Arin et al.

Iraqi Journal of Science, 2024, Vol. 65, No.1, pp: 414- 430 DOI: 10.24996/ijs.2024.65.1.34





ISSN: 0067-2904

# Air Quality Analysis of the Capitol City in Developing Countries During COVID-19 Emergency Care Based on Internet of Things Data

### Ikrar Adinata Arin<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Arief Ramadhan<sup>3</sup>, Edi Abdurachman<sup>1</sup>, Agung Trisetyarso<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Zarlis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>BINUS Graduate Program, Doctor of Computer Science, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia <sup>2</sup>School of Information Systems, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia <sup>3</sup>School of Computing, Telkom University, Bandung, Indonesia

Received: 28/6/2022 Accepted: 6/1/2023 Published: 30/1/2024

#### Abstract

This paper attempts to develop statistical modeling for air-conditioning analysis in Jakarta, Indonesia, during an emergency state of community activity restrictions enforcement (Emergency CARE), using a variety of parameters such as  $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ ,  $SO_2$ , CO,  $O_3$ , and  $NO_2$  from five IoT-based air monitoring systems. The parameters mentioned above are critical for assessing the air quality conditions and concentration of air pollutants. Outdoor air pollution concentration variations before and after the Emergency CARE, which was held in Indonesia during the COVID-19 pandemic on July 3-21, 2021, were studied. An air quality monitoring system based on the IoT generates sensor data that is collected from a government-integrated data portal, and that can be analyzed statistically. There are two main types of ANOVA (Analysis of Variance): one-way (or unidirectional) and two-way, which are applied to the collected sensor data and hypotheses calculated using ANOVA. ANOVA one-way was found to be more effective for analyzing air quality condition data. During emergency CARE, the average concentrations of  $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ , and  $O_3$  from the air quality monitoring system show values that have exceeded the standard Air Quality Index (AQI), while the concentrations of CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, and SO<sub>2</sub> are still below the applicable AQI values. It stated that air pollution in Jakarta worsened during the implementation of Emergency CARE.

Keywords: Air quality, COVID-19 pandemic, IoT, Statistical analysis.

#### **1. Introduction**

The Coronavirus Disease 2019, also referred to as "COVID-19," was named by the WHO, or World Health Organization, as a virus that manifested symptoms in the first known case of pneumonia (with an unknown etiology) in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China [1]. SARS-CoV-2 causes COVID-19, an infectious disease caused by the coronavirus. Most infected with the virus will suffer from mild to moderate respiratory illnesses and recover without special treatment. However, some individuals will become gravely ill and require medical care. People who are older or who have pre-existing conditions such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, chronic respiratory disease, or cancer are more likely to develop serious illnesses. At any age, anyone can contract COVID-19 and become gravely ill or die [2].

<sup>\*</sup> Email: <u>ikrar@binus.ac.id</u>

As of May 1, 2022, this virus had infected approximately 226 countries and territories worldwide [3]. This virus is known to be extremely dangerous and is one of the world's deadliest viruses. The World Health Organization (WHO) declared the COVID-19 pandemic an international public health emergency on January 30, 2020. This is a big problem for countries with weak health systems [4].

### 1.1 COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia

The Republic of Indonesia is one of the most populated nations worldwide and among the largest countries by total area [5]. Indonesia is the world's largest island country and the 14<sup>th</sup> largest country by area, at 1,904,569 square kilometers (km<sup>2</sup>) (735,358 square miles), Java Island, where Indonesia is located, is home to more than half of the country's population. According to official population data from 2010, Indonesia has eleven cities with populations over one million. Estimates from 2014, though, show that there are now fourteen cities with more than a million people [6].

The COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia is part of a global pandemic of the coronavirus disease, which has been causing severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS-CoV-2) since 2019 [7]. Although surrounded by infected nations such as the Philippines, Malaysia, Australia, and Singapore, Indonesia reported zero cases of COVID-19 from January to February 2020. Additionally, flight schedules continued to operate from countries with high infection rates, such as Thailand and South Korea. Researchers from Harvard University have expressed concern that Indonesia is unprepared for an outbreak and that COVID-19 cases may go undetected [8].

It was confirmed on March 2, 2020, that the virus had spread to Indonesia after a dance instructor and her mother tested positive for the virus. Both were exposed to the virus by Japanese citizens [9]. By April 9, 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic had covered almost 34 provinces in Indonesia. Jakarta, West Java, and Central Java are the provinces hardest hit, accounting for nearly half of all cases nationwide [10].

### **1.2 Government Response**

The governments of each nation have implemented diverse lockdown tactics to prevent the spread of the COVID-19 virus. The government of the Republic of Indonesia used large-scale social restrictions (PSBB/LSRR) in areas with a high risk of virus spread as a strategic action to reduce the risk of virus spread [11].

With this situation and conditions, all modes of public transportation must still operate with reduced hours and capacities, but stores and offices that are not essential must close. Restaurants and food stalls are only open for takeout and delivery, while essential and market businesses are permitted to operate within a social distance. Depending on the region, private transportation passenger restrictions and mask requirements will be in effect [12], [13], [14], and [15]. The local government implements the restrictions with approval from the Ministry of Health.

It includes measures such as the closure of public spaces and schools, the restriction of public transportation, and the limitation of travel to and from restricted areas. Instead of implementing a lockdown and a nationwide curfew, the Republic of Indonesia implemented "large-scale social restrictions" (Indonesian: Pembatasan Sosial Berskala Besar, abbreviated as PSBB). The Ministry of Home Affairs changed the name of the measure in Java and Bali on January 7,

2021. It is now called the Community Activities Restrictions Enforcement, or CARE (Indonesian: Pemberlakuan Pembatasan Kegiatan Masyarakat, or PPKM) [16].

