



Low-cost sensors and microscale land use regression: Data fusion to resolve air quality variations with high spatial and temporal resolution

L.F. Weissert^{a,*}, K. Alberti^b, G. Miskell^a, W. Pattinson^c, J.A. Salmond^d, G. Henshaw^b,
David E. Williams^{a,e}

^a School of Chemical Sciences, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, 1142, New Zealand


^b Aeroqual Ltd, 460 Rosebank Rd, Avondale, Auckland, 1026, New Zealand

^c Mote, 40 George St, Mount Eden, Auckland, 1024, New Zealand

^d School of Environments, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, 1142, New Zealand

^e MacDiarmid Institute for Advanced Materials and Nanotechnology, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, 1142, New Zealand

GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Land-use regression
Spatio-temporal model
Nitrogen dioxide
Ozone
Air pollution

Abstract: The strong temporal and spatial gradients in NO_2 concentrations frequently observed in urban microenvironments are very difficult to measure and model accurately. Recent developments in low-cost air quality instruments have led to improvement in the spatial coverage of time-resolved measurement, however interpolation is still needed to map pollutant concentrations and connect time- as well as space-dependent variations to urban design features. Here we propose a novel approach that uses a previously-described microscale land use regression (LUR) model to spatially interpolate data from a well-calibrated network of low-cost air quality instruments. We use a semiconducting oxide-based ozone sensor to provide a robust correction of the output of an electrochemical NO_2 sensor for ozone interference. We characterise signal noise probably associated with meniscus fluctuations as a significant error source, that can be handled with appropriate signal averaging. The LUR model is used to provide high spatial resolution in the data set, whilst correlation with sensor measurements provides a time-dependent estimate associated with different land use types. Observations from the network of instruments showed marked variability in NO_2 concentrations over short distances (on the scale of 100 m), with highest concentrations reached near bus stops, intersections and under shop awnings. This approach connects the complex time- and space-dependent variations to urban design features and is a promising way forward as a basis for objective spatial mapping of time-dependent mean concentration fields and local population exposure estimates.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: l.weissert@auckland.ac.nz (L.F. Weissert), david.williams@auckland.ac.nz (D.E. Williams).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.06.019>

Received 14 March 2019; Received in revised form 23 May 2019; Accepted 8 June 2019

Available online 11 June 2019

1352-2310/ © 2019 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Epidemiological studies often use modelling techniques, such as land use regression modelling or dispersion modelling, to quantify pollutant concentrations (Hoek et al., 2008; Vardoulakis et al., 2011). Land use regression (LUR) models are suitable for mapping air pollution with minimal additional data acquisition and are therefore a low-cost alternative to fixed monitoring (Jerrett et al., 2005). However, standard LUR models lack information about temporal variability particularly at the daily, hourly and sub-hourly scales. Land use regression studies also generally focus on city and regional scales where the explanatory variables have large spatial scale. The spatial resolution of the models is km and not representative of microscale environments (Mukerjee et al., 2012; Weissert et al., 2018). Thus, recent studies have focussed on urban design as a driver of air pollution. ‘Microscale’ LUR models have been developed that emphasise local urban design variables (Miskell et al., 2015; Weissert et al., 2018). The distance scale of these models is 50 m and, indeed, over such small distance scales the variations are significant. To improve the temporal resolution of LUR models, previous studies have shown some success using temporally dynamic predictor variables (i.e. traffic, meteorology) (Masiol et al., 2018; Miskell et al., 2018b; Son et al., 2018; Yeganeh et al., 2018). This approach may be limited by the availability of such data at a high temporal and spatial resolution. Other studies have linked regulatory monitoring data with the output from LUR models (Cordioli et al., 2017; Johnson et al., 2013; Nethery et al., 2008; Slama et al., 2007). However, regulatory monitoring networks are typically sparsely distributed across urban areas and data from just one or two sites are used to calibrate LUR models (Cordioli et al., 2017; Johnson et al., 2013; Slama et al., 2007). Consequently, these approaches are based on the assumption that temporal variability is the same across large areas (Cordioli et al., 2017; Johnson et al., 2013).

The central question of our research is how to assess the full spatio-temporal pollution field on hourly timescale or shorter, updated at a minimum hourly, and on distance scales of 50 m.

Using nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) measurements from a pilot study undertaken in Auckland, New Zealand, we show that results from low-cost instruments have sufficient accuracy and precision to resolve spatial variations, then show how to combine results from a network of low-cost instruments with a microscale LUR model in order to estimate the hourly mean concentration at a high temporal and spatial resolution, taking into account the effect of land use variables. The results provide important insights into site-specific effects on the temporal variability of NO₂ concentrations.

2. Theory

We used a microscale LUR model (Weissert et al., 2018) and a network of low-cost instruments to derive a LUR model that is updated hourly and to identify site-specific effects (e.g. interaction of bus stops and traffic lights at different times of the day).

Let $\bar{c}_{LUR,i}$ denote the long-term time-averaged concentration at site i modelled by LUR, using data $[z]$ measured by diffusion tubes. The LUR model is fitted by linear least-squares regression:

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{c}_{LUR,i}|[z]) = \mathbb{N}\left(\left[\beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j q_{j,i}\right], \sigma_{LUR}^2\right) \quad (1)$$

where $q_{j,i}$ denotes the site characteristics and $[\beta_j]$ are the fitted parameters, which are normally-distributed, independent random variables. Here, \mathbb{P} denotes the probability density and \mathbb{N} denotes the normal distribution ($\mathbb{N}(\mu, \sigma)$). The coefficient β_0 is derived from the β_j and the mean of the data and so is not an independent variable. Equation (1) is a typical LUR formulation as implied in many studies (e.g. Hoek et al., 2008).

