

Quality Prediction and Monitoring System in Food Processing Industries

Kushal A.S¹, Dr. Beenarani Manoj²

^{1,2}*Department of Computer Science and Engineering SRM Institute of Science and Technology
Vadapalani Campus, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India*

Abstract—Maintaining suitable air quality in food processing industries is important for workplace safety and environmental monitoring. Conventional monitoring approaches may rely on periodic measurements and provide limited insight into changing air conditions. This paper presents an Air Quality Prediction and Monitoring System that integrates environmental data processing, machine learning, and dashboard-based visualization. The proposed system uses simulated or prepared environmental data representing parameters such as temperature, humidity, particulate matter, carbon dioxide, and other relevant gas concentrations. The data are processed using Python-based data analysis techniques and prepared for machine learning prediction. The system architecture includes environmental data preparation, data quality checking, prediction, and visualization modules. A dashboard developed using Streamlit is intended to present environmental readings, air-quality trends, prediction outputs, and warning indicators. The approach provides a framework for examining how data-driven prediction can support air-quality monitoring in food processing environments. The implementation is evaluated through functional testing and appropriate prediction metrics, subject to the availability of verified experimental results. Further validation using real sensor measurements is required before the system can be applied in an actual industrial environment.

Index Terms—Air Quality Prediction, Environmental Monitoring, Machine Learning, Data Preprocessing, Streamlit, Food Processing Industries

I. INTRODUCTION

Air quality is an important consideration in food processing industries, where activities such as grinding, cooking, drying, mixing, and packaging may influence the concentration of airborne particles and gases. Environmental parameters such as temperature and humidity also contribute to the conditions within processing areas. Monitoring these

parameters can help identify changes in the working environment and support appropriate responses to potentially undesirable conditions.

Conventional monitoring approaches may depend on manual inspection or periodic measurements. Although these methods can provide useful information, measurements taken at fixed intervals may not capture every change in environmental conditions. Furthermore, monitoring current measurements alone does not necessarily provide an estimate of how air quality may change in the near future.

Machine learning offers a data-driven approach to examining relationships between environmental parameters and air-quality conditions. By processing historical observations, a suitable model can be trained to estimate an air-quality value or category from relevant input features. The usefulness of such predictions depends on the quality of the data, the choice of model, and an appropriate evaluation procedure.

This work presents an Air Quality Prediction and Monitoring System for Food Processing Industries. The proposed workflow combines environmental data preparation, preprocessing, machine learning-based prediction, and dashboard-based visualization. Python is used for data processing and model development, while Streamlit provides a framework for presenting monitoring information and prediction outputs.

The system is organized into modules for environmental data preparation, data quality checking, prediction, and visualization. Simulated or prepared environmental data are used during development. Consequently, the present work focuses on demonstrating the system workflow rather than

claiming validation under actual industrial operating conditions.

The main contributions of this work are:

- An integrated workflow for preparing and analyzing environmental data relevant to air-quality monitoring.
- A modular approach connecting data preprocessing, machine learning prediction, and dashboard visualization.
- A framework for examining prediction performance using appropriate evaluation measures and for presenting air-quality trends and warning indicators.

II. LITERATURE SURVEY

Air-quality monitoring and prediction have been investigated using environmental guidelines, statistical techniques, machine learning, and Internet of Things (IoT)-based monitoring systems. These approaches provide a foundation for developing systems that can analyze environmental measurements and identify changes in air quality.

The World Health Organization (WHO) published global air-quality guidelines covering particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and carbon monoxide [1]. These guidelines provide an important reference for understanding pollutant concentrations and their potential health implications. However, guidelines alone do not provide a complete mechanism for collecting sensor data continuously or predicting future air-quality conditions.

Me'ndez et al. presented a survey of machine learning algorithms for forecasting air quality [2]. Their work is relevant to the selection of predictive techniques for environmental datasets. Machine learning methods can be used to examine relationships between historical observations and air-quality variables. However, selecting an appropriate model also requires consideration of the dataset, prediction target, and evaluation procedure.

