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Key Points:
- We developed an Automated Machine Learning workflow to evaluate the utility of incorporating multiple trace gas columns in PM$_{2.5}$ estimates
- Tropospheric trace gas columns contain signatures of PM$_{2.5}$ precursors and improve PM$_{2.5}$ estimates
- We infer the regional dominance of primary versus secondary sources of PM$_{2.5}$ using AutoML and Spearman's ranking correlation
Abstract

India is largely devoid of high-quality and reliable on-the-ground measurements of fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$). Ground-level PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations are estimated from publicly available satellite Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) products combined with other information. Prior research has largely overlooked the possibility of gaining additional accuracy and insights into the sources of PM using satellite retrievals of tropospheric trace gas columns. We first evaluate the information content of tropospheric trace gas columns for PM$_{2.5}$ estimates over India within a modeling testbed using an Automated Machine Learning (AutoML) approach, which selects from a menu of different machine learning tools based on the dataset. We then quantify the relative information content of tropospheric trace gas columns, AOD, meteorological fields, and emissions for estimating PM$_{2.5}$ over four Indian sub-regions on daily and monthly time scales. Our findings suggest that, regardless of the specific model assumptions, incorporating trace gas modeled columns improves PM$_{2.5}$ estimates. We use the ranking scores produced from the AutoML algorithm and Spearman's rank correlation to infer the relative dominance of primary versus secondary sources of PM$_{2.5}$ as a first step towards estimating particle composition. Our comparison of AutoML-derived models to selected baseline machine learning models demonstrates that AutoML is at least as good as model selection and hyperparameter tuning prior to training. The idealized pseudo-observations used in this work lay the groundwork for applying satellite retrievals of tropospheric trace gases to estimate fine particle concentrations in India and serve to illustrate the promise of AutoML applications in atmospheric and environmental research.

Plain Language Summary

Ground-level fine particle (PM$_{2.5}$) concentrations are frequently estimated with freely available satellite Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) products. We focus on India where sparse ground-based monitoring leaves gaps in our understanding of particle concentrations and the relative importance of different sources. We use an atmospheric chemistry model to test whether satellite retrievals of tropospheric trace gas columns can provide information on the origins of PM$_{2.5}$ and improve satellite-derived. We created an Automated Machine Learning (AutoML) workflow to evaluate the utility of incorporating multiple trace gas columns in PM$_{2.5}$ estimates, which represents nonlinear relationships between predictands and predictors while freeing users from selecting and tuning a specific machine learning model. On daily and monthly time scales, we quantify the relative information content of trace gas columns, AOD, meteorological fields, and emissions. We find that incorporating trace gas columns improves PM$_{2.5}$ estimates and may also enable inference of broad characteristics of particle composition.

1 Introduction

High levels of ambient fine particles (known as PM$_{2.5}$, particles 2.5 μm in diameter or smaller) pose a major environmental issue in India. As estimated by Chowdhury et al., (2019), nearly the entire population (99.9%) in India is exposed to annual PM$_{2.5}$ exceeding the previous World Health Organization (WHO) guideline of 10 μg/m$^3$. The latest WHO Global Air Quality Guidelines (AQG) announced on September 22, 2021, has lowered the annual AQG level of PM$_{2.5}$ to 5 μg/m$^3$ (World Health Organization, 2021). To tackle the issue of air pollution, the Government of India launched the National Clean Air Program (NCAP) in January 2019, aimed
at reducing particulate pollution by 20-30% relative to 2017 levels by 2024. Monitoring air
quality and understanding pollutant sources are critical to implementing effective air quality
management plans, but India mostly lacks long-term, publicly accessible, reliable (i.e., quality
controlled) measurements of particle composition that enable source attribution (Bali et al., 2021;
Brauer et al., 2019). Although the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) has maintained a
routine monitoring network for total PM$_{2.5}$ mass (composition unknown) and certain gas-phase
species since 2008, the density of India’s monitoring network (~0.14 monitors/million persons)
is lower than other developing countries such as China (1.2 monitors/million persons) and
developed countries such as USA (3.4 monitors/million persons), and leaves the majority of rural
India entirely unmonitored (Bali et al., 2021; Brauer et al., 2019; Karambelas et al., 2018;
Ravishankara et al., 2020).

Publicly available satellite products offer the opportunity to overcome limitations in
spatiotemporal coverage and estimate PM$_{2.5}$ across India by combining satellite data with other
information. Satellite aerosol optical depth (AOD) is often used to estimate PM$_{2.5}$ (van
Donkelaar et al., 2006; Hoff & Christopher, 2009). Columnar AOD is combined with
geophysical or statistical models that ingest additional meteorological data, emission inventories,
chemical transport model simulations, and/or land use to estimate PM$_{2.5}$ and achieve better
performance (Brauer et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2015). Typically, these approaches require high-
quality ground-based measurements for model training and validation, which is not possible in
India due to the country’s low monitor density relative to other world regions (e.g., U.S. and
China).