We developed a new model for explaining the hourly mean

concentration, whose expected value for any particular hour, l , and any particular site, i , $\bar{c}_{i,l}$, is conditional upon the original LUR-modelled concentration for that site $\bar{c}_{LUR,i}$, the measured set of hourly mean values from the sensors for that hour, $[y_k]$, and the original LUR model applied at the instrument sites, $[\bar{c}_{LUR,k}]$. We assume a linear relationship between the measured, hourly-averaged sensor data, $[y_{k,l}]$ for any given hour of any given day, l , and the original LUR model:

$$y_{k,l} = \hat{a}_{i,l} \bar{c}_{LUR,k} + e_l \quad (2)$$

where, provided the sensors and the diffusion tubes have the same calibration slope with respect to the true NO₂ concentrations, any offset error between sensors and diffusion tubes is zero-mean with normally distributed errors. If the model is fitted by linear least squares regression, then e_l are normally-distributed zero-mean, random errors and the slope, $\hat{a}_{i,l}$, is a normally distributed random variable. Then we assume that this model applies at all other sites, i . That is, the model for the hourly-averaged concentration at site i for any given hour of any given day, l , is:

$$\bar{c}_{i,l} = \hat{a}_{i,l} \bar{c}_{LUR,i} + \varepsilon_{i,l} \quad (3)$$

where the estimates $\hat{a}_{i,l}$ are derived by least-squares fitting of equation (2). The actual distribution of the error term (indication of the model performance), $\varepsilon_{i,l}$ would reflect site-specific effects that are not captured by the original LUR model, and can be determined at the instrument sites, k .

3. Materials and methods

3.1. Location

Auckland is New Zealand's biggest and fastest growing city and is characterised by high traffic volumes with a large proportion of diesel vehicles (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). Road traffic is therefore the largest source of air pollution in Auckland, accounting for almost 80% of the NO_x (NO₂ and NO) emissions (Xie et al., 2014). However, Auckland's coastal geographic location facilitates relatively high wind speeds, preventing a large build-up of air pollutants (Senaratne and Shooter, 2004). The focus of this pilot study was on a ~2 km long road section around 4 km south of Auckland's city centre (Fig. 1). This section of road (Dominion Road) was chosen as it not only has high vehicle traffic (average daily weekday traffic: 25,901 vehicles) (Auckland Transport, 2017) but is also a busy area for pedestrians using the shops, bars and cafés along the road. Dominion Road is also well-used by buses and commuters to Auckland's airport and its central business district (CBD). We deployed eight instruments at different sides of the road, spaced between ~100 m and 1 km apart, and at different distances from intersections (Fig. 1a). In addition, in a previous study carried out from November 2016–February 2017, we measured NO₂ concentrations at 40 sites, representative of the typical land use characteristics along the road section, using Palmes diffusion tubes (Weissert et al., 2018) (Fig. 1b). These measurements were used to develop a microscale LUR model for the study area, which is described in detail in Weissert et al. (2018). The presence of awnings and the number of bus stops within a 100 m buffer had the highest proportional contribution (79% and 17%, respectively) to the modelled NO₂ concentrations, with street width and distance to major road playing a minor role. The final model explained 66% of the variability in NO₂ concentrations (RMSE: 3.3 μg m⁻³) (Weissert et al., 2018). We also had a reference site in Auckland's CBD, 3 km north of Dominion Road (Fig. 1c). The study was undertaken over 30 days during summer when mean temperatures ranged between 14 °C and 24 °C (NIWA, 2017), and the wind was from the SW with speed predominantly in the range 0–2 m s⁻¹ (detailed data in the Supporting Information, SI).




Fig. 1. a) Map of instrument locations, b) location of the diffusion tubes deployed in the previous study and c) map of the instrument locations in relation to Auckland's Central Business District (CBD) and the location of the reference site at the edge of the CBD.

3.2. Low-cost instruments

The term 'low-cost sensor' is often used to refer to the assembly of the detection element, measurement electronics, air-inlet, air-sampling and communications systems, and housing and mounting that together deliver the measurement result; 'low-cost' refers to such sensors whose installed capital cost is less than about 2% of that of a regulatory-

standard reference instrument. The term 'sensor' can also be taken to mean just the detection element and its specifically associated electronics and calibration. Here, we use it in that way since the whole measurement package (the 'instrument') contains several such sensors. The deployed 'low-cost' instruments were the AQY from Aeroqual Ltd, Auckland, New Zealand. An independent validation of these instruments, for both ozone and NO₂ has also been reported (South Coast

AQMD, 2018). Since the accuracy and precision are critical to the assessment of the model developed in this paper, we give a detailed assessment here. Nitrogen dioxide in the ‘low-cost’ devices was measured using an electrochemical sensor (Membraport type O3/M5; output $\sim 2 \text{ nA}/(\mu\text{g m}^{-3})$) that was exposed directly to the atmosphere hence sampling by diffusion. The ‘low-cost’ instruments also incorporated an ozone sensor that uses a gas-sensitive semiconducting (GSS) oxide, WO_3 , as the detection element (Aliwell et al., 2001; Hansford et al., 2005; Utembe et al., 2006; Williams et al., 2002). Air was drawn through the ozone sensor by a fan, through PTFE tubing and stainless steel filters. The ozone sensor has been extensively validated in both laboratory and field studies (Air Quality Sensor Performance Evaluation Center, 2018; Bart et al., 2014; Deville Cavellin et al., 2016; Lin et al., 2017; Miskell et al., 2018a; Williams et al., 2013). The major cause of drift in these, which occurs over the long term, is particulate deposition in the inlet and on the sensor causing ozone decomposition or diminution in the air flow. The two sensors were mounted side-by-side, protruding from the base of the polycarbonate case and protected by a shield from accidental impacts (photographs in the SI). Sensor signals were sampled every 1-min, digitised using a 16-bit A-D converter, and transmitted using a cell-phone modem to a remote database. Key features of the device include solar shields to regulate heat, and a sophisticated inlet configuration for the ozone sensor (inert dust filters; anti-static and inert materials).