The Indonesian government implemented CARE for the first time on January 11–25, 2021. CARE was implemented for two weeks in Java and Bali in accordance with the instructions of Minister of Home Affairs No. 1, 2021. On July 21, 2021, Tito Karnavian, the Minister of Home Affairs, finally announced the new term for the CARE mechanism, namely the first-through-fourth level of CARE shown in Table 1.

| Level | Case Confirmed (people) | In Patient (people) | Victim Dead (people) | Risk Level   |
|-------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Ι     | Less than 20            | Less than 5         | Less than 1          | Low          |
| II    | 20-50                   | 5 - 10              | Less than 2          | Intermediate |
| III   | 50-100                  | 10 - 30             | 2-5                  | High         |
| IV    | More than 150           | More than 30        | More than 5          | Very High    |

#### Table 1: CARE levels.

Based on a region's transmission rate and COVID-19 active cases, the government can determine whether CARE can be implemented. Each case was counted in terms of 100,000 people per week [17, 18]. There are CARE implementations such as "applied CARE," "micro-scale CARE," "Emergency CARE," and "CARE Levels 1-4." The government implemented a number of policies in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. During pandemic lockdowns, it was believed that the decrease in human mobility and economic activities would reduce air pollution because there would be less traffic and industrial activities, and restrictions on human activities during the lockdown purportedly contributed to the reduction of global carbon emissions [19].

### **1.3 Related Works**

Indonesia's capital, Jakarta, is the fifth most polluted capital in 2019 because Jakarta is the largest city of industry and mobility in Indonesia [20]. Several studies have examined the impact of lockdowns on air quality in several countries. Bao [21] and Wang [22] investigated the effect of lockdown on six air pollutants (PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub>) in northern China. During the lockdown, they discovered that the air quality improved due to decreased emissions from cars and secondary emissions from industry sectors.

Mahato [23] studied the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the lockdown in New Delhi, and India's air quality.  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$  both decreased by fifty percent, while  $NO_2$  and CO decreased by fifty-two percent and thirty-three percent, respectively.

Adam [24] also conducted research to determine the air quality impact of the lockdown in Ontario, Canada. The results revealed that the concentration of  $PM_{2.5}$  did not change from before, whereas the concentrations of  $O_3$  and  $NO_2$  decreased moderately and significantly, respectively. Similar research has also been undertaken in a number of other nations, such as Iraq by Hashim [25], the United Kingdom by Ropkins [26], the United States by Chen [27], Bangladesh by Rahman [28], and Egypt by Aboud El-Magd [29]. Some nations had a considerable decrease in several air pollutants, while others did not.

According to the author's knowledge, no statistical modeling and analysis studies on air conditioning analysis in Indonesia have been conducted as of yet, especially in Jakarta, one of the capital cities in developing countries. Consequently, this study aimed to examine the air quality during Emergency CARE in Jakarta. An ANOVA statistic was used to analyze the air

quality of the data collected from the IoT system [30]. These analyses can also educate the IoT system to make decisions whenever any air pollution parameters indicate an abnormal change.

### 2. Material

# 2.1 Study Area

Air pollution is a decrease in air quality, resulting in a decrease in the air's usability to the point where it can no longer serve its intended purpose. As a source of pollution, this item is both a source of movable and immovable activity. Monitoring ambient and emitted air quality, followed by evaluation and analysis, is one of the methods for controlling air pollution. Local governments are required by the Minister of the Environment's Regulation No. 12 of 2010 to conduct air quality monitoring and evaluate the results of ambient air quality monitoring [31]. Table 2 shows a brief description of each air pollutant parameter.

| No | Air Pollutant                              | Description  |
|----|--|--|
| 1  | Particulate<br>Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )  | $PM_{10}$ is a mixture of particles suspended in the air that do not exceed 10 micrograms in diameter. In urban areas, the primary sources of $PM_{10}$ are construction, transportation, and industrial activities, particularly the metal industry.  |
| 2  | Particulate<br>Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) | PM <sub>2.5</sub> is a mixture of particles suspended in the air that do not exceed 2.5 micrograms in diameter. It has very subtle physical characteristics, can enter the inner respiratory tract, and has a long-term negative effect on human health.   |
| 3  | Sulfur<br>Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )       | Sources of SO <sub>2</sub> are generally from fuels containing sulfur, such as diesel-fueled motor vehicles, and from industries that have fossil fuel combustion activities.  |
| 4  | Carbon<br>Monoxide<br>(CO)                 | Sources of CO emissions are mainly from motorized vehicles (traffic density) when<br>incomplete fuel combustion occurs. The presence of high levels of CO in the air has an<br>impact on public health.  |
| 5  | Ozone (O <sub>3</sub> )                    | Ozone is a secondary air pollutant formed in the presence of nitrogen oxide compounds and VOCs, assisted by solar radiation energy. In cities with high temperatures. In general, the reaction rate for the formation of $O_3$ is high, with the precursor source being dominated by motor vehicles. |
| 6  | Nitro dioxide<br>(NO <sub>2</sub> )        | Nitrogen dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> ) is a pollutant that also has a close relationship with emissions from burning fuel oil, such as in motor vehicles and industry.  |

### Table 2: Air pollutant parameter

The development of infrastructure and transportation sectors in the Jakarta area will have positive and negative impacts on the community. One of the negative impacts that arise is air pollution, in the form of a decrease in ambient air quality and noise. When air pollution happens, it can hurt people's health, especially their lungs, and it will also have an effect on the environment [19].

Therefore, the Jakarta Provincial Government has continuously monitored ambient air quality and has set the Air Pollution Standard Index (ISPU), which is shown in Figure 1. ISPU is a description of ambient air quality conditions in certain locations based on the impact on human health, aesthetic value, and other living things [11].



Figure 1: ISPU block diagram

The ISPU value is obtained from an automatic air quality monitoring system (AQMS) that has been installed at 5 locations, namely the Bundaran Hotel Indonesia (HI), Lubang Buaya, Jagakarsa, Kelapa Gading, and Kebon Jeruk. So, it is hoped that the air quality will be depicted in the 5 administrative city areas in Jakarta, as shown in Figure 2.



