 2019, pp. 85–95, DOI: 10.2478/remav-2019-0038.

Received: August 21, 2024 Accepted: February 17, 2025