3.2.1. NO_2 measurements: design principles

The NO_2 concentrations averaged over a 2-week period, measured using diffusion tubes in the previous study (Weissert et al., 2018), varied from 4 to $30 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$. Reliable measurement over such a low concentration range, that is sufficiently accurate to discriminate effects between sites, is very challenging using low-cost sensors (Baron and Saffell, 2017; Cordero et al., 2018; Cross et al., 2017; Feinberg et al., 2018; Lewis et al., 2016; Munir et al., 2019; Popoola et al., 2018) and requires careful consideration of the sensor performance. The electrochemical NO_2 sensor is a conceptually simple but physically complex device (Baron and Saffell, 2017). A current is measured in an electrochemical cell. Conceptually, the electrode potential at a sensing electrode is set such that the reaction rate at the sensing electrode is constrained to a maximum value by the rate of diffusion of the gas through a membrane that covers the electrode. Thus, the current for the reaction of gases at low concentration in air is proportional to the product of gas concentration and diffusion coefficient through the membrane. However, the signal is the sum of an offset current and currents due to the reaction of different gases at the electrodes, and is dependent on electrocatalytic activity of the electrode materials towards the different gases that might be present. The electrode is a porous structure through which gases diffuse to the electrode-electrolyte interface. The reaction current depends on wetted area, gas diffusion through the porous electrode structure, and temperature. Oscillations in water vapour pressure, temperature and water vapour transport can cause oscillations in the meniscus where the liquid electrolyte, electrode and gas meet, hence alterations in wetted area. Sudden changes in humidity indeed cause significant, rapid current transients in these electrochemical gas sensors (Pang et al., 2017, 2018) as we have also observed. The offset current, and the electrode reaction kinetics, can also change with time, since the reactive electrode catalyst materials change slowly with time. These effects can be significant for measurement at typical urban atmosphere concentrations, where the reaction current is typically 2% or less of the offset current for the commercial devices that we used.

Ozone and nitrogen dioxide are both electroreduced at a diffusion-limited rate at the operating potential of the sensor. Thus, the measurement model for the sensor can be written:

$$i_{\text{meas}} = i_0 - k_1 C_{\text{NO}_2} - k_2 C_{\text{O}_3} \quad (4)$$

$$C_{\text{NO}_2} = b_0 - b_1 i_{\text{meas}} - b_2 C_{\text{O}_3} \quad (5)$$

Where i_{meas} and i_0 are the measured and the offset current, respectively and the parameters $b_0 = i_0/k_1$, $b_1 = 1/k_1$ and $b_2 = k_2/k_1$ have to be determined by calibration. A simple correction can be made if an independent measure of the ozone concentration is available. In the literature, this has been done using a remote reference analyser (Mead et al., 2013) or a model for ozone concentration (Popoola et al., 2018), or another electrochemical sensor (e.g. Cordero et al., 2018; Munir et al., 2019). On the microscale, with traffic-dominated emissions, variability is expected to be large both in time and space, so we rejected a remote or model-based approach. Correction using an electrochemical sensor for ozone relies on constructing sensors for which k_1 and k_2 are sufficiently different; however, since NO_2 and O_3 have virtually the same diffusion coefficient in air, because they have almost the same molecular weight, $k_1 \approx k_2$. A disadvantage of that method is that a total of 6 different parameters must be determined, and these have to remain stable, and be confirmed to be stable, over the life of the sensor. In addition, the electrochemical ozone sensor has the sensitivity to temperature and humidity fluctuations that are found for the nitrogen dioxide sensor, making the compensation difficult (Cordero et al., 2018). An alternative is to incorporate an ozone decomposition catalyst on the NO_2 sensor (Hossain et al., 2016). A disadvantage of this is reliance on the unknown efficiency of the ozone catalyst, which must remain high, and be confirmed to remain high, over the life of the sensor. We have adopted an alternative approach, which is to use a semiconducting oxide-based sensor for ozone. As noted above, this sensor has been extensively validated in long-term measurements in the atmosphere, and is negligibly sensitive to humidity changes, to nitrogen oxides at atmosphere concentrations, and to temperature variations (Bart et al., 2014).

3.2.2. NO_2 measurements: errors and validation

Drift or errors in the NO_2 measurement could arise because:

- The actual value of the offset i_0 could alter from the value stored in the instrument and used in the calculation: background currents in the electrochemical cell are temperature and wetted area (hence relative humidity and interfacial tension) – dependent. Uncalibrated interferences could also cause additional currents and hence an alteration in i_0 . A specific issue is the response to rapid humidity changes noted above.
- The actual value of k_1 could alter from the value stored in the instrument and used in the calculation: clogging of pores in the membrane by dirt deposited in the sensor, or by poisoning or ageing of the electrode.
- The actual value of b_1 can change from the value stored in the instrument and used in the calculation: decomposition of ozone inside the sensor housing, inlet filter or on the membrane as a consequence of dirt deposition.
- The instrument-measured value of CO_3 can drift from the true value: drift in the ozone sensor.

Of particular significance is signal noise that is specifically related to exposure in the atmosphere, previously noted and attributed to atmosphere composition fluctuations (Baron and Saffell, 2017; Mead et al., 2013) (Fig. 2a). The fluctuations were of relatively high frequency (Fig. 2b). The amplitude distribution of the sampled signal overall could be represented as the sum of two normal distributions, varied with time, and could roughly be classified into ‘noisy’ and ‘quiet’ periods, not correlated with a diurnal cycle (Fig. 2c). The standard deviation of the sampled signal did not correlate with the mean signal. This noise was not present under laboratory conditions of constant humidity (Fig. 2d). The noise was also removed if the sensor in the atmosphere was covered with a cap (Fig. 2e), or was mounted at the end of a sufficiently long tube, open to the atmosphere at the end remote to the sensor, and could be altered by altering the size of the hole in the cap covering the sensor. Therefore, these fluctuations were not due to the electronics, or to rapid