Figure 2: Reference map of AQMS Jakarta

| Tuble et HQHID | b ultur tu                                      |                    |
|----------------|---|--------------------|
| Station Code   | Location  | Coordinates        |
| DKI1           | Bundaran HI – Jakarta Pusat (road area)         | 106.8235; -6.19466 |
| DKI2           | Kelapa Gading – North Jakarta (commercial area) | 106.9108; -6.15357 |
| DKI3           | Jagakarsa – South Jakarta (housing area)        | 106.8037; -6.35693 |
| DKI4           | Lubang Buaya – East Jakarta (mixed area)        | 106.9092; -6.28889 |
| DKI5           | Kebon Jeruk – West Jakarta (housing area)       | 106.7525; -6.20737 |

### Table 3: AQMS Jakarta

# 2.2 Sampling

The Indonesian government implemented CARE for the first time on January 11–25, 2021. The two-week CARE implementation was carried out in Java and Bali in accordance with Instruction No. 1 (2021) of the Minister of Home Affairs. Several provinces had previously implemented large-scale social restrictions (LSSR) to prevent the spread of COVID-19 in 2020.

The first phase of CARE has been implemented in seven provinces on the Java and Bali islands, namely Jakarta, Banten, West Java, Central Java, Yogyakarta, East Java, and Bali. The government has extended CARE through the Instruction of the Minister of Home Affairs No. 2, 2021. The second stage of CARE took place between January 26 and February 8, 2021. In this second phase, the operating hours of shopping centers or malls are changed and should be closed at 8:00 PM WIB.



Figure 3: Implementation of CARE COVID-19 Jakarta

CARE has reverted back to micro-based CARE on February 9–22, 2021, following the implementation of two previous iterations that produced economically ineffective results. As in the past, a number of provinces and municipalities have implemented micro-PPKM. In micro-PPKM, arrangements have been made for the establishment of COVID-19 handling posts at the village and sub-district levels; the operating hours of shopping centers or malls are less strictly regulated, specifically until 9:00 PM WIB; and there are fewer office restrictions, with fifty percent of employees permitted to work from home (WFH).

Emergency CARE is in effect from July 3, 2021, through July 25, 2021, and aims to reduce daily confirmed case additions to below 10,000. This government program was put into place in 136 cities across the Republic of Indonesia. The level of care was based on the assessment value and the number of hospital beds, as well as transmission rate and response capacity indicators.

The CARE levels 1 through 4 were determined based on an evaluation of the pandemic COVID-19 situation, which serves as an indicator for intensifying or reducing efforts to prevent and defeat the COVID-19 pandemic. It's possible that a particular area was at level 3 one day but rose to level 4 the following week due to non-compliance with health protocols, overcrowding at the community level, etc.

To analyze the air quality in Jakarta during Emergency CARE, air quality parameter data such as  $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ ,  $SO_2$ , CO,  $O_3$ , and  $NO_2$  were extracted from the results of air quality monitoring stations (AQMS) located in five areas. The Jakarta Provincial Integrated Data Portal [32] was used to obtain air quality data.

The data was divided into three groups: Pre-Emergency CARE (June 2021), During Emergency CARE (July 2021), and Post Emergency CARE (August 2021). On July 12, 2021, there were 460 available records and 1 missing record at DKI4, which was completed via interpolation due to unknown causes.

| Station Code | PM <sub>10</sub> | PM2.5 | SO <sub>2</sub> | CO | <b>O</b> 3 | NO <sub>2</sub> |
|--------------|------------------|-------|-----------------|----|------------|-----------------|
| DKI4         | 0                | 0     | 0               | 0  | 0          | 0               |

Table 4 : Missing data on AQMS during Jun-Aug 2021

### 2.3 IoT System Specification

Based on research done by the author [33], PT. Trusur Superior Teknusa built the DKI Jakarta province's Air Quality Monitoring System (AQMS). The Internet of Things (IoT) is nothing more than enabling actual physical objects to communicate over the internet. Creating a network of physical objects that can communicate, sense, collaborate, and interact using embedded technology is the definition of the Internet of Things (IoT).IoT could be a network of interconnected computing devices, mechanical and digital machines, objects, animals, or those with unique identifiers and the ability to transfer data over a network without requiring human-to-human or human-to-computer interaction. Figure 4 shows the sensor device that is used by AQMS Trusur® [34].



Figure 4 : Trusur® IoT sensor (a) Trusur AQMS® (b) ISPUTEK® (c) ISPUTEN® (d) ISPUGAS®

• Trusur AQMS®: an air quality monitoring system and instrumentation that operates continuously and in real time.

• ISPUTEK<sup>®</sup>: mobile station with gas parameters:  $PM_{10}$ ,  $SO_2$ , CO,  $O_3$ , and  $NO_2$  and also weather parameters (temperature, humidity, speed, and wind direction), GPS.

ISPUTEN<sup>®</sup>: mobile station with particulate parameters (PM<sub>10</sub> and/or PM<sub>2.5</sub>), which are equipped with weather, temperature, humidity, wind speed and direction, and GPS parameters.
ISPUGAS<sup>®</sup>: mobile station with gas parameters O<sub>3</sub>, CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and the ability to accommodate an additional parameter. The additional options are HC, VOC, NH<sub>3</sub>, or H<sub>2</sub>S.

# 3. Methodology

We have used statistical methods for air-conditioning quality analysis. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a collection of statistical models and their associated estimation procedures (such as "variation" among and between groups) that are used to analyze the differences between means. Ronald Fisher, a statistician, developed the analysis of variance [35]. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a statistical technique used to determine if the means of two or more groups differ significantly. ANOVA examines the effect of one or more variables by comparing the sample means. In other words, we can use a statistical method to compare these three treatment samples and illustrate how dissimilar they are from one another. In an ANOVA, the observed variance in a particular variable is decomposed into its various components based on the sources of variance. We use multivariate analysis to determine whether there is a significant difference between the means. The F-statistic is the computed variance between means divided by the variance of the sample. Figure 5 shows the hypothesis check for analysis.