Importantly, the possibility of gleaning additional insights into sources of PM from
satellite retrievals of tropospheric trace gases has generally been overlooked. Trace gases
including sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and ammonia are precursors to fine particles that form
via chemical reactions and thus should indicate the potential to form secondary PM. Other trace
gases such as carbon monoxide (a product of incomplete combustion) and formaldehyde
produced during the oxidation of numerous organic gases) may correlate with emissions of
aerosols or their precursor gases and may thus indicate primary (directly emitted) PM, as well as
transported pollution of particles emitted or produced upwind. Thus we evaluate here the
potential for incorporating trace gas tropospheric columns into statistical approaches to increase
the accuracy of ground-level PM$_{2.5}$ estimates in India. In this first study, we use a model as a
testbed to assess the potential information content in tropospheric trace gas columns retrieved
from satellite instruments.

Artificial intelligence (AI) and data science methods, and machine learning (ML)
methods in particular, have been developed and used in atmospheric and environmental studies
over the last few years. This trend is likely to persist into the foreseeable future enabled by the
rapid advances and tremendous needs in many areas, such as weather forecasting and predictions
(Agrawal et al., 2019; Lagerquist et al., 2019; McGovern et al., 2017), Earth system modeling
(Gentine et al., 2021; Irrgang et al., 2021; Reichstein et al., 2019), and climate analysis (Labe &
Barnes, 2021; Toms et al., 2020). As an alternative to simple geophysical or statistical
approaches, ML approaches such as Random Forest and Gradient Boosting have been applied to
meld satellite estimates of aerosol optical depth (AOD) with weather and land use data to
produce highly spatially and temporally resolved datasets to develop surface PM$_{2.5}$ concentration
(Di et al., 2019; Geng et al., 2020; Rybarczyk & Zalakeviciute, 2018; Xiao et al., 2018).

According to the “No Free Lunch (NFL)” theorem (Wolpert, 1996), no one ML algorithm can be
universally good for all data and problems. Instead, the nature of the problem, the data, and the purpose synergistically determine the appropriate learning algorithm for a problem. For example, a deep-learning-based model architecture trained to predict severe weather might not successfully predict an extreme air pollution episode. In some cases, given the sensitivity of the data-driven models, incorporating new predictors could shift the “ideal” learning algorithm from one to another (e.g., from linear to nonlinear). Even if the “best” learning algorithm is predefined (e.g., a neural network or a gradient boosting model), searching and tuning the hyperparameters (e.g., number of hidden layers in a neural network, or the learning rate of a gradient boosting model) usually depends on human knowledge and decisions. Furthermore, ML approaches generally require significant computational resources to implement.

Concerns with machine learning computational efficiency have given rise to fast and economical software frameworks, known as Automated Machine Learning (AutoML) (Wang et al., 2021), in which “the user simply provides data, and the AutoML system automatically determines the approach that performs best for this particular application” (Hutter et al., 2019). AutoML frees domain scientists from selecting learners and hyperparameters and can potentially prevent suboptimal choices due to idiosyncrasies or ad-hocness. For example, Adams et al. (2020) have successfully employed AutoML (an R package “H2O”) for an optimal solution to correct low-cost air quality sensors.

In this study, we leverage the power of AutoML to evaluate the added benefit of satellite retrieval of tropospheric trace gases in PM$_{2.5}$ estimates over India. We use a chemical transport model as a synthetic testbed for developing methods under spatially and temporally continuous (“perfect”) datasets and use the AutoML as a tool to fit the regression of surface PM$_{2.5}$ given the meteorological fields, emission inventory, and satellite-like pseudo-datasets sampled from the model. Note the overarching goal of this study is not to provide regression models or PM$_{2.5}$ products. Instead, we aim to assess the improved accuracy that may be possible by incorporating satellite retrievals of tropospheric trace gases, thereby providing guidance for developing future PM$_{2.5}$ products by blending together multiple datasets, especially over regions lacking widespread networks of particle mass and composition measurements.