Fig. 2. a) Raw electrochemical sensor signal, sampled at 0.15 Hz, illustrating the offset and noise and the effect of signal averaging by a running mean. The cycle of daylight hours is superimposed. b) Expansion of time scale of a segment of the record, to illustrate the high-frequency noise. c) Amplitude distribution of the noise, modelled by a sum of two Gaussians, with standard deviation 8.7 mV (equivalent to $13 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{NO}_2$) and 21 mV (equivalent to $33 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{NO}_2$). d) Signal noise at high time resolution in ambient air in a laboratory chamber: signal standard deviation 0.67 mV, equivalent to $1 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{NO}_2$. e) Effect of placing a cap over the sensor, outside in the atmosphere (inset: segment of the time series with cap on at high time resolution: signal standard deviation 1.4 mV, equivalent to $2.2 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{NO}_2$). The instrument output voltage sensitivity to current variations through the sensor is 1.4 mV/nA.

temperature fluctuations but were connected to exposure in the atmosphere and particularly to the design of the sensor inlet and hence probably to fluctuations around the sensor inlet that cause perturbations in the meniscus at the fluid-electrode-gas interface. Such fluctuations could perhaps be related to fluctuations in transport of water between liquid and gas phases. A reliable measurement of ($\text{NO}_2 + \text{O}_3$) could be obtained by averaging over a sufficient time. In the case of the instruments used in the present study, we used the hourly average of instantaneous measurements made once per minute. Subsequent instrument designs have used higher frequency sampling, but these were not available for the present study. For the 60-point running mean, the estimated standard deviation in the mean based on the noise amplitude distribution and the sensitivity determined from calibration using the running mean was between 1.7 and $4.3 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{NO}_2$ ('quiet' and 'noisy' periods respectively) and from the 60-point running standard deviation determined over several days was $2.5 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{NO}_2$.

To verify the performance of the devices, first ten devices were co-located for a period of 35 days with reference instruments for O_3 and NO_2 (O_3 : Thermo Scientific Model 49i, NO_2 : Thermo Scientific Model 42i) at a site close to a motorway junction, approximately 3 km distant from the study area (Fig. 1). The performance of the O_3 sensor is critical, since errors propagate directly through to the NO_2 estimation. For hourly-averaged data, individual devices showed excellent correlation between the O_3 sensors and the reference analyser (Adj. $R^2 = 0.99$) with no drift during the entire co-location period. The O_3 sensors also agreed well among each other, with an Adj. R^2 of 0.98. The major effect on the accuracy of the NO_2 readings was the noise. The results were

however satisfactory with sufficient averaging: we chose 1 h as the time-scale for consistency with practise reporting results from reference stations. As noted above, the standard deviation in the 60-point mean of the raw signal from the NO_2 sensor was equivalent to $2.5 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{NO}_2$. We determined the measurement model coefficients (equation (5)) using the final 10 days of hourly-averaged data from the co-location, before deployment ('calibration period') and evaluated the accuracy and precision relative to the reference instruments using the previous 23 days of data ('test period'). The calibration period was chosen to be immediately prior to deployment to minimise the risk of drift during the deployment period. The test period was of similar length to the site deployment. For the aggregate of all ten NO_2 instruments the root mean square error (RMSE) from the 1:1 line was $5.5 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ (Fig. 3). For individual NO_2 instruments, the RMSE evaluated against the reference analyser ranged from 4.1 to $5.1 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ during the test period.

To illustrate the stability over time of the results, Fig. 4 shows the hourly-average midday NO_2 and O_3 concentration at the reference site for each of the ten sensors, compared with the reference analyser during the test period.

After the co-location at the reference site eight of the ten devices were then mounted at different sites across the study area. The instruments were mounted at approximately 3 m height in front of shops and businesses where an external power supply was available. Site photographs are given in the SI. One site (site H) was powered with solar panels and two were battery powered during daytime due to the mains supply being limited by timers. In addition, we measured wind direction and wind speed at site E using a sonic anemometer




Fig. 3. Scatter plot showing the relationship between reference data and the sensor-calculated NO_2 during the test period. Dotted is the 1:1 line; solid is the regression line.

(WindSonic, Gill Instruments Ltd.) that was installed on a lamp post 5 m above the sidewalk (wind data are shown in the SI).

The main concern relating to the data for the deployment period was to demonstrate the stability of the devices over time, and to demonstrate that the observed site-specific effects were significant relative to the errors of measurement. To evaluate the stability of the ozone sensors we used the mean-variance (MV) proxy matching procedure described in previous work (Miskell et al., 2016, 2018a). There were just two reference instruments available (at locations that were not in similar land use to the study site) – the motorway junction site

and a suburban site approximately 7 km distant, operated by Auckland City Council. We calculated apparent slope and offset using 3-day running mean and variance, as described previously (Miskell et al., 2018a) and did not note any significant drift.

Fig. 4 shows that, at the reference site before the deployment, midday NO_2 did not show any significant long-term trend. Therefore, as a further check to assess the stability of the NO_2 results during the deployment, we simply checked for any long-term trend in the hourly-averaged values at midday for each site. Fig. 5 shows the results for the eight deployment sites. Any trend was at most $5 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ across the whole deployment period.

4. Results

4.1. Spatial and temporal variability of NO_2 concentrations

Results from the low-cost instruments showed very strong gradients in NO_2 concentration in both time, and space, over short distances, of the order of 100 m. Mean diurnal NO_2 concentrations are illustrated in Fig. 6a, and the variability is further illustrated by the diurnal variation of the standard deviation of measurements over 1 h (Fig. 6b). In general, NO_2 concentrations were low, ranging from around $5 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ at night-time to a maximum between 25 and $30 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ during the morning rush hour on weekdays, close to heavily-trafficked intersections and bus stops (sites A, C and G; Fig. 6). In contrast, other sites, even relatively close by, showed maximum concentrations below $20 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ throughout the day. The evening peak was less distinct (Fig. 6). On weekends, NO_2 concentrations remained below $20 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ throughout the day with no distinct morning peak (Fig. 6). Ozone followed an opposite diurnal cycle to NO_2 with a maximum at site E and a minimum at sites A, C and G (see SI), consistent with titration of marine background O_3 against vehicle-emitted NO (Weissert et al., 2017).