Figure 5: The hypothesis check for analysis

# 4. Results Discussion

# 4.1 ANOVA One-way

We apply ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for air quality parameters such as particulate matter ( $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ ), sulfur dioxide ( $SO_2$ ), carbon monoxide (CO), ozone ( $O_3$ ), and nitrous dioxide ( $NO_2$ ). These parameters are categorized by the AQMS station location. Our investigation is divided into three COVID-19 CARE periods: pre-emergency care (June 2021),

emergency care (July 2021), and post-emergency care (Aug 2021). Emergency CARE is in effect in Jakarta from July 3-25, 2021.

ANOVA one-way on the samples and evaluate the prediction with regard to each individual air pollution parameter by determining the null hypothesis, i.e., the p-value must be bigger than the value.

We can make research hypotheses  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  as follows:

 $H_0$ : there is no effect of the air parameter value generated by the IoT sensor on the air quality of DKI Jakarta during Emergency CARE.

 $H_1$ : there is an effect of the air parameter value generated by the IoT sensor on the air quality at DKI Jakarta during Emergency CARE.

4.1.1 Pre emergency CARE

In the Pre-Emergency CARE period, while almost all cities and regions in Indonesia were still implementing CARE on a micro-scale, it was observed that the hot weather covered Jakarta, and the following observations were made:

- i.PM<sub>10</sub>: Among all stations, station DKI5 has the lowest mean PM<sub>10</sub> at 56.77  $\mu$ /m3 (Figure 6a), while station DKI3 has the highest variance at 102.88  $\mu$ /m3 (Figure 6b). Maximum mean PM<sub>10</sub> levels of 67.23  $\mu$ /m3 were recorded at station DKI2.
- ii.PM<sub>2.5</sub>: Station DKI1 has the lowest mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> value of 80,57  $\mu/m^3$ , and DKI5 has the largest variance of 1100,37  $\mu/m^3$  among all stations (Figure 6b); station DKI4 has the highest mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> value of 105,67  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by station DKI2 with a value of 88,87  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 6a).
- iii.SO<sub>2</sub>: Station DKI1 has the smallest mean value of 26,30  $\mu/m^3$  SO<sub>2</sub>, and DKI4 has the largest variance of 63.38  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 6b); the mean SO<sub>2</sub> at station DKI2 was the highest at 54,33  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by DKI3 stations with values of 48,87  $\mu/m^3$ , respectively (Figure 6a).
- iv.CO: The smallest mean CO value of  $8,33 \,\mu/m^3$  was observed at DKI3, while the largest variance of 44,95  $\mu/m^3$  was recorded at station DKI4 (Figure 6b); station DKI1 also recorded the highest mean CO of 16,97  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 6a).
- v.O<sub>3</sub>: Station DKI1 had the lowest mean O<sub>3</sub> at 19,97  $\mu/m^3$ , and station DKI2 had the largest variance at 128,02  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 6b); station DKI2 had the highest mean O<sub>3</sub> at 55,33  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by station DKI4 with a value of 27,20  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 6a).
- vi.NO<sub>2</sub>: Station DKI3 had the lowest mean NO<sub>2</sub> of 17,83  $\mu/m^3$ , and station DKI5 had the greatest variance of 154,05  $\mu/m^3$ , among all stations (Figure 6b); station DKI1 recorded the highest mean NO<sub>2</sub> value of 35,07  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 6a).



Figure 6: Pre emergency CARE (a) Mean (b) Variance

After doing statistical analysis using ANOVA one-way on the dataset for the air pollutant parameter, we can draw conclusions from the observations in Table 5 that: The p value of the air pollutant is 0.000 and was less than  $\alpha$  value of 0.05, so null hypotheses can be rejected.

| SUMMARY                      |     |       |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|------------------------------|-----|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Groups                       |     | Count | Sum      | Average  | Variance |          |          |          |
| $\mathbf{PM}_{10}$           |     | 150   | 9211     | 61,40667 | 73,71    | 73,71942 |          |          |
| <b>PM</b> <sub>2.5</sub>     |     | 150   | 13387    | 89,24667 | 470,8    | 470,8045 |          |          |
| $SO_2$                       |     | 150   | 5836     | 38,90667 | 149,6154 |          |          |          |
| СО                           |     | 150   | 2025     | 13,5     | 29,04362 |          |          |          |
| O3                           |     | 150   | 4350     | 29       | 244,9262 |          |          |          |
| NO <sub>2</sub>              |     | 150   | 4069     | 27,12667 | 92,59459 |          |          |          |
|                              |     |       |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              |     |       |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              |     |       |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| ANUVA<br>Source of Variation | n 🗌 |       | SS       | df       | MS       | F        | P-value  | F crit   |
|                              |     |       | 551042.0 | ui<br>-  | 114260.0 | <b>I</b> |          |          |
| Between Groups               |     |       | 5/1843,9 | 5        | 114368,8 | 646,941  | 4,7E-294 | 2,224116 |
| Within Groups                |     |       | 158044,9 | 894      | 176,784  |          |          |          |
|                              |     |       |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Total                        |     |       | 729888,8 | 899      |          |          |          |          |

| Table 5: | ANOVA | pre em | ergency | care |
|----------|-------|--------|---------|------|
|----------|-------|--------|---------|------|

Using the results of the calculations in the table above, it can be concluded that there are significant differences for each column of air parameters (PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, O<sub>3</sub>, and NO2), which means that all air parameter values generated by the IoT sensor have an influence on air quality in Jakarta during Pre Emergency PPKM.

 $PM_{2.5}$  has the largest mean value when compared to other types of air pollutants. DKI4 station on Lubang Buaya in Jakarta, close to a mixed area. At this location, domestic activities in the form of community activities are the dominant source of nearby air pollution.