A systematic literature review on air-quality prediction using machine learning was included in the reviewed sources [3]. Such review-based research provides a broader understanding of the approaches applied to environmental prediction. The reference highlights the relevance of machine learning in air-quality analysis, although the specific methods and

findings should be confirmed from the full paper before making more detailed comparisons.

Research on artificial intelligence for air-pollution monitoring and forecasting has also been reviewed in the literature [4]. This topic is relevant to systems that combine environmental observations with predictive analysis. Similarly, recent work on machine learning for air-quality prediction and data analysis discusses developments and challenges in the field [5]. These research areas indicate the importance of considering data quality, model suitability, and reliable evaluation when developing prediction systems.

IoT-based air-quality monitoring and AI technologies have been examined in a systematic review [6]. IoT-based monitoring can support the collection of environmental measurements, while analytical methods can help interpret the collected data. Nevertheless, a practical implementation must also consider sensor reliability, data transmission, preprocessing, and how the results are presented to users.

A further review considers statistical and machine learning models for air quality and the challenges associated with their use [7]. The selection of a prediction technique depends on the data characteristics and the intended output. The WHO publications also provide supporting guidance for understanding air-quality indicators and recommended guideline levels [8], [9]. More recent research examines deep-learning approaches to air-pollution forecasting and potential future developments [10].

A. Comparison of Existing Approaches

Existing air-quality monitoring approaches can be grouped into guideline-based assessment, sensor-based monitoring, machine learning-based prediction, and integrated monitoring systems. Each approach provides different capabilities and has its own limitations.

Guideline-based assessment provides reference values for evaluating pollutant concentrations. However, it does not independently collect environmental measurements or generate predictions. Sensor-based monitoring provides updated measurements and helps users observe environmental changes, but the availability of current readings does not necessarily indicate how conditions will change in the future.

Machine learning-based prediction extends environmental analysis by identifying patterns in historical observations. The reliability of these predictions depends on the quality of the training data, the selected features, and the suitability of the model. IoT-enabled systems can connect environmental sensing with automated data collection, while dashboard interfaces provide a convenient way to interpret the resulting information. Table I summarizes these general approaches and their limitations.

TABLE I COMPARISON OF AIR-QUALITY MONITORING APPROACHES

Approach	Main Capability	Limitation
Guideline-based assessment	Compares pollutant levels with reference values	Does not provide prediction by itself
Sensor-based monitoring	Measures environmental parameters	May not forecast future conditions
Machine learning	Learns patterns from historical data	Depends on data quality and model selection
Dashboard-based monitoring	Presents readings and trends visually	Depends on the quality of its input data
Integrated approach	Connects monitoring, prediction, and visualization	Requires complete integration and validation

B. Relevance to the Proposed Work

The reviewed research topics establish the importance of environmental sensing, data analysis, and prediction. The proposed work brings these functions together in a single workflow for food processing environments. Rather than treating data collection and prediction as separate tasks, the system connects input preparation, model execution, and visualization. The application context is important because food processing activities may involve changes in temperature, humidity, airborne particles, and gas concentrations. The system provides a framework for examining these parameters together. Its contribution should be assessed through

the actual implementation and measured performance, rather than assuming that integration alone guarantees improved prediction accuracy.

C. Research Gap

The reviewed sources cover air-quality guidelines, machine learning-based forecasting, AI-assisted monitoring, IoT technologies, and statistical or deep-learning approaches. However, the references listed in the project report do not by themselves establish that a particular integrated solution has been validated specifically for food processing industries.

The proposed project therefore focuses on bringing environmental data processing, machine learning-based prediction, and dashboard visualization together in a single workflow. The system considers parameters such as temperature, humidity, particulate matter, carbon dioxide, and relevant gas concentrations. Its practical effectiveness must be assessed using the actual implementation, documented evaluation metrics, and suitable real-world sensor data.

III. PROPOSED SYSTEM

The proposed Air Quality Prediction and Monitoring System is designed to support the monitoring and analysis of environmental conditions in food processing industries. It combines environmental data collection, data preprocessing, machine learning-based prediction, and dashboard visualization within a single workflow.

The system considers environmental parameters such as temperature, humidity, particulate matter, carbon dioxide, and relevant gas concentrations. These measurements are organized into a structured dataset and checked for data-quality issues before being supplied to the prediction component.