Fig. 4. Mean hourly-averaged midday NO_2 and O_3 concentrations (error bars: standard deviation) for each of the ten instruments at the reference site compared with the reference analyser for the test period.




Fig. 5. Long-term trend for each site (instrument) of measured hourly-averaged midday NO₂ concentration during the deployment period illustrating small drift during the study period.




Fig. 6. Comparison of the diurnal variability across sites of the a) mean and b) standard deviation of NO₂ concentrations between weekday and weekends.

4.2. Time-dependent LUR model

Fig. 7 gives example correlations according to equation (2) of the hourly-averaged sensor measurements with the microscale LUR model, applied at the eight sites. It indicates that, while the static linear model

is reasonable (Adj. $R^2 = 0.70\text{--}0.96$ for the example shown in Fig. 7) there are some significant site-specific, time-dependent deviations.

Fig. 8 shows the hourly-averaged sensor data plotted against the hourly-averaged modelled NO₂ concentrations, $\bar{c}_{i,t}$ (equation (3)), for each site over the entire deployment period. The model in general




Fig. 7. Linear regression of hourly-averaged sensor results from one day against the static LUR model applied at the eight instrument sites. The black solid line is the slope from equation (2) and the black dashed lines are ± 1 standard error of the slope. The dotted red line is the 1:1 line. The panels are different hours of the day. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)




Fig. 8. Hourly averaged NO₂ concentrations measured at the eight sites against the modelled NO₂ concentrations ($\hat{c}_{i,t}$, equation (3)). The dashed line is the 1:1 line.

captured the time- and space-variation in NO₂.

Fig. 9 shows the difference between the modelled and measured concentrations, $\epsilon_{i,k}$ (equation (3)), coded by site, for the whole period of the study, plotted against the hourly-averaged modelled data and also shows the distribution of the difference at each site. Fig. 9 indicates that there is no concentration-dependent bias. Fig. 10 shows the mean diurnal difference averaged over the entire deployment period, between hourly-averaged measured and modelled NO₂ concentrations, evaluated for each site. These variations are small, but the errors are also correspondingly reduced by the averaging over 30 days: estimated standard deviation $\sim 1 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$. Figs. 9 and 10 show that there are site- and time-specific effects that are not captured by the model and that are not well-correlated with the modelled concentrations.

5. Discussion

Despite the low pollutant concentrations, the low-cost instruments successfully captured significant differences between the different sites. The model, fusing the low-cost sensor observations with the microscale LUR model, captured the time and space variation reasonably well. The distribution of the difference between the modelled and measured NO₂

concentrations shown in Figure 10 shows small offsets for different instruments, that are within the error estimates developed in the ‘methods’ section. Superimposed on these offsets, a clear diurnal variation can be seen at some sites and not at others, of the difference between measurement and model, averaged over the whole deployment (Fig. 10). Although the number of sites in the study was small, a tentative assessment of the site- and time-specific effects could be made, relating the observations to specific urban design features. Table 1 shows the dominant parameters for the LUR model at each instrument site, and also notes the side of the road, the presence of traffic lights and the direction with respect to the dominant direction of traffic, which determines whether traffic is stationary during the rush hour or accelerating on the instrument side of the road. The highest concentrations, which also had a notable diurnal variation, were observed at a site under an awning directly next to a bus stop, (site A and C, respectively). Sites close to bus stops but not close to traffic lights (D, E, F) did not show a significant diurnal variation. Site H was unusual, showing a diurnal variation with the lowest concentrations during the day.

LUR modelling studies undertaken at the local (Miskell et al., 2015) and microscale (Weissert et al., 2018) in Auckland have identified the proximity and number of bus stops as key predictors for NO₂




Fig. 9. Variation of the difference between modelled and measured hourly-average NO₂ concentrations ($\epsilon_{i,k}$, equation (3)) with the modelled hourly-averaged concentration for the eight instrument sites, and the distribution of this difference at the different sites.




Fig. 10. The mean diurnal variability of $\epsilon_{L,k}$ at the instrument sites, k . The colours show where the $\epsilon_{L,k}$ model over- or underestimated NO_2 concentrations.

Table 1

Dominant parameters for the LUR model (bold parameters were significant in the LUR model development) and additional parameters that seem to be relevant at the instrument locations. Values are the characteristics of each of these parameters at each instrument site.

Site	Awning	Nr. of bus stops within 100 m	Traffic light within 100 m	Distance to bus stop (m)	Side of Street	Dominant direction to traffic light
A	Y	3	Y	3	W	Downstream
B	N	3	Y	30	E	Upstream
C	Y	4	Y	70	W	Upstream
D	Y	2	N	18	W	-
E	Y	2	N	10	E	-
F	N	2	N	15	E	-
G	Y	3	Y	61	W	Downstream
H	Y	1	N	37	W	-

concentrations. The importance of bus stops within a short distance within the LUR model emphasises the significance of diesel buses as the major source of NO_x emissions. A sizable share of NO_x emissions from diesel vehicles is associated with uphill driving, acceleration on a ramp, or positive accelerations from a standstill (Franco et al., 2014; Gis, 2017). For turbocharged diesel engines, NO emissions increase strongly with relative positive acceleration, defined as the integral of the product of instantaneous speed and instantaneous positive acceleration over a defined section of a driving schedule, and are also correlated with gear changes during the acceleration (Giakoumis and Triantafyllou, 2018; Giakoumis and Zachiotis, 2018). The occurrence of events such as these would vary across the day, and would depend on traffic lights, the dominant direction of traffic with respect to the lights, traffic density and the interaction of traffic lights with one another (reflected in the average transit time). A diurnal variation might thus be expected, associated with traffic lights. Sites D, E, F were some distance from traffic lights, which could account for the lack of diurnal variation of the difference between measurement and model at these sites. Site A, which recorded the highest concentrations, is upstream from a traffic light and on the west side of the road, where morning traffic is higher, and under an awning. It is directly by a bus stop. Further, it is on a slight hill, where traffic is accelerating away from the traffic light, and exit from the bus stop is impeded by parked cars. Buses at site A arrive around every 5 min throughout the day, likely explaining the continuously high NO_2 concentrations at this site. Whilst there is no bus stop very close to site C, this site is upstream from a traffic light, just after where a bus-only near-side lane terminates at a lane for cars