### 4.1.2 During emergency CARE

Jakarta was one of the Indonesian cities that implemented Emergency CARE during the period, and the following observations were made:

- i.PM<sub>10</sub>: Among all stations, station DKI5 has the lowest mean PM<sub>10</sub> at 60.74  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 7a), while station DKI2 has the highest variance at 292.75  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 7b). Maximum mean PM<sub>10</sub> levels of 72.29  $\mu/m^3$  were recorded at station DKI2.
- ii.PM<sub>2.5</sub>: Station DKI1 has the lowest mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> value of 86,32  $\mu/m^3$ , and DKI2 has the largest variance of 1435,64  $\mu/m^3$  among all stations (Figure 7b); station DKI4 has the highest mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> value of 127,26  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by station DKI5 with a value of 101,58  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 7a).
- iii.SO<sub>2</sub>: Station DKI1 has the smallest mean value of 29,32  $\mu/m^3$  SO<sub>2</sub>, and DKI3 has the largest variance of 52,65  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 7b); the mean SO<sub>2</sub> at station DKI2 was the highest at 53,77  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by DKI3 stations with values of 46,42  $\mu/m^3$ , respectively (Figure 7a).

iv. CO: The smallest mean CO value of 7,71  $\mu/m^3$  was observed at station DKI3, while the largest variance of 19,91  $\mu/m^3$  was recorded at station DKI4 (Figure 7b); station DKI5 also recorded the highest mean CO of 11,61  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 7a).

v. O<sub>3</sub>: Station DKI1 had the lowest mean O<sub>3</sub> at 24,42  $\mu/m^3$ , and station DKI2 had the largest variance at 89,73  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 7b); station DKI2 had the highest mean O<sub>3</sub> at 54,00  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by station DKI5 with a value of 26,74  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 7a).

vi. NO<sub>2</sub>: Station DKI3 had the lowest mean NO<sub>2</sub> of 16,84  $\mu/m^3$ , and station DKI5 had the greatest variance of 80.12  $\mu/m^3$ , among all stations (Figure 7b); station DKI1 recorded the highest mean NO<sub>2</sub> value of 26,19  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 7a).



Figure 7: During emergency CARE (a) Mean (b) Variance

After doing statistical analysis using ANOVA one-way on the dataset for the air pollutant parameter, observations are listed in Table 6. The following air quality parameters are affected:

The p value of the air pollutant is 0.000 and was less than  $\alpha$  value of 0.05, so null hypotheses can be rejected.

| SUMMARY                  |   |          |       |          |          |          |         |
|--------------------------|---|----------|-------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| Groups                   |   | Count    | Sum   | Average  | Variance |          |         |
| $\mathbf{PM}_{10}$       |   | 155      | 10263 | 66,2129  | 176,9089 |          |         |
| <b>PM</b> <sub>2.5</sub> |   | 155      | 15432 | 99,56129 | 1004,196 |          |         |
| $SO_2$                   |   | 155      | 6203  | 40,01935 | 106,6165 |          |         |
| СО                       |   | 155      | 1644  | 10,60645 | 14,461   |          |         |
| <b>O</b> 3               |   | 155      | 4949  | 31,92903 | 175,1962 |          |         |
| $\mathbf{NO}_2$          |   | 155      | 3527  | 22,75484 | 46,47197 |          |         |
|                          |   |          |       |          |          |          |         |
|                          |   |          |       |          |          |          |         |
| ANOVA                    |   |          |       |          |          |          |         |
| Source of Variation      | n | SS       | df    | MS       | F        | P-value  | F crit  |
| Between Groups           |   | 821522,7 | 5     | 164304,5 | 646,9317 | 7,9E-299 | 2,22379 |
| Within Groups            |   | 234673   | 924   | 253,9751 |          |          |         |
|                          |   |          |       |          |          |          |         |
| Total                    |   | 1056196  | 929   |          |          |          |         |

| <b>Table 0.</b> ANO VA during emergency care | Table 6: | ANOVA | during | emergency | care |
|--|----------|-------|--------|-----------|------|
|--|----------|-------|--------|-----------|------|

Using the results of the calculations in the table above, it can be concluded that there are significant differences for each column of air parameters (PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, O<sub>3</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub>), which means that all air parameter values generated by the IoT sensor have an influence on air quality in Jakarta during Emergency CARE. The concentration of PM<sub>2.5</sub> in January–December

2021 was measured to be very volatile, both between times and between monitoring station locations. The DKI4 location has a higher average daily concentration than other locations. In July 2021, almost all AQMS locations had an average daily PM concentration value that exceeded the standard value. This condition is supported by the dry season and decreased rainfall.

# 4.1.3 Post emergency CARE

In the Post Emergency CARE period, the air quality in Jakarta is stagnant due to the dry season still existing, and the following observations were made:

- i.  $PM_{10}$ : Among all stations, station DKI1 has the lowest mean  $PM_{10}$  at 56,74  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 8a), while station DKI5 has the highest variance at 102,45  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 8b). Maximum mean  $PM_{10}$  levels of 63,74  $\mu/m^3$  were recorded at station DKI2.
- ii. PM<sub>2.5</sub>: Station DKI1 has the lowest mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> value of 77,58  $\mu/m^3$ , and DKI3 has the largest variance of 407,91  $\mu/m^3$  among all stations (Figure 8b); station DKI4 has the highest mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> value of 102,29  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by station DKI5 with a value of 88,13  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 8a).
- iii. SO<sub>2</sub>: Station DKI1 has the smallest mean value of 27,87  $\mu/m^3$  SO<sub>2</sub>, and DKI3 has the largest variance of 46,04  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 8b); the mean SO<sub>2</sub> at station DKI2 was the highest at 52,16  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by DKI3 stations with values of 44,65  $\mu/m^3$ , respectively (Figure 8a).
- iv. CO: The smallest mean CO value of 9,39  $\mu/m^3$  was observed at station DKI5, while the largest variance of 10,11  $\mu/m^3$  was recorded at station DKI5 (Figure 8b); station DKI3 also recorded the highest mean CO of 10,90  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 8a).
- v. O<sub>3</sub>: Station DKI4 had the lowest mean O<sub>3</sub> at 24,71  $\mu/m^3$ , and station DKI2 had the largest variance at 125,75  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 8b); station DKI2 had the highest mean O<sub>3</sub> at 43,71  $\mu/m^3$ , followed by station DKI5 with a value of 26,48  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 8a).
- vi. NO<sub>2</sub>: Station DKI3 had the lowest mean NO<sub>2</sub> of 14,71  $\mu/m^3$ , and station DKI5 had the greatest variance of 86,93  $\mu/m^3$ , among all stations (Figure 8b); station DKI1 recorded the highest mean NO<sub>2</sub> value of 27,19  $\mu/m^3$  (Figure 8a).