2 Methods

2.1 GEOS-CHEM simulations and Data Processing

We use simulations from the GEOS-Chem version 12.0.2 (The International GEOS-Chem User Community, 2018) chemical transport model as idealized pseudo-observations continuously available from ground-based and space-based platforms. The simulations were conducted for the year 2015 with a global $2^\circ$ latitude x $2.5^\circ$ longitude domain providing boundary conditions to a nested grid ($0.25^\circ$ latitude x $0.3125^\circ$ longitude, ~25 km x 30 km) and 47 non-uniform vertical layers over India (0-40$^\circ$ N and 60-100$^\circ$ E) as described in Karambelas et al. (2022). This nested grid configuration was loosely based on (Chaliyakunnel et al., 2019), which used the MERRA-2 reanalysis meteorology. Instead, we use GEOS-FP fields to achieve higher spatial resolution (Karambelas et al., 2022). We use the standard tropospheric and stratospheric chemistry (e.g., NO$_2$-O$_x$-HC-aerosol-Br with a simple secondary organic aerosol representation) and physics (Pai et al., 2020; Prashanth et al., 2021), and natural and biogenic emissions. Anthropogenic emissions are from the ECLIPSE anthropogenic emission inventory (Stohl et al.,
We construct surface PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations from the individual simulated chemical components (ammonium, nitrate, sulfate, black carbon, organic carbon, secondary organic aerosols, dust, and sea salt), and assume a relative humidity of 50%. We develop “pseudo-datasets” by sampling modeled fields at satellite overpass time. These datasets are "perfect" in the sense that no instrument noise or missed retrievals are introduced (e.g. due to clouds, etc.). Specifically, we use the Flexible Aerosol Optical Depth (FlexAOD) post-processing tool (Curci et al., 2015) to estimate aerosol optical depth (AOD) at 550 nm and dust AOD. These fields are sampled at 5:00 AM UTC to coincide with Terra’s local 10:30 AM overpass. The tropospheric vertical columns (troposphere is defined as from the surface layer to model level 38) of trace gases (CO, SO$_2$, NO$_2$, CH$_2$O, and NH$_3$) are sampled at 8:00 AM UTC to match satellite instruments with a local 1:30 PM overpass. Meteorological fields were averaged on a daily and a monthly basis for further analysis. The emission fields without daily variation were only used for monthly analyses. Table 1 lists the fields (features) used in our analyses. Note that the months April and August were used as the hold-out samples (testing data) for validation purposes, and the remaining ten months (including PM episodes that happened in December) were used for the regionalization (see Section 2.2) and training in the Automated Machine Learning (AutoML) workflow. We restrict our analysis to land grid cells (defined as land covering a fraction greater than 0.5 of any individual cell).

Table 1. Features (fields) definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Feature (fields)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Temporal resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meteorological</td>
<td>T2M</td>
<td>2-meter air temperature</td>
<td>Daily and Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>2-meter relative humidity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBLH</td>
<td>Planetary boundary layer height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U10M</td>
<td>10-meter eastward wind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V10M</td>
<td>10-meter northward wind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRECTOT</td>
<td>Total precipitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite (aerosol)</td>
<td>AOT_C</td>
<td>Aerosol optical thickness (or AOD) at 550 nm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AOT_DUST_C</td>
<td>Aerosol optical thickness (or AOD) of dust at 550 nm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite (trace gases)</td>
<td>CO_trop</td>
<td>tropospheric vertical column of CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO2_trop</td>
<td>tropospheric vertical column of SO2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO2_trop</td>
<td>tropospheric vertical column of NO2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH2O_trop</td>
<td>tropospheric vertical column of CH2O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH3_trop</td>
<td>tropospheric vertical column of NH3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission</td>
<td>EmisDST_Natural</td>
<td>Dust emissions from natural sources (EmisDST1_Natural+ EmisDST2_Natural+ EmisDST3_Natural+ EmisDST4_Natural), number indicates GEOS-Chem size bin</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EmisNO_Fert</td>
<td>NO emissions from fertilizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EmisNO_Lightning</td>
<td>NO emissions from lightning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EmisNO_Shield</td>
<td>NO emissions from ships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EmisNO_Soil</td>
<td>NO emissions from soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EmisBC_Anthro</td>
<td>Black carbon aerosol emissions from anthropogenic sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Delineating geographical regions

We perform regional analysis to facilitate comprehension of spatial patterns. Rather than define regions for our analysis based on prior studies, for example, based on climate regions (Hu et al., 2017) or PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations (Greenstone et al., 2015), we propose a simple data-driven unsupervised learning approach for regionalization (Figure 1). Our approach groups grid cells into a few regions (clusters) based on their spatiotemporal similarity. The regionalization consists of two steps: (1) Empirical Orthogonal Functions (EOFs) and Varimax rotated EOFs (REOFs) analysis to reduce the dimensionality of the dataset and capture the spatiotemporal
patterns, and (2) $k$-means clustering to identify common regional patterns of variability across the EOFs.

**Figure 1. The workflow of delineating geographical regions.** (a) PCA to derive the EOFs that capture over 50% of the variance (first four EOFs); (b) Varimax-rotated loadings for the selected EOFs; (c) Weighted averaged loadings for the selected EOFs; (d) “Elbow method” to determine the number of regions (clusters); (e) Regions based on $k=6$ from $k$-means clustering; (f) Four regions that intersect with India’s land pixels.