turning left at the traffic light (driving is on the left in New Zealand). Buses, which pass this site around every 5 min throughout the day, are thus stopped near the site by the traffic waiting to turn (see SI for site photos). Whilst measured concentrations at Site H were low, this site was unusual in showing a diurnal variation with overestimated concentrations during the morning and underestimated concentrations in the evening. There are a number of fast-food outlets near this site, which are busiest at night, which may explain the observed variation. Although the offsets for the different instruments were within the error estimates for the model, some tentative deductions can be made in relation to the results from sites E, F and G. Site F was not directly next to a bus stop but it was located between the entry and exit of a large car park hence where vehicles would be accelerating, possibly explaining the higher NO_2 concentrations measured by the instruments compared to the model. Similar to site A, site G was directly downstream from a traffic light, likely explaining the higher measured NO_2 concentrations. Site E was close to a bus stop and under an awning, where higher NO_2 concentrations would be expected, yet measured NO_2 concentrations were low. However, there is a potential effect of the siting: the instrument was against the wall directly under the awning, where air circulation may be limited. Previous studies have shown that pollutant concentrations can be significantly lower at the building side than the kerbside (Moodley et al., 2011) and that concentrations decrease with increasing height (Vardoulakis et al., 2011), both effects possibly explaining the lower NO_2 concentrations recorded by the instrument. The diffusion tubes, which were used to develop the LUR model, on the other hand were directly on the kerbside and at a lower height (2 m).

While NO_2 concentrations in Auckland are relatively low compared to other cities, our results indicate that the largest contribution of high NO_2 concentrations is likely related to buses, which are almost exclusively diesel operated in Auckland, and start-stop traffic at traffic lights. Considering that regular commuters wait at bus stops twice a day, five times per week, which accumulates to around 60 min per week, and wait at intersections to cross the road, this can contribute considerably to an individual's exposure (Velasco and Tan, 2016).

6. Conclusion

We have presented a novel approach to combine a network of low-cost air quality instruments with microscale LUR models to interpolate and map NO_2 concentrations at 50 m spatial scale and hourly time-scale. With attention to detail, specifically to the electrochemical NO_2 sensor noise, and to reliable correction for the ozone interference, low-cost NO_2 instruments give data that are sufficiently accurate to capture

the important spatio-temporal variations of concentration of this pollutant in an urban environment, even if the concentrations are low. The study has also shown how analysis of differences between the measured and modelled concentrations can reveal specific urban design features that are not necessarily well-captured by simple linear LUR models but which might contribute disproportionately to population exposure. Further research is needed to assess site and time specific effects across different seasons and weather conditions. However, to date long-term NO₂ data from dense low-cost instrument networks are rare largely due to sensor drift and the lack of efficient calibration procedures.

The ability to map air pollutants across a grid for any given day and hour at a high spatial resolution offers new opportunities for exposure assessments that take account of people moving through micro-environments at different times of the day/week/year. For example, it allows comparing the air pollution exposure along different routes to a supermarket, school or restaurant at different hours of the day, different days of the week or month. The method could be used as a tool to identify pollution hot spots at different times of the day, which could help urban planning.

This study has indicated the importance of site-specific interaction effects between land use variables, that are not well handled by simple spatial linear models. Models which incorporate both space- and time-dependent variables, and which can be constructed through a measurement programme using simple hand-held sensors (Miskell et al., 2018b) offer a possible way forward. Another approach may be the use of geographically weighted regression models, that account for non-stationary spatial effects (Song et al., 2019). Limitations are also imposed by siting requirement for the low-cost instruments, chiefly access to power. Specifically, there is the need to ensure that the sampled air is representative of the main land use. If the network is large enough, the LUR model may be built directly using the output from the low-cost air quality instruments. This may also allow investigation of space- and time-dependent effects and model adjustments in more detail.

Acknowledgments

We thank Gwynn Evans for his help during instrument placement and the shop owners for generously providing permission to install the instruments. This work was financially supported by the NZ Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, contract UOAX1413.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data related to this article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.06.019>.

References

- Air Quality Sensor Performance Evaluation Center, 2018. Field Evaluation Aeroqual AQY (v0.5). Retrieved from: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/eq-spec/field-evaluations/aeroqual-aqy-v0-5-field-evaluation.pdf?sfvrsn=4>.
- Aliwell, S.R., Halsall, J.F., Pratt, K.F., O'Sullivan, J., Jones, R.L., Cox, R.A., Utembe, S.R., Hansford, G.M., Williams, D.E., 2001. Ozone sensors based on WO₃: a model for sensor drift and a measurement correction method. *Meas. Sci. Technol.* 12, 684–690.
- Auckland Transport, 2017. *Dominion Road Upgrade*.
- Baron, R., Saffell, J.R., 2017. Amperometric gas sensors as a low cost emerging technology platform for air quality monitoring applications: a review. *ACS Sens.* 2, 1553–1566.
- Bart, M., Williams, D.E., Ainslie, B., McKendry, I., Salmond, J., Grange, S.K., Alavi-Shoshtari, M., Steyn, D., Henshaw, G.S., 2014. High density ozone monitoring using gas sensitive semi-conductor sensors in the lower Fraser valley, British Columbia. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 48, 3970–3977. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es404610t>.
- Cordero, J.M., Borge, R., Narros, A., 2018. Using statistical methods to carry out in field calibrations of low cost air quality sensors. *Sensor. Actuator. B Chem.* 267, 245–254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2018.04.021>.
- Cordioli, M., Pironi, C., De Munari, E., Marmioli, N., Lauriola, P., Ranzi, A., 2017. Combining land use regression models and fixed site monitoring to reconstruct spatiotemporal variability of NO₂ concentrations over a wide geographical area. *Sci. Total Environ.* 574, 1075–1084. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.09.089>.
- Cross, E.S., Williams, L.R., Lewis, D.K., Magoon, G.R., Onasch, T.B., Kaminsky, M.L., Worsnop, D.R., Jayne, J.T., 2017. Use of electrochemical sensors for measurement of