Figure 8: Post emergency CARE (a) Mean (b) Variance

After doing statistical analysis using ANOVA one-way on the dataset for each air pollutant parameter, observations are listed in Table 7. The following air quality parameters are affected:

The p value of the air pollutant is 0.000 and was less than  $\alpha$  value of 0.05, so null hypotheses can be rejected.

| SUMMARY             | - |          |       |          |          |         |         |
|---------------------|---|----------|-------|----------|----------|---------|---------|
| Groups              |   | Count    | Sum   | Average  | Variance |         |         |
| $\mathbf{PM}_{10}$  |   | 155      | 9087  | 58,62581 | 80,6253  |         |         |
| $PM_{2.5}$          |   | 155      | 13414 | 86,54194 | 315,6135 |         |         |
| SO <sub>2</sub>     |   | 155      | 6111  | 39,42581 | 87,50582 |         |         |
| СО                  |   | 155      | 1576  | 10,16774 | 7,374277 |         |         |
| <b>O</b> 3          |   | 155      | 4646  | 29,97419 | 100,9863 |         |         |
| $NO_2$              |   | 155      | 3241  | 20,90968 | 55,53724 |         |         |
|                     |   |          |       |          |          |         |         |
| Source of Variation |   | SS       | df    | MS       | F        | P-value | F crit  |
| Between Groups      |   | 598766,8 | 5     | 119753,4 | 1109,44  | 0       | 2,22379 |
| Within Groups       |   | 99736,94 | 924   | 107,9404 |          |         |         |
|                     |   |          |       |          |          |         |         |
| Total               |   | 698503,7 | 929   |          |          |         |         |

# Table 7: ANOVA post emergency care

From the results of the calculations in the table above, we can conclude that there are significant differences for each column of air parameters ( $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ ,  $SO_2$ , CO,  $O_3$ , and  $NO_2$ ), which means that all air parameter values generated by the IoT sensor have an influence on air quality in Jakarta in Post Emergency CARE. Entering August 2021, the concentration value also decreases; although it is still the dry season, it has started to rain, so it is wetter, and the concentration of pollutants in the air is decreasing.

# 4.2 ANOVA Two-way

In our ANOVA two-way statistical analysis, we attempt to assess the influence of the air pollution parameter on the observing stations. The following conclusions can be drawn from Table 8 below:

- i.PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, O<sub>3</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub> at each station: The finding shows that for the data, there is a statistically significant difference between *F* and the *F*-critical value, and the *P*-value is extremely low in comparison to the  $\alpha$  value (0.05).
- ii. Although there is difference value between *F*-critical and *F* for columns, *P*-value is less than  $\alpha$  value.
- iii.Interaction showing that as an independent air parameter, the Particulate Matter (PM) air pollution parameter is unacceptable due to the wide variance in F value, F-critical value, and *P-value*; it is acceptable as a group because there is little fluctuation in *F* value and *F-critical* value.

| SUMMARY            | <b>PM</b> <sub>10</sub> | <b>PM</b> <sub>2.5</sub> | SO <sub>2</sub> | СО       | <b>O</b> 3 | NO <sub>2</sub> | Total    |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------|------------|-----------------|----------|
| DKI1 (Bunderan HI) |                         |                          |                 |          |            |                 |          |
| Count              | 92                      | 92                       | 92              | 92       | 92         | 92              | 552      |
| Sum                | 5427                    | 7498                     | 2562            | 1174     | 2141       | 2707            | 21509    |
| Average            | 58,98913                | 81,5                     | 27,84783        | 12,76087 | 23,27174   | 29,42391        | 38,96558 |
| Variance           | 53,32955                | 154,7582                 | 12,32824        | 19,39274 | 34,81546   | 52,79634        | 614,7157 |