### 2.2.1 EOF and REOF analysis

Compared to supervised learning, where model performance is evaluated by a set of metrics (e.g., root-mean-square error) against validation datasets, unsupervised learning does not lend itself to quantitative evaluation. The principal component analysis (PCA) and its variant “varimax rotated PCA” have been widely applied in atmospheric and climate research, such as decomposing sea surface temperature (Lian & Chen, 2012) into REOFs to determine modes of variability. Motivated by a previous application of REOFs on the observed patterns of surface ozone ($O_3$) in the eastern United States (Fiore et al., 2003, 2021), we first applied PCA to derive the EOFs that capture over 50% of the variance (first four EOFs) in PM$_{2.5}$, then varimax-rotated the first four EOFs.

### 2.2.2 $k$-means clustering

The $k$-means clustering is an unsupervised learning approach and has been applied for ecoregion delineation (Kumar et al., 2011), environmental risk zoning (Shi & Zeng, 2014), and aerosol mixing state regionalization (Zheng et al., 2020). Qualitatively, we gauge successful implementations of clustering by the emergence of spatially contiguous regions without the
direct guidance of spatial information (e.g., providing the algorithm with latitude and longitude). We multiply the EOF loadings by the corresponding explained variance to produce “weighted EOFs” as the input for the $k$-means clustering so that Euclidean distances among them correctly capture the relationships with respect to the original feature space. We use the “elbow method” to identify an optimal trade-off point and select six clusters (Hastie et al., 2009). Then we select four regions that intersect with India’s land pixels as our study areas. Note that the four regions (Fig. 1e) contain not only India but also nearby countries, such as Bangladesh, Nepal, and Myanmar. Additionally, Region C (the union of four regions) and Region A (India and its neighbors, including all land grid cells from the simulations) are considered in this study to examine patterns at various spatial scales (see Section 2.4).

2.3 Automated Machine Learning (AutoML)

Rather than using a specific machine learning approach (e.g., Random Forest) to build regression models and quantify the importance of various features (fields), here we use a lightweight Python library “FLAML” (a Fast and Lightweight AutoML library) (Wang et al., 2021) as the tool for the AutoML task. This library chooses a search order optimized for both computational cost and model error, and selects the learner, hyperparameters, sample size, and resampling strategy iteratively. When tested on a large open-source AutoML benchmark, FLAML has superior performance compared to the top-ranked AutoML libraries, but with much smaller computational and time budgets (Wang et al., 2021). Given our modeling formulation, we configured the AutoML for a regression task with “auto” for the estimator list, optimizing the $R^2$ metric, and assigned a time budget of “5400 seconds” (1.5 hours) for each AutoML experiment. The “auto” scheme of ML estimator models consists in this library of tree-based approaches, namely, LightGBM (Light Gradient Boosting Machine, Ke et al., 2017), XGBoost (eXTreme Gradient Boosting, Chen & Guestrin, 2016), CatBoost (categorical boosting, Prokhorenkova et al., 2018), Random Forests (Breiman, 2001), and Extra-Trees (Extremely randomized trees, Geurts et al., 2006). We then compare the best estimator (the specific learning algorithm/model with the best result on the held-out validation data) from AutoML with two baseline models: the default configurations of XGBoost and Random Forests.

2.4 Experimental Design

We conduct a series of comparisons and answer three core questions by using the best estimators trained from AutoML (Table 2). First, the maximum benefit of tropospheric trace gas columns (using modeled proxies as described in Section 2.1) for surface PM$_{2.5}$ estimates can be determined by assessing the improvement in estimator performance when trace gas columns are used as features, in addition to meteorological variables, emissions, and AOD. We also test the model performance in the absence of AOD (removing total and dust AOD) when trace gases, meteorological variables, and emissions are available. Second, the same feature combination but different data (monthly versus daily) can be used to estimate the maximum information content possible from tropospheric trace gas columns and other input variables (using “perfect” model datasets) at different time scales. Monthly estimates, in comparison to daily estimates, attempt to capture spatial patterns and seasonal cycles but are unable to incorporate daily weather data. Third, the best estimators trained on data at different-sized regions ingested on different temporal
averaging periods (monthly versus daily) provide insights on whether any benefit from including tropospheric trace gas columns is spatially equivalent.