- air pollution: correcting interference response and validating measurements. *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* 10, 3575–3588. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-10-3575-2017>.
- Deville Cavellin, L., Weichenthal, S., Tack, R., Ragetti, M.S., Smargiassi, A., Hatzopoulou, M., 2016. Investigating the use of portable air pollution sensors to capture the spatial variability of traffic-related air pollution. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50, 313–320. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b04235>.
- Feinberg, S., Williams, R., Hagler, G.S.W., Rickard, J., Brown, R., Garver, D., Harshfield, G., Stauffer, P., Mattson, E., Judge, R., Garvey, S., 2018. Long-term evaluation of air sensor technology under ambient conditions in Denver, Colorado. *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* 11, 4605–4615. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-4605-2018>.
- Franco, V., Sánchez, F.P., German, J., Mock, P., 2014. Real-world exhaust emissions from modern diesel cars - a meta-analysis of pems emissions data from EU (Euro 6) and US (tier 2 bin 5/ulev ii) diesel passenger cars. Part 1: aggregated results. In: *International Council on Clean Transportation Europe, Neue Promenade 6*, pp. 10178 (Berlin).
- Giakoumis, E.G., Triantafyllou, G., 2018. Analysis of the effect of vehicle, driving and road parameters on the transient performance and emissions of a turbocharged truck. *Energ.* 11, 295. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en11020295>.
- Giakoumis, E.G., Zachiotis, A.T., 2018. A comprehensive comparative investigation of a heavy-duty vehicle's performance, consumption and emissions during eight driving cycles. *Int. J. Ambient Energy* 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01430750.2018.1525578>.
- Gis, M., 2017. Comparative studies exhaust emissions of the euro VI buses with diesel engine and spark-ignition engine cng fuelled in real traffic conditions. In: *VII International Congress on Combustion Engines, International Congress on Combustion Engines*, MATEC Web of Conferences.
- Hansford, G.M., Freshwater, R.A., Bosch, R.A., Cox, R.A., Jones, R.L., Pratt, K.F., Williams, D.E., 2005. A low cost instrument based on a solid state sensor for balloon-borne atmospheric O₃ profile sounding. *J. Environ. Monit.* 7, 158–162. <https://doi.org/10.1039/b412184h>.
- Hoek, G., Beelen, R., de Hoogh, K., Vienneau, D., Gulliver, J., Fischer, P., Briggs, D., 2008. A review of land-use regression models to assess spatial variation of outdoor air pollution. *Atmos. Environ.* 42, 7561–7578.
- Hossain, M., Saffell, J.R., Baron, R., 2016. Differentiating NO₂ and O₃ at low cost air quality amperometric gas sensors. *ACS Sens.* 1, 1291–1294.
- Jerrett, M., Arain, A., Kanaroglou, P., Beckerman, B., Potoglou, D., Sahuvaroglu, T., Morrison, J., Giovis, C., 2005. A review and evaluation of intraurban air pollution exposure models. *J. Expo. Anal. Environ. Epidemiol.* 15, 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.jea.7500388>.
- Johnson, K., MacNeill, M., Grgicak-Mannion, A., Nethery, E., Xu, X., Dales, R., Rasmussen, P., Wheeler, A.J., 2013. Development of temporally refined land-use regression models predicting daily household-level air pollution in a panel study of lung function among asthmatic children. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* 23, 259–267.
- Lewis, A.C., Lee, J.D., Edwards, P.M., Shaw, M.D., Evans, M.J., Moller, S.J., Smith, K.R., Buckley, J.W., Ellis, M., Gillot, S.R., White, A., 2016. Evaluating the performance of low cost chemical sensors for air pollution research. *Faraday Discuss* 189, 85–103.
- Lin, C., Masey, N., Wu, H., Jackson, M., Carruthers, D., Reis, S., Doherty, R., Beverland, I., Heal, M., 2017. Practical field calibration of portable monitors for mobile measurements of multiple air pollutants. *Atmosphere* 8, 231. <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos8120231>.
- Masiol, M., Zikova, N., Chalupa, D.C., Rich, D.Q., Ferro, A.R., Hopke, P.K., 2018. Hourly land-use regression models based on low-cost pm monitor data. *Environ. Res.* 167, 7–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.052>.
- Mead, M.I., Popoola, O.A.M., Stewart, G.B., Landshoff, P., Calleja, M., Hayes, M., Baldovi, J.J., McLeod, M.W., Hodgson, T.F., Dicks, J., Lewis, A., Cohen, J., Baron, R., Saffell, J.R., Jones, R.L., 2013. The use of electrochemical sensors for monitoring urban air quality in low-cost, high-density networks. *Atmos. Environ.* 70, 186–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.11.060>.
- Miskell, G., Salmond, J., Alavi-Shoshtari, M., Bart, M., Ainslie, B., Grange, S., McKendry, I.G., Henshaw, G.S., Williams, D.E., 2016. Data verification tools for minimizing management costs of dense air-quality monitoring networks. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50, 835–846. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b04421>.
- Miskell, G., Salmond, J., Longley, I., Dirks, K.N., 2015. A novel approach in quantifying the effect of urban design features on local-scale air pollution in central urban areas. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 49, 9004–9011. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b00476>.
- Miskell, G., Salmond, J.A., Williams, D.E., 2018a. Solution to the problem of calibration of low-cost air quality measurement sensors in networks. *ACS Sens.* 3, 832–843. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssensors.8b00074>.
- Miskell, G., Salmond, J.A., Williams, D.E., 2018b. Use of a handheld low-cost sensor to explore the effect of urban design features on local-scale spatial and temporal air quality variability. *Sci. Total Environ.* 619–620, 480–490. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.11.024>.
- Moodley, K.G., Singh, S., Govender, S., 2011. Passive monitoring of nitrogen dioxide in urban air: a case study of Durban metropolis, South Africa. *J. Environ. Manag.* 92, 2145–2150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2011.03.040>.
- Mukerjee, S., Smith, L., Neas, L., Norris, G., 2012. Evaluation of land use regression models for nitrogen dioxide and benzene in four us cities. *Sci. World J.* 2012, 865150. <https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/865150>.
- Munir, S., Mayfield, M., Coca, D., Jubb, S.A., Osammar, O., 2019. *Analysing the Performance of Low-Cost Air Quality Sensors, Their Drivers, Relative Benefits and Calibration in Cities - a Case Study in Sheffield*. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. pp. 191.
- NIWA, 2017. <https://www.niwa.co.nz/climate/summaries/monthly/climate-summary-for-february-2017>.
- Nethery, E., Teschke, K., Brauer, M., 2008. Predicting personal exposure of pregnant women to traffic-related air pollutants. *Sci. Total Environ.* 395, 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2008.05.011>.