#### Table 8: ANOVA two-way

| DKI2 (Kelapa Gading) |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
|----------------------|---------------|----------|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------|
| Count                | 92            | 92       | 92        | 92            | 92             | 92            | 552      |
| Sum                  | 6234          | 8145     | 4914      | 1084          | 4689           | 2022          | 27088    |
| Average              | 67,76087      | 88,53261 | 53,41304  | 11,78261      | 50,96739       | 21,97826      | 49,07246 |
| Variance             | 145,4587      | 550,5374 | 9,981366  | 6,567606      | 139,1967       | 41,05447      | 824,2452 |
| DKI3 (Jagakarsa)     |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
| Count                | 92            | 92       | 92        | 92            | 92             | 92            | 552      |
| Sum                  | 5808          | 7846     | 4289      | 827           | 2473           | 1513          | 22756    |
| Average              | 63,13043      | 85,28261 | 46,61957  | 8,98913       | 26,88043       | 16,44565      | 41,22464 |
| Variance             | 108,2465      | 671,194  | 37,3372   | 11,879        | 59,95258       | 14,84317      | 868,6718 |
|                      |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
| DKI4 (Lubang Buaya)  |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
| Count                | 92            | 92       | 92        | 92            | 92             | 92            | 552      |
| Sum                  | 5746          | 10286    | 3469      | 1034          | 2385           | 2121          | 25041    |
| Average              | 62,45652      | 111,8043 | 37,70652  | 11,23913      | 25,92391       | 23,05435      | 45,36413 |
| Variance             | 146,7783      | 605,1481 | 40,42941  | 21,56856      | 40,99415       | 18,73328      | 1280,555 |
|                      |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
| DKI5 (Kebon Jeruk)   |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
| Count                | 92            | 92       | 92        | 92            | 92             | 92            | 552      |
| Sum                  | 5346          | 8458     | 2916      | 1126          | 2257           | 2474          | 22577    |
| Average              | 58,1087       | 91,93478 | 31,69565  | 12,23913      | 24,53261       | 26,8913       | 40,90036 |
| Variance             | 93,39465      | 617,6221 | 25,42284  | 27,39274      | 54,36156       | 130,9111      | 869,8721 |
|                      |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
| Total                |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
| Count                | 460           | 460      | 460       | 460           | 460            | 460           |          |
| Sum                  | 28561         | 42233    | 18150     | 5245          | 13945          | 10837         |          |
| Average              | 62,08913      | 91,81087 | 39,45652  | 11,40217      | 30,31522       | 23,5587       |          |
| Variance             | 120,2818      | 627,4522 | 113,9044  | 18,92069      | 173,6542       | 71,03141      |          |
|                      |               |          |           |               |                |               |          |
| ANOVA                |               | 10       | 140       | -             | <b>D</b> 1     |               |          |
| Source of Variation  | SS<br>36567 4 | df       | <u>MS</u> | F<br>60 40464 | <i>P-value</i> | <i>F crit</i> |          |
| Columns              | 1976/171      | 5        | 395294.2  | 3004 953      | 4,16E-30       | 2,373100      |          |
| Interaction          | 120795 2      | 20       | 6039 758  | 45 91312      | 2 5E-155       | 1 57438       |          |
| Within               | 359124,8      | 2730     | 131,5475  | 10,71012      | 2,02 100       | 1,07100       |          |
|                      | 0.4000.50     | 0750     |           |               |                |               |          |
| Total                | 2492958       | 2759     |           |               |                |               |          |

Based on data analysis of the daily average concentration of air pollutants, the daily average concentration value throughout Jakarta in Emergency CARE period (Jun-Aug 2021) for particulates matter  $PM_{10}$  is 62,09  $\mu/m3$  and  $PM_{2.5}$  is 91,81  $\mu/m3$ .

The highest  $PM_{10}$  95  $\mu/m3$  and  $PM_{2.5}$  174  $\mu/m3$  measured in DKI4 on Jul 15, 2021. The daily average concentration value of SO<sub>2</sub> is 39,46  $\mu/m3$ , CO is 11,04  $\mu/m3$ , O<sub>3</sub> is 30,32  $\mu/m3$ , and NO<sub>2</sub> is 23,56  $\mu/m3$ .

The highest SO<sub>2</sub> concentration, 66  $\mu/m3$  was measured in DKI2 (Kelapa Gading). The highest concentrations of CO were in DKI5 (Kebon Jeruk) with values of 30  $\mu/m3$  and O<sub>3</sub> was in DKI2 (Kelapa Gading) with a value of 81  $\mu/m3$ . Then, for NO<sub>2</sub>, 63  $\mu/m3$  were measured in DKI5 (Kebon Jeruk).

### **5.** Conclusions

The goal of the Internet of Things (IoT)-based Air Quality Monitoring System (AQMS) being developed is to track Jakarta's air quality. The AQMS, which was built by Jakarta's government, was used for collecting sensor data from designated stations for various air quality parameters, including PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, O<sub>3</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub>, in order to provide a dataset used to assess air quality. The collected data were effectively utilized to evaluate the air quality using ANOVA one-way, which evaluates a specific parameter and predicts the air quality based on the value collected. ANOVA two-way was employed to investigate two parameters as separate entities and as a pair. We concluded that the analysis results suggested that an ANOVA one-way was optimal for training the IoT systems. The observations revealed that all air quality parameters play an important role in at least monitoring the air quality during one of the Emergency CARE periods. During Emergency CARE, the average concentrations of PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub> from the air quality monitoring system show values that have exceeded the standard Air Quality Index (AQI), while the concentrations of CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, and SO<sub>2</sub> are still below the applicable AQI values. It stated that air pollution in Jakarta worsened during the implementation of Emergency CARE.

#### References

- [1] Z. Wu and J. M. McGoogan, "Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China," *JAMA*, vol. 323, no. 13, p. 1239, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.2648.
- [2] World Health Organization, "Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19)," *World Health Organization*, 2020. https://www.who.int/health-topics/coronavirus#tab=tab\_1 (accessed May 01, 2022).
- [3] Worldmeter, "Reported Cases and Deaths by Country or Territory," *Worldmeter*, 2022. https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/ (accessed May 01, 2022).
- [4] C. Sohrabi *et al.*, "World Health Organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19)," *Int. J. Surg.*, vol. 76, pp. 71–76, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2020.02.034.
- [5] Statista, "Indonesia Statistics & Facts," *Statista*, 2022. https://www.statista.com/topics /2398/indonesia/#topicHeader\_wrapper (accessed Apr. 30, 2022).
- [6] World Population Review, "Indonesia Area and Population," *World Population Review*, 2022. https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/indonesia-population (accessed Apr. 30, 2022).
- [7] R. Ratcliffe, "First coronavirus cases confirmed in Indonesia amid fears nation is ill-prepared for outbreak," *www.theguardian.com*, Mar. 02, 2020.
- [8] Randy Mulyanto and Febriana Firdaus, "Why are there no reported cases of coronavirus in Indonesia?," *www.aljazeera.com*, Jakarta/Denpasar, Feb. 18, 2020.
- [9] Reuters, "Indonesia confirms first cases of coronavirus," *www.bangkokpost.com*, Jakarta, Mar. 02, 2020.
- [10] H. Andriyanto, "Indonesia's Covid-19 Recoveries Beat Active Cases for First Time," *jakartaglobe.id*, Jul. 13, 2020.
- [11] A. Gunawan, "THE IMPACT OF COVID-19 PANDEMIC TOWARDS TOUR BUS BUSINESS IN JABODETABEK," *Adv. Transp. Logist.* ..., 2020, [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.itltrisakti.ac.id/index.php/ATLR/article/view/255.
- [12] Tim detikcom, "Yang Perlu Diketahui dari PSBB Jakarta yang Berlaku Hari Ini," *news.detik.com*, Jakarta, Apr. 10, 2020.
- [13] L. S. Rahayu, "Kemenhub: Penumpang Kereta Api Jurusan Daerah PSBB Dibatasi 65%," *news.detik.com*, Jakarta, Apr. 12, 2020.
- [14] L. S. Rahayu, "Cegah Corona, Kemenhub: Penumpang Pesawat Jurusan Daerah PSBB Dibatasi