Table 2. Experimental design and core questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Time Scale</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Questions</td>
<td>Do tropospheric trace gases improve PM$_{2.5}$ estimates?</td>
<td>How does the ranking of features vary at different time scales?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiments</td>
<td>Data from the collection of all the grid cells falling into a certain region:</td>
<td>How does the ranking of features vary in different regions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- with trace gas columns</td>
<td>- E/S/W/N: individual region from Figure 2(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- without trace gas columns but with AODs</td>
<td>- C: the union of four regions (E + S + W + N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- with trace gas columns but without AODs</td>
<td>- A: India and the neighboring countries (all land grid cells from the simulations, including Region C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Feature Importance Attribution

In Data Science, “feature importance” refers to a score that represents how useful the feature is at predicting the target variable. However, the type of feature importance score differs for different learning algorithms and results in values with varying orders of magnitude. For example, the feature importance of Extra-Trees is based on “impurity” (the normalized total reduction of the mean squared error brought by that feature), LightGBM’s feature importance is by default based on “split” (the numbers of times the feature is used in a tree node in the model), and XGBoost usually uses “gain” (the average Gini impurity/information gain across all splits the feature is used in).

Here we derive a metric, “ranking score,” to unify the comparison of feature importance from different learning algorithms (e.g., Extra-Trees, LightGBM, and XGB). For each estimator, we rank the feature importance values from lowest to highest and assign a “ranking score” to each feature based on the rank order of the corresponding feature importance value. That is, the least important feature has a score of 1, the second to least important feature has a score of 2, and so on. As a result, ranking scores are bounded between 1 (least important) and the number of features (most important), which converts the feature importance of different estimators to the same scale for comparison. We also group features within the same type (Table 1) and compute the mean ranking score and the standard deviation within each type.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Including multiple trace gas modeled columns generally improves PM$_{2.5}$ estimates

We first evaluate whether PM$_{2.5}$ estimates improve in accuracy when we add trace gas tropospheric columns simulated by the GEOS-Chem model to the simulated meteorological variables, AOD, and emissions. We apply AutoML-derived nonlinear models and linear regression (LR). The coefficient of determination ($R^2$, based on an ordinary least-squares
regression) between PM$_{2.5}$ simulated by GEOS-Chem versus that predicted with machine learning approaches is used as a metric for accuracy. These regressions provide average estimates, across the study area and time scales, of the association between trace gas columns and PM$_{2.5}$. As a comparison, we also apply the same approach to AODs.

While the “best estimator” from AutoML varies in space and time, we observe an increase in $R^2$ when simulated columnar trace gases are included in nonlinear and linear regression models (Fig. 2), implying that trace gases contain signatures useful for PM$_{2.5}$ estimation. However, including AODs as features in the presence of trace gas columns does not guarantee improved performance, and sometimes impairs the model performance (e.g., the difference between “GA” (both trace gas columns and AODs are available) and “G” (trace gas columns are available but AODs are not available) in monthly Region N). Given that the models with nonlinear relationships exhibit higher $R^2$ compared to the linear model, here we focus on the results from AutoML. The analysis of different ML model assumptions is discussed in Section 3.4. Some emission inventories in the model are only available at the monthly resolution, while others vary day-by-day. By comparing the results of monthly PM$_{2.5}$ estimates using only the emissions available at daily time scales (“Monthly (same features as Daily)”) versus all emission inventories (“Monthly”), we find that using “all emission inventories” yields higher $R^2$ (e.g., 0.02 to 0.15 improvement in $R^2$ for “GA”) at monthly time scales, implying that more accurate emission inventories (captured by the monthly emission features) will improve PM$_{2.5}$ estimates. In the following sections, we will keep the “Monthly” results that utilized emission data available at both monthly and daily time scales for analysis, since they yielded the best overall estimates of PM$_{2.5}$ in this study.

**Figure 2.** Improved predictive capability of PM$_{2.5}$ estimates when adding trace gas columns to other feature types in Table 1. Estimators are trained based on (a) AutoML and (b) linear regression. The left and middle panels differ in time scale (daily v.s. monthly), and the middle
and right panels differ in feature numbers (see Section 2.1 and Table 1). GA: both trace gas columns and AODs are available; A: AODs are available but trace gas columns are not available; G: trace gas columns are available but AODs are not available. Note the bars with the coefficient of determination lower than 0 are not shown, and results are based on testing data.

The improvements in $R^2$ vary spatially and temporally at the regional scale. In Region E, adding trace gas columns alongside AOD (GA) boosted daily $R^2$ from 0.59 to 0.74, and monthly from 0.76 to 0.93 compared to AOD alone (A). But in Region W, the increases in $R^2$ are moderate (+0.07 for daily and +0.01 for monthly). Given that other features already account for 86% of the variance in Region W on the monthly scale, adding trace gases only results in marginal increases in $R^2$ (note the improvement is not a linear addition, it reconstructs the interactions among all features, not only the interactions between other features and trace gases).