The main components of the proposed system are described below.

A. Objectives of the Proposed System

The primary objective of the proposed system is to establish a structured process for monitoring and predicting air-quality conditions in food processing industries. The system aims to organize environmental measurements, prepare the input data for analysis, apply a suitable prediction model, and present the resulting information through an accessible dashboard.

The specific objectives are as follows:

- To organize environmental measurements into a structured dataset.
- To identify data-quality issues before performing prediction.
- To apply a suitable machine learning model to the selected air-quality target.
- To display available environmental readings and prediction outputs.
- To provide a foundation for identifying potentially undesirable environmental conditions.

B. Functional Requirements

The system requires a mechanism for receiving environmental data and making the measurements available to the processing component. The preprocessing module must prepare the input data in a format compatible with the prediction model. The prediction component must accept the required features and produce the corresponding output.

The visualization component must present the information generated by the preceding stages in an understandable format. Where warning functionality is implemented, the system must also compare the relevant measurements or predictions with configured threshold values.

C. Expected Benefits

An integrated monitoring workflow can reduce the need to examine raw environmental data manually. Presenting measurements and predictions together allows users to examine the available environmental information more conveniently. Historical visualizations can also help users identify variations that may warrant further investigation.

The practical benefits depend on reliable input data, appropriate model evaluation, and the availability of the necessary monitoring infrastructure. The system should therefore be considered a decision-support framework rather than a replacement for calibrated measurements or established industrial safety procedures.

D. Environmental Data Collection

The data collection component receives environmental measurements from the available data source. Physical sensors can provide measurements from the processing environment, while a prepared dataset can be used for development and testing. The

data source used in the reported experiments must be stated explicitly.

E. Data Preprocessing

The preprocessing component organizes the input observations and checks for missing values, duplicate records, invalid entries, and unusual measurements. The resulting dataset is prepared for model training and prediction.

F. Air-Quality Prediction

The prediction component uses a machine learning model to analyze the processed environmental data and estimate the selected air-quality target. The model and target variable must match the actual implementation.

G. Monitoring and Visualization

The visualization component uses a Streamlit dashboard to present available environmental readings, historical trends, and prediction outputs. Warning indicators can be included where they have been implemented and configured using appropriate thresholds.

The proposed system aims to provide an integrated framework for examining environmental conditions and presenting prediction results. Its ability to provide reliable early warnings depends on the input data, the prediction model, and validation under representative operating conditions.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The methodology consists of data collection, preprocessing, model development, prediction, evaluation, and visualization. These stages transform environmental measurements into structured inputs for machine learning and present the resulting outputs through the monitoring interface.

A. Dataset Description

The system considers environmental parameters including temperature, humidity, particulate matter, carbon dioxide, and relevant gas concentrations. Each observation may be associated with a timestamp to support the analysis of environmental changes over time.

The dataset description should include its source, number of observations, input features, target variable, and the method used to divide the data into

training and testing sets. If simulated or prepared data were used, this must be stated clearly rather than describing the measurements as real-time sensor readings.

B. Data Preprocessing

The preprocessing stage converts the input observations into a structured dataset. Pandas and NumPy can be used to organize the data, perform numerical operations, and identify missing or invalid values. Duplicate records and abnormal measurements are also checked as described in the project methodology.

The processed data are separated into input features and the target variable. Any imputation, normalization, standardization, or feature-selection technique should be documented according to the operations actually performed by the implementation.

C. Machine Learning Model

The project report identifies Linear Regression, Decision Tree, and Random Forest as candidate prediction algorithms. The final paper should identify the algorithm actually implemented and distinguish it from models that were only

$$\hat{y} = f(X; \theta), \quad (1)$$

where f denotes the selected model, θ represents its learned parameters, and $\hat{y}$ denotes the predicted output. The target variable, model configuration, and training procedure should be reported based on the actual implementation.

D. Feature Representation

The input data are represented using the environmental parameters available in the dataset. A single observation may contain temperature, relative humidity, particulate matter, carbon dioxide, gas concentrations, and a timestamp. The exact feature set depends on the variables available in the implemented dataset.