50%," news.detik.com, Jakarta, Apr. 12, 2020.

- [15] Donny Dwisatryo Priyantoro, "Selama PSBB, Ojol di Kota Ini Tak Boleh Angkut Penumpang," *otomotif.kompas.com*, Jakarta, Apr. 16, 2020.
- [16] CNN Indonesia, "Soal PSBB Jawa-Bali, Pemerintah Kenalkan Istilah PPKM," *CNN Indonesia*, Jan. 07, 2021.
- [17] Redaksi CNBC Indonesia, "PPKM Darurat akan Diganti Jadi PPKM Level 1-4," *www.cnbcindonesia.com*, Jakarta, Jul. 21, 2021.
- [18] Redaksi CNBC Indonesia, "Oh Ternyata, Ini Beda PPKM Level 1 Sampai Level 4," www.cnbcindonesia.com, Jakarta, Jul. 21, 2021.
- [19] A. Jakob, S. Hasibuan, and D. Fiantis, "Empirical evidence shows that air quality changes during COVID-19 pandemic lockdown in Jakarta, Indonesia are due to seasonal variation, not restricted movements," *Environ. Res.*, 2022, [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com /science/article/pii/S0013935121016923.
- [20] A. R. Anugerah, P. S. Muttaqin, and D. A. Purnama, "Effect of large-scale social restriction (PSBB) during COVID-19 on outdoor air quality: Evidence from five cities in DKI Jakarta Province, Indonesia," *Environ. Res.*, vol. 197, p. 111164, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2021.111164.
- [21] R. Bao and A. Zhang, "Does lockdown reduce air pollution? Evidence from 44 cities in northern China," Sci. Total Environ., vol. 731, p. 139052, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j. scitotenv. 2020.139052.
- [22] P. Wang, K. Chen, S. Zhu, P. Wang, and H. Zhang, "Severe air pollution events not avoided by reduced anthropogenic activities during COVID-19 outbreak," *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, vol. 158, p. 104814, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104814.
- [23] S. Mahato, S. Pal, and K. G. Ghosh, "Effect of lockdown amid COVID-19 pandemic on air quality of the megacity Delhi, India," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 730, p. 139086, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139086.
- [24] M. D. Adams, "Air pollution in Ontario, Canada during the COVID-19 State of Emergency," Sci. Total Environ., vol. 742, p. 140516, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140516.
- [25] B. M. Hashim, S. K. Al-Naseri, A. Al-Maliki, and N. Al-Ansari, "Impact of COVID-19 lockdown on NO2, O3, PM2.5 and PM10 concentrations and assessing air quality changes in Baghdad, Iraq," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 754, p. 141978, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141978.
- [26] K. Ropkins and J. E. Tate, "Early observations on the impact of the COVID-19 lockdown on air quality trends across the UK," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 754, p. 142374, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142374.
- [27] L.-W. A. Chen, L.-C. Chien, Y. Li, and G. Lin, "Nonuniform impacts of COVID-19 lockdown on air quality over the United States," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 745, p. 141105, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141105.
- [28] M. S. Rahman *et al.*, "How air quality and COVID-19 transmission change under different lockdown scenarios? A case from Dhaka city, Bangladesh," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 762, p. 143161, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143161.
- [29] I. Abou El-Magd and N. Zanaty, "Impacts of short-term lockdown during COVID-19 on air quality in Egypt," *Egypt. J. Remote Sens. Sp. Sci.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 493–500, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ejrs.2020.10.003.
- [30] P. M. Pujar, H. H. Kenchannavar, R. M. Kulkarni, and U. P. Kulkarni, "Real-time water quality monitoring through Internet of Things and ANOVA-based analysis: a case study on river Krishna," *Appl. Water Sci.*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 22, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s13201-019-1111-9.
- [**31**] D. J. Dinas Lingkungan Hidup, "Laporan Akhir Pemantauan Kualitas Udara Tahun 2021," Jakarta, 2021.
- [32] "Jakarta Open Data Portal Data Terpadu Pemerintah Provinsi DKI Jakarta." https://data.jakarta.go.id/.
- [33] Bagian Perlengkapan Dan Layanan Pengadaan Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup Dan Kehutanan, "Informasi Tender," *lpse.menlhk.go.id*, 2020. https://lpse.menlhk.go.id/eproc4/evaluasi /13827291/pemenang (accessed May 08, 2022).
- [34] PT. Trusur Unggul Teknusa, "AQMS," *trusur.com*, 2022. https://trusur.com/products-services/aqms (accessed May 08, 2022).
- [35] R. A. Fisher, "XV.-The Correlation between Relatives on the Supposition of Mendelian

Inheritance.," Trans. R. Soc. Edinburgh, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 399–433, Jul. 1919, doi: 10.1017/S0080456800012163.