Marginal increases in $R^2$ also occur for Region N, where the daily and monthly increases are 0.06 and 0.04, respectively. The increases in $R^2$ are not proportional to the baseline (without trace gases; A). For example, although the baseline monthly $R^2$ in Region S is relatively low, its increase is similar to other regions. The lower $R^2$ values for monthly PM$_{2.5}$ estimates in Region S may be due to insufficient samples, as this region’s sample size is approximately one-fifth to half that of the other regions.

When training on data from the union of our four individual regions (Region C) or all the land grid cells as a whole (Region A), the inclusion of trace gases always contributes to a higher $R^2$. Especially, trace gases in Region C increased $R^2$ from 0.74 to 0.82 at the daily scale. At a larger geospatial scale (Region A), although the baseline $R^2$ values on the daily scale (0.86) and monthly scale (0.94) are well explained by meteorological fields, emission inventory, and AODs, the presence of trace gas columns can further explain variance (0.02 for both) in PM$_{2.5}$ and improve the estimates. However, a cost may be associated with the minor improvement, depending on the effort required to acquire additional data. As such, it is necessary to weigh the trade-offs.

3.2 The relative importance of trace gas columns to accurate PM$_{2.5}$ estimates varies spatially and temporally

We compare ranking scores among the types (Figure 3) and features (Figures 4 and 5), defined in Table 1, to study the relative importance of trace gas columns for improving PM$_{2.5}$ estimates over India, where a type or feature with a higher ranking score indicates its higher importance compared to other types or features in the regression. The ranking scores shown in Figures 3 - 5 suggest that the important features and feature interactions differ in space and time,
which may be explained by regional and temporal differences in the dominant sources and the interactions with meteorological conditions.

Figure 3. Ranking scores of AODs, meteorological fields, emission inventory, and trace gas column simulated by the GEOS-Chem model in estimating modeled PM$_{2.5}$. (a) both trace gas columns and AODs are available; (b) AODs are available but trace gas columns are not available; (c) trace gas columns are available but AODs are not available. Means and standard deviations of the ranking scores are derived from AutoML-trained “best estimators” within the same type.

On a daily scale, trace gas columns from GEOS-Chem (NO$_2$, SO$_2$, CH$_3$O, and NH$_3$) are the most important factors that boost the performance of PM$_{2.5}$ estimates in Region E (Figure 4). The order of other types remains similar (Figure 3) when trace gas columns or AODs are not included as features in this region. Region S, however, shows that the inclusion of the trace gas columns rearranges the order of feature importance among types (Figure 3). Without the use of trace gas columns to estimate daily PM$_{2.5}$ levels, the most significant feature type is AOD, followed by meteorological fields and emissions. When trace gas columns are considered, the relative importance of AOD decreases, and meteorological fields (e.g., V10M and planetary boundary layer) take precedence, implying that AOD and trace gas columns may contain redundant information. Meteorological fields and AODs are the most important factors for PM$_{2.5}$ estimates in Region W and Region N when trace gas columns are not available. But the trace gas columns (SO$_2$, NH$_3$, NO$_2$) are as important as the meteorological fields (V10M, U10M, PBLH) when they are taken into account, implying possible chemical reactions (e.g., formation of ammonium sulfate and nitrate) and physical processes (e.g., transport and dispersion) within the regions. The model trained from Region C (four regions as a whole) shows that AODs can explain a large fraction of the variance of PM$_{2.5}$ when trace gas columns are missing. However, with the presence of trace gas columns, meteorological fields are the most important factors that modulate PM$_{2.5}$ estimates. Similarly, this discrepancy could be attributed to the redundant
information in AODs and trace gas columns. In a larger area (Region A), regardless of the presence of trace gas columns, meteorological fields are the dominant features. This result may be explained by the high correlation between AODs and all trace gas columns (Figure A1), which leads to features to be selected from either type as they contain similar information thus resulting in a lower overall ranking score for either feature type. Notably, while daily estimates indicate that emissions are the least important features in all cases, this could be because much of the predictive information can be inferred from the other features, due to a scarcity of varying emission data, or because the source at daily time scales does not change spatially as much in the model.

Figure 4. Ranking scores of features from AODs, meteorological fields, and trace gas columns in estimating daily PM$_{2.5}$. The ranking scores are derived from AutoML-trained "best estimators" that incorporate both trace gas columns and AOD, as well as meteorological fields and an emission inventory.