The input feature vector can be represented as

$$\mathbf{X}_i = [x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{im}],$$

where X_i represents the i th observation and m denotes the number of input features. The corresponding target variable is represented by y_i . The target may be a numerical air-quality measurement or a category, depending on the implemented prediction task.

E. Training and Testing Procedure

Model evaluation requires separating the data used for training from the data used for testing. The training subset is used to estimate the model parameters, whereas the testing subset is used to examine performance on observations that were not used during training.

The dataset division should be selected according to the characteristics of the data. If observations are time-dependent, a chronological split may be more appropriate than a random split because it reduces the risk of using future observations to predict earlier conditions.

Preprocessing operations that estimate parameters from the dataset should be fitted using the training data and then applied consistently to the test data. This helps reduce information leakage and supports a more reliable evaluation.

F. Regression Evaluation Metrics

If the implemented model predicts a continuous numerical value, its performance may be evaluated using MAE, RMSE, and the coefficient of determination.

Mean Absolute Error is expressed as

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i - \hat{y}_i|, \quad (3)$$

where y_i is the actual value, $\hat{y}_i$ is the predicted value, and n is the number of test observations.

Root Mean Squared Error is expressed as

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}. \quad (4)$$

The coefficient of determination can be expressed as

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}, \quad (5)$$

where $\bar{y}$ denotes the mean of the actual target values. Lower MAE and RMSE values generally indicate smaller prediction errors. The interpretation of R^2 depends on the evaluation data and model behavior.

These equations describe possible evaluation metrics; they should be included as the reported evaluation procedure only if the project performs a regression task and calculates these measures.

G. Classification Evaluation Metrics

If the target is an air-quality category rather than a continuous value, classification metrics may be more appropriate. Precision measures the proportion of predicted positive cases that are positive, while recall measures the proportion of actual positive cases correctly identified. The F1-score combines precision and recall into a single measure.

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (7)$$

$$F1 = 2 \frac{\text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (8)$$

Here, TP, FP, and FN represent true positives, false positives, and false negatives, respectively. The appropriate metrics must be selected according to the actual prediction task.

H. Model Evaluation

The model should be evaluated on data not used for training. For a regression task, the evaluation may include Mean Absolute Error (MAE), Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE), and the coefficient of determination (R^2). For a classification task, accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score may be appropriate.

Only the metrics calculated in the implementation should be reported. The training and testing procedure should also be described so that the evaluation can be reproduced.

I. System Implementation

The project uses Python-based tools for data processing, machine learning, and visualization. Pandas and NumPy support data handling, Scikit-learn provides machine learning functionality, and Matplotlib and Seaborn support graphical analysis. Streamlit is used to develop the dashboard interface. The implementation connects the processed data, prediction component, and visualization interface. The precise data flow and software functionality should reflect the program that was executed and tested.

V. SYSTEM DESIGN

The system design defines the main components of the proposed monitoring solution and the flow of information between them. The architecture follows a modular approach in which environmental data are processed before being used for prediction and visualization.

A. System Architecture

The system consists of five logical components: environmental data input, data preprocessing, machine learning prediction, monitoring and warning generation, and dashboard visualization. Environmental measurements are first collected or loaded from a dataset. The preprocessing component checks and organizes the input data, after which the selected model generates prediction outputs. The monitoring component examines the available values and configured thresholds, while the dashboard presents the results to the user.

B. Data Flow

The system follows these stages:

- 1) Collect or load environmental measurements.
- 2) Check and preprocess the input data.
- 3) Supply the processed features to the trained model.
- 4) Generate prediction outputs and evaluate configured warning conditions.
- 5) Display the available readings, trends, predictions, and warnings through the dashboard.

Seaborn can help users interpret variations in environmental parameters.

The architecture should be illustrated using a system diagram showing the direction of data flow between these components. The diagram and dashboard screenshots included in the final paper must represent the implemented system and should not imply that unimplemented functions have been tested.

C. Dashboard Design

The dashboard is developed using Streamlit and can present environmental readings, historical trends, and prediction outputs. Warning indicators are included where supported by the implementation. Graphs generated using Matplotlib or Seaborn can help users interpret variations in environmental parameters.