- [org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2008.01.047](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2008.01.047).
- Pang, X., Shaw, M.D., Gillot, S., Lewis, A.C., 2018. The impacts of water vapour and co-pollutants on the performance of electrochemical gas sensors used for air quality monitoring. *Sensor. Actuator. B Chem.* 266, 674–684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2018.03.144>.
- Pang, X., Shaw, M.D., Lewis, A.C., Carpenter, L.J., Batchellier, T., 2017. Electrochemical ozone sensors: a miniaturised alternative for ozone measurements in laboratory experiments and air-quality monitoring. *Sensor. Actuator. B Chem.* 240, 829–837. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2016.09.020>.
- Popoola, O.A.M., Carruthers, D., Lad, C., Bright, V.B., Mead, M.I., Stettler, M.E.J., Saffell, J.R., Jones, R.L., 2018. Use of networks of low cost air quality sensors to quantify air quality in urban settings. *Atmos. Environ.* 194, 58–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2018.09.030>.
- Senaratne, I., Shooter, D., 2004. Elemental composition in source identification of brown haze in Auckland, New Zealand. *Atmos. Environ.* 38, 3049–3059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2004.02.046>.
- Slama, R., Morgenstern, V., Cyrus, J., Zutavern, A., Herbarh, O., Wichmann, H.E., Heinrich, J., LISA Study Group, 2007. Traffic-related atmospheric pollutants levels during pregnancy and offspring's term birth weight: a study relying on a land-use regression exposure model. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 115, 1283–1292.
- Son, Y., Osornio-Vargas, Á.R., O'Neill, M.S., Hystad, P., Texcalac-Sangrador, J.L., Ohman-Strickland, P., Meng, Q., Schwander, S., 2018. Land use regression models to assess air pollution exposure in Mexico city using finer spatial and temporal input parameters. *Sci. Total Environ.* 639, 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.05.144>.
- Song, W., Jia, H., Li, Z., Tang, D., Wang, C., 2019. Detecting urban land-use configuration effects on NO₂ and no variations using geographically weighted land use regression. *Atmos. Environ.* 197, 166–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2018.10.031>.
- Statistics New Zealand, 2013. 2013 Census Usually Resident Population Counts.
- Utembe, S.R., Hansford, G.M., Sanderson, M.G., Freshwater, R.A., Pratt, K.F.E., Williams, D.E., Cox, R.A., Jones, R.L., 2006. An ozone monitoring instrument based on the tungsten trioxide (WO₃) semiconductor. *Sensor. Actuator. B Chem.* 114, 507–512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2005.04.049>.
- Vardoulakis, S., Solazzo, E., Lumbreras, J., 2011. Intra-urban and street scale variability of btex, NO₂ and O₃ in Birmingham, UK: implications for exposure assessment. *Atmos. Environ.* 45, 5069–5078. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.06.038>.
- Velasco, E., Tan, S.H., 2016. Particles exposure while sitting at bus stops of hot and humid Singapore. *Atmos. Environ.* 142, 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.07.054>.
- Weissert, L.F., Salmond, J.A., Miskell, G., Alavi-Shoshtari, M., Grange, S.K., Henshaw, G.S., Williams, D.E., 2017. Use of a dense monitoring network of low-cost instruments to observe local changes in the diurnal ozone cycles as marine air passes over a geographically isolated urban centre. *Sci. Total Environ.* 575, 67–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.09.229>.
- Weissert, L.F., Salmond, J.A., Miskell, G., Alavi-Shoshtari, M., Williams, D.E., 2018. Development of a microscale land use regression model for predicting NO₂ concentrations at a heavy trafficked suburban area in Auckland, NZ. *Sci Total Environ.* 619–620, 112–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.11.028>.
- Williams, D.E., Aliwell, S.R., Pratt, K.F., Caruana, D.J., Jones, R.L., Cox, R.A., Hansford, G.M., Halsall, J., 2002. Modelling the response of a tungsten oxide semiconductor as a gas sensor for the measurement of ozone. *Meas. Sci. Technol.* 13, 923–931.
- Williams, D.E., Henshaw, G.S., Bart, M., Laing, G., Wagner, J., Naisbitt, S., Salmond, J.A., 2013. Validation of low-cost ozone measurement instruments suitable for use in an air-quality monitoring network. *Meas. Sci. Technol.* 24, 065803. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0957-0233/24/6/065803>.
- Xie, S., Sridhar, S., Metcalfe, J., 2014. Auckland Air Emissions Inventory, Auckland Council. technical report, TR2014/015. Auckland Council Auckland, New Zealand.
- Yeganeh, B., Hewson, M.G., Clifford, S., Tavassoli, A., Knibbs, L.D., Morawska, L., 2018. Estimating the spatiotemporal variation of NO₂ concentration using an adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system. *Environ. Model. Softw.* 100, 222–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2017.11.031>.