For monthly PM$_{2.5}$ estimates, although the patterns of the relative importance of different feature types remain similar among the four regions and Region C, the specific ranking order of features varies in different regions. The results can be partially related to the dominant sources. For example, a slightly lower mass fraction of sulfate in Region W (~13% in PM$_{2.5}$) compared to other regions (14%-17%) corresponds to a lower ranking score of “SO$_2$ _trop”. When building a model for a larger geospatial extent (Region A), the ranking score of meteorological fields declines. A possible reason is that the ML model for Region A assumes the same interactions among features for all regions and gives lower importance to meteorological variables compared to other types. But in reality, meteorology varies across the country and different meteorological factors may play different roles in different regions. On the other hand, monthly averaged precipitation and relative humidity in Region A are less correlated with PM$_{2.5}$ (Figure A2) than
in other regions on monthly or daily scales, implying that information about processes (e.g., wet deposition) is diluted.

Figure 5. Ranking scores of features from AODs, meteorological fields, and trace gas columns in estimating monthly PM$_{2.5}$. The ranking scores are derived from AutoML-trained "best estimators" that incorporate both trace gas columns and AOD, as well as meteorological fields and an emission inventory.

3.3 Implications for PM$_{2.5}$ speciation

Along with the feature importance generated by AutoML, we use Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient to infer the chemical composition of PM$_{2.5}$. Note that feature importance (or ranking score) and Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient address different aspects. Feature importance concerns the interactions among features and features’ contribution to the predictive capability, but it does not reveal the individual relationship between target variable and each feature. On the other hand, Spearman’s rank measures the monotonic relationship (whether linear or not) between two variables but does not necessarily inform on its significance in a predictive model with other features. Here we show that, in the regions where trace gas columns are associated with higher ranking scores, the correlation between trace gas columns and PM$_{2.5}$ are also high. We find that tropospheric columns of SO$_2$ and NO$_2$ contribute most to the daily and monthly PM$_{2.5}$ estimates in Region E based on ranking scores, along with the highest Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients. The agreement between AutoML and Spearman’s rank correlation suggests secondary inorganic PM (sulfate and nitrate) are critical species modulating the PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations in Region E. Thus, the agreement between the ranking scores and the Spearman correlations provide evidence for chemical speciation of PM$_{2.5}$ and thus potential to infer source attribution in the subregions. Figure 6 also suggests that SO$_2$ (Region S) and CO (Region W and Region N) have higher correlation coefficients with PM$_{2.5}$ compared to other trace gas columns, consistent with the monthly ranking scores (Figure 5). The findings suggest
that sulfate may modulate monthly PM$_{2.5}$ variability in Region S, whereas primary pollutant CO may modulate monthly PM$_{2.5}$ variability in Regions W and N.

**Figure 6.** Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient between PM$_{2.5}$ and AODs, meteorological fields, and trace gas columns.

### 3.4 AutoML consistently outperforms baseline machine learning models

We use the independent testing data to evaluate the advantage of using AutoML by comparing the “best estimator” from AutoML with LR and two commonly used nonlinear ML models: Random Forest (RF) and XGBoost (XGB). As expected, the performance of ML models varies case by case (Fig. 7a). For example, although the performance of RF is generally worse than XGBoost, it outperforms XGBoost when estimating monthly PM$_{2.5}$ in Region N. Therefore, it is not the best practice to implement the same machine learning algorithm for every region. Instead, the best estimators trained by AutoML outperform RF, XGBoost, and LR, especially at the regional scale. Because AutoML consists of a set of different learning algorithms and explores several possible hyperparameter combinations of each algorithm when training the estimators, it is at least no worse than a prior model selection and hyperparameter tuning (e.g., grid-search, random search, and bayesian search, etc.). We also show that an increase in data volume (e.g., daily compared to monthly) is likely to narrow the gap in $R^2$, highlighting the importance of attaining a large quantity of high-quality data for data-driven model development.

To assess whether trace gas columns can improve the PM$_{2.5}$ estimates, we repeat the regressions by implementing the above learning algorithms on a daily and monthly scale without trace gas columns, and calculate the difference in $R^2$ (Fig. 7b). We show that no matter the choice of learning algorithms, including trace gas columns consistently results in a higher $R^2$. Although the most obvious improvements come from LR, the best estimators from LR are in general worse than the nonlinear models, confirming that the assumption of a nonlinear relationship between features and PM$_{2.5}$ is more appropriate. In accordance with the present
results, previous studies (e.g., Porter & Heald, 2019; Tai et al., 2010) have demonstrated that the correlations between PM and meteorological conditions are complex.

**Figure 7.** Performance of different estimators in estimating daily and monthly PM$_{2.5}$. (a) Estimators trained from the data with trace gas products; (b) Increases in $R^2$ from (a) compared to the estimators without considering trace gas products as features. Estimators are trained from Automated Machine Learning (AutoML), linear regression (LR), Random Forest (RF), and eXtreme Gradient Boosting (XGB).