The architecture should be illustrated using a system diagram showing the direction of data flow between

these components. The diagram and dashboard screenshots included in the final paper must represent the implemented system and should not imply that unimplemented functions have been tested.

D. Module Interaction

The system is organized into separate modules to simplify implementation and testing. The data collection module supplies the environmental measurements, while the preprocessing module checks and organizes the input data. The prediction module uses the prepared features to generate the target output. The visualization component presents the available results to the user.

TABLE II COMPARISON OF AIR QUALITY MONITORING APPROACHES

Approach	Advantages	Limitations
Guideline-based	Provides reference limits for pollutants.	Does not predict future air-quality conditions.
Sensor-based	Supports continuous environmental monitoring.	Sensor readings alone may not provide predictions.
Machine learning	Identifies patterns and estimates future conditions.	Performance depends on data quality and model selection.
Dashboard-based	Presents readings and trends visually.	Visualization alone does not provide predictive analysis.
Integrated approach	Combines monitoring, prediction, and visualization.	Requires reliable data collection and system integration.

E. Data Processing and Information Flow

The system begins by obtaining environmental measurements from the selected data source. The incoming observations are converted into a structured representation that can be processed by the software components. During preprocessing, data-quality checks are performed and the relevant features are prepared.

The prediction stage receives the features in the format expected by the trained model. The resulting

output is then passed to the visualization component. Where warning logic is implemented, the monitoring module evaluates the appropriate measurement or prediction against its configured threshold.

The modular organization allows each stage to be examined independently. For example, preprocessing can be tested using input records containing missing or invalid values, while the prediction component can be evaluated using a separate test dataset. The dashboard can be checked to confirm that it displays the available outputs correctly.

F. Implementation Considerations

The processing workflow must maintain consistency between the features used during model training and those supplied during prediction. Differences in feature order, units, or preprocessing operations may lead to incorrect outputs. Consequently, the data format and preprocessing procedure should be applied consistently across the training and inference stages.

The system must also distinguish between measurements and model predictions in the dashboard. Displaying both types of information separately allows users to understand which values were measured and which were estimated by the model.

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section evaluates the operation of the proposed Air Quality Prediction and Monitoring System. The evaluation considers data preprocessing, machine learning-based prediction, and the monitoring dashboard.

A. Data Preprocessing Results

The preprocessing component is intended to identify missing, duplicate, invalid, or abnormal observations and prepare the dataset for prediction. Its effectiveness should be demonstrated using the actual dataset, including the number of records processed and any data-quality issues identified.

B. Prediction Performance

The selected prediction model should be evaluated using the metrics appropriate to its target variable. Table III provides a format for reporting the measured results.

TABLE III PREDICTION MODEL PERFORMANCE

Metric	Measured Value
MAE	Insert actual value
RMSE	Insert actual value
R ²	Insert actual value

The table should be used only if the implemented model performs a regression task and these metrics have been calculated. For a classification task, replace the table with the actual classification metrics. The reported values must be obtained from the test data.

C. Dashboard Evaluation

The dashboard should be evaluated by verifying whether the implemented interface displays the available environmental readings, historical trends, prediction outputs, and warning indicators. Screenshots of the running application can be included to demonstrate the functions that were tested.

D. Discussion

The results should be interpreted in relation to the project objectives. Prediction metrics can indicate how closely the model estimates the target variable, while module-level testing can demonstrate whether data processing and visualization operate as expected. However, successful execution of the software alone does not establish reliable prediction under actual industrial conditions.

If the evaluation uses simulated or prepared data, this limitation should be acknowledged. Further validation using measurements collected from a real food processing environment is necessary before making claims about deployment performance.

E. Module-Level Evaluation

The complete monitoring workflow can be evaluated by examining the behaviour of its individual components. The data preprocessing module should be assessed using the quality of the processed dataset. The prediction module should be assessed using the selected metrics on held-out test observations. The visualization module should be assessed by checking whether the available readings and prediction outputs are presented correctly.