3.5 Is “Big Data” always better?

The above analysis has shown that a larger volume of data at the same time scale (e.g., Region A) results in a better predictive capability compared to separate models for each of its subregions. However, such comparisons are potentially misleading, because the testing datasets are different and the averaging effect between regions of the metric. Two questions are raised here: (1) How well does a “generalized model” trained on the larger region perform when applied to the sub-regions it encompasses (“spatial mismatch”)? (2) What role do trace gas products play in the application of a “spatially mismatched” model? Both questions are in line with the emphasis of Data-Centric AI, as a generalized model attempts to make use of the additional available samples to more robustly infer the predictive relationships, but it is possible that only a part of the data is indeed useful. On the other hand, while the first principle (e.g., chemical reactions) should be universal, due to incomplete features such as human activities, the underlying physical and chemical processes embedded in different places are distinct. For
example, the models are unaware of prior knowledge such as the number of vehicles and power plants, and the complex regional meteorological processes, which would suggest using a model tailored to each region.

Here we assess the applicability of the “best estimators” trained from larger areas (Region A and Region C) by applying them back to the sub-regions (E, S, W, N). The results (Figure 8a) suggest that the generalized model (“a global model”) is not universally the best solution. For example, incorporating data from other regions (Region C) can improve the monthly PM$_{2.5}$ estimates in Region S, but the estimates suffer as a result of gaining more irrelevant data (Region A), implying that fundamentally different governing processes control PM$_{2.5}$ variability in that region. Such noise has the potential to mislead machine learning algorithms. On the contrary, the monthly PM$_{2.5}$ estimates in Region N benefit from more data. As a result, models that perform well at larger geographic scales may ensure generally good performance overall, but fail to capture the specificity in pollutant sources and meteorological processes for each of their subregions, because tailored models may be necessary if pollutant sources and meteorological processes vary from region to region. Even if we “mistakenly” apply the model across spatial scales, we find that the presence of trace gas columns benefits models (Figure 8b). In our cases, including trace gas columns as features does not impair predictive capability.

Figure 8. Performance of estimators in estimating daily and monthly PM$_{2.5}$ across spatial scales. (a) Estimators trained from the data with trace gas products; (b) Increases in R$^2$ from (a)
compared to the estimators without considering trace gas products as features. Estimators are trained from the region (R), the group of regions (C), and all land grid cells (A) and applied back to each region.

4 Conclusions

We use an Automated Machine Learning (AutoML) approach on a modeling testbed to evaluate the information content of tropospheric trace gas columns for fine particle estimates in India. We quantify the relative information content of trace gas columns, AODs, meteorological fields, and emissions for four sub-regions within India, and on daily versus monthly time scales. As a byproduct, an unsupervised-learning-based regionalization strategy is developed to delineate geographical regions with similar daily patterns of variability for analysis.

Our results suggest that incorporating trace gas modeled columns enhances PM$_{2.5}$ estimates in general, regardless of model assumptions. The enhancements in predictive capability differ in both space and time. Using the ranking scores and Spearman’s rank correlation, we can infer the possible particle composition, and thus sources of PM$_{2.5}$. For example, we infer that PM$_{2.5}$ variability in Region E (see Figure 6) is modulated by secondary PM (sulfate and nitrate). However, in Region W and Region N, primary pollutants - as indicated by a strong correlation with CO - may modulate monthly PM$_{2.5}$ variability, whereas meteorological processes influence the daily PM$_{2.5}$ variability.

Our comparison of AutoML-derived models against selected baseline ML models demonstrates that AutoML is at least as good as a prior model selection and hyperparameter tuning. We ask the question “Is Big Data always better?” and find a nuanced answer that is regionally dependent. Even in these “spatially mismatched” models, however, we show that incorporating trace gas products can still improve PM$_{2.5}$ estimates across India.

The modeling testbed, like any other modeling-based study, is necessarily hampered by simulation accuracy. However, the idealized pseudo-observations used in this work provide a foundation for a better understanding of the importance of satellite retrievals of tropospheric trace gases for fine particle estimates in India, as well as the promising application of AutoML in atmospheric and environmental research. Future PM$_{2.5}$ estimates, for example, may benefit from the trace gas columns acquired by high-resolution geostationary satellites.

Data Availability

Scripts and data to reproduce the results and figures are preserved at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6363824 (Zheng, 2022) or https://github.com/zzheng93/code_DSI_India_AutoML. The raw data from GEOS-Chem
Simulations used for Automated Machine Learning and analysis in this study are available at https://doi.org/10.7916/nwx1-jt94 (Zheng et al., 2022).
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Appendix
Figure A1. Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient among PM$_{2.5}$, AODs, meteorological fields, and trace gas columns at the daily scale.

Figure A2. Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient among PM$_{2.5}$, AODs, meteorological fields, and trace gas columns at the monthly scale.
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