TABLE IV SYSTEM EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Component	Evidence to Report
Data processing	Missing values, duplicate records, and records retained
Prediction model	Model name and measured test metrics
Visualization	Screenshots and verified dashboard functions
Warning logic	Configured thresholds and observed test behaviour, if implemented

F. Limitations of the Evaluation

The interpretation of the results depends on the dataset used in the experiments. A model evaluated on simulated or prepared data may demonstrate the operation of the software pipeline, but its performance may not represent the conditions encountered in an actual food processing facility.

Environmental measurements can vary with processing activities, ventilation, sensor placement, and operating conditions. A dataset that does not capture these variations may limit the generalization of the model. Similarly, sensor accuracy and missing measurements can affect the reliability of the information supplied to the prediction component.

These considerations highlight the need to report the data source, model configuration, testing procedure, and measured evaluation metrics. Future experiments should use representative sensor data and evaluate whether the model remains reliable under different environmental conditions.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper presents an Air Quality Prediction and Monitoring System designed for food processing industries. The proposed workflow integrates environmental data preparation, preprocessing, machine learning-based prediction, and dash-board visualization. It provides a structured approach to organizing environmental measurements and presenting prediction outputs through a unified monitoring interface.

The system is intended to support the analysis of parameters such as temperature, humidity, particulate matter, carbon dioxide, and relevant gas concentrations. Its effectiveness depends on the quality and source of the dataset, the suitability of the

selected prediction model, and the reliability of the evaluation procedure. Numerical claims about model performance should therefore be based on measured experimental results.

Future work includes deploying physical environmental sensors in food processing facilities, collecting a larger dataset under different operating conditions, and evaluating alternative machine learning models using a consistent testing procedure. The system could also be extended with cloud-based storage, remote notifications, multi-zone monitoring, edge computing, and automated ventilation control. These extensions would require additional implementation and validation to establish their practical benefits.

In addition to model evaluation, future development should examine the reliability of the complete monitoring pipeline under practical operating conditions. This includes checking sensor calibration, consistency of data transmission, handling of missing observations, and the time required to process new measurements. A larger dataset collected across different processing activities could support a more comprehensive evaluation of the selected prediction model.

Further development could investigate multi-zone monitoring, where measurements from different locations are analyzed to identify variations within a facility. Cloud-based storage could support the maintenance of historical records, while edge-based processing could be considered where low-latency analysis is required. Any automated ventilation or air-purification control should be implemented only after appropriate safety checks and validation. These improvements provide possible directions for extending the proposed framework beyond its current implementation.

REFERENCES

- [1].World Health Organization, WHO Global Air Quality Guidelines: Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), Ozone, Nitrogen Dioxide, Sulfur Dioxide and Carbon Monoxide. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2021.
- [2].M. Méndez, M. G. Merayo, and M. Núñez, "Machine Learning Algorithms to Forecast Air Quality: A Survey," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 56, pp. 10031–10066, 2023.
- [3]. "Air Quality Prediction Using Machine Learning: Systematic Literature Review," in *Proc. Ninth International Conference on Informatics and Computing (ICIC)*, IEEE, 2024.
- [4]. "Application of Artificial Intelligence in Air Pollution Monitoring and Forecasting: A Systematic Review," *Environmental Modelling & Soft-ware*, vol. 185, 2025.
- [5]. "Machine Learning for Air Quality Prediction and Data Analysis: Review on Recent Advancements, Challenges, and Outlooks," *Science of the Total Environment*, vol. 1002, 2025.
- [6]. "Advancements in Air Quality Monitoring: A Systematic Review of IoT-Based Air Quality Monitoring and AI Technologies," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 2025.
- [7]. "Statistical and Machine Learning Models for Air Quality: A Systematic Review of Methods and Challenges," *Algorithms*, vol. 18, no. 12, 2025.
- [8].World Health Organization, WHO Global Air Quality Guidelines: Executive Summary. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2021.
- [9].World Health Organization, WHO Global Air Quality Guidelines: Recommended Air Quality Guideline Levels and Interim Targets. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2021.
- [10]. "Harnessing Deep Learning for Air Pollution Forecasting: Trends, Techniques, and Future Prospects," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 59, 2026.