## Supplementary

## **Tables**

Table S1 Keywords and associated SED for Beijing and New Delhi.

| Panel A: Baidu Index in Beijing            | Panel A: Baidu Index in Beijing  Panel A: Baidu Index in Beijing |           |          |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Baidu Index                                | Max  | Mean      | Std.     |  |  |  |  |  |
| "Beijing" AND "Air quality"                | 1500.00  | 199.40    | 136.50   |  |  |  |  |  |
| "Beijing" AND "Pollution"                  | 367.00   | 27.20     | 50.20    |  |  |  |  |  |
| "Beijing" AND "Haze"                       | 4034.00  | 202.30    | 245.00   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beijing's PM <sub>2.5</sub>                | 53703.00   | 2079.90   | 3632.80  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM <sub>2.5</sub> extraordinary in Beijing | 434560.00  | 293.40    | 10269.90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM <sub>2.5</sub> forecasting in Beijing   | 715.00   | 52.10     | 75.40    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beijing's weather                          | 1111.00  | 398.00    | 113.30   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather forecast for Beijing area          | 913.00   | 314.40    | 73.60    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Today's air quality in Beijing             | 365.00   | 58.80     | 57.90    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Air quality in Beijing                     | 83409.00   | 2993.60   | 4801.70  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beijing air quality report                 | 1041.00  | 139.10    | 130.40   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beijing's air quality forecast             | 1374.00  | 184.30    | 166.00   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beijing air quality index                  | 23385.00   | 1872.20   | 2282.00  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather forecast for Beijing city          | 4211.00  | 1138.70   | 321.50   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather in Beijing                         | 930129.00  | 195024.50 | 90577.80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather PM <sub>2.5</sub> in Beijing       | 1182.00  | 70.30     | 95.90    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather forecast for Beijing               | 119111.00  | 21481.70  | 9074.30  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather forecast for 15 days in Beijing    | 15617.00   | 3278.00   | 1798.90  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather forecast for a week in Beijing     | 10325.00   | 2205.40   | 1433.20  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pollution of Beijing                       | 1434.00  | 109.50    | 88.80    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Haze of Beijing                            | 921548.00  | 1705.80   | 23653.40 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Red alert for haze in Beijing              | 497212.00  | 548.80    | 13854.30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Haze event in Beijing                      | 273.00   | 15.00     | 34.10    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Picture of haze in Beijing                 | 5787.00  | 129.10    | 288.60   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Haze forecasting for Beijing               | 2167.00  | 139.00    | 222.00   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alert for haze in Beijing                  | 1620.00  | 42.10     | 108.70   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Causes of haze in Beijing                  | 1764.00  | 58.80     | 101.40   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beijing haze index                         | 6307.00  | 454.10    | 462.60   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beijing haze index forecasting             | 2030.00  | 138.70    | 396.10   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather in Beijing                         | 9769.00  | 279.40    | 610.80   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weather forecasting in Beijing             | 7944.00  | 1209.50   | 553.30   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Haze in Beijing                            | 2228.00  | 53.80     | 101.60   |  |  |  |  |  |

Table S1 Keywords and associated SED for Beijing and New Delhi (Continued).

| Panel B: Google Trends in New Delhi |       |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Google Trends                       | Mean  | Std.  |
| New Delhi air pollution             | 9.38  | 10.77 |
| Air pollution in New Delhi          | 15.22 | 14.97 |
| New Delhi pollution                 | 7.82  | 11.67 |
| Pollution New Delhi India           | 14.86 | 15.46 |
| Delhi India pollution               | 7.94  | 10.79 |
| Delhi India air pollution           | 10.25 | 10.95 |
| New Delhi air quality index         | 10.12 | 16.17 |
| New Delhi air quality               | 9.92  | 12.38 |
| New Delhi air quality forecast      | 4.78  | 20.36 |
| New Delhi air quality index today   | 6.02  | 18.00 |
| New Delhi air pollution level       | 8.23  | 16.84 |
| New Delhi air pollution index       | 6.16  | 15.29 |
| New Delhi air pollution causes      | 3.89  | 18.45 |
| New Delhi air quality real time     | 2.49  | 12.79 |
| Delhi air pollution AQI             | 3.83  | 9.66  |
| Delhi air pollution today           | 4.55  | 9.48  |
| Delhi air pollution odd even scheme | 3.58  | 14.30 |
| Delhi air pollution report today    | 6.01  | 17.05 |
| Delhi air pollution level           | 3.88  | 8.83  |
| Delhi air pollution odd even        | 10.84 | 19.39 |
| Delhi air pollution index           | 6.98  | 10.76 |
| Delhi air pollution case study      | 15.51 | 20.62 |
| Delhi air pollution after Diwali    | 0.95  | 7.17  |
| Delhi air pollution report          | 11.68 | 16.15 |
| Delhi air pollution news            | 3.49  | 8.55  |
| Delhi air pollution latest news     | 4.60  | 14.36 |
| Delhi air pollution live            | 5.28  | 13.98 |
| Delhi air pollution causes          | 16.24 | 17.60 |
| Delhi air pollution data            | 18.89 | 22.40 |
| Delhi air pollution solutions       | 9.14  | 20.68 |
| Delhi air pollution reasons         | 10.70 | 21.79 |
| Delhi air pollution level today     | 4.57  | 10.99 |
| Delhi air pollution mask            | 5.71  | 11.85 |
| Delhi air pollution 2017            | 4.03  | 9.04  |
| Delhi air pollution 2019            | 4.94  | 15.70 |

Table S1 Keywords and associated SED for Beijing and New Delhi (Continued).

| Panel B: Google Trends in New Delhi  |       |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Google Trends                        | Mean  | Std.  |
| Delhi air pollution data today       | 5.74  | 22.36 |
| Delhi air pollution essay            | 14.42 | 19.71 |
| Delhi air pollution index today      | 5.92  | 12.57 |
| Delhi air pollution video            | 2.50  | 9.02  |
| Why Delhi air pollution              | 11.27 | 15.20 |
| Delhi air pollution map              | 12.52 | 21.95 |
| Delhi air pollution problem          | 11.00 | 20.40 |
| Delhi air pollution level today live | 2.49  | 10.44 |
| Delhi air pollution forecast         | 4.68  | 16.51 |
| Air pollution in Delhi               | 5.69  | 9.62  |
| Pollution New Delhi                  | 7.21  | 11.15 |
| Air pollution in New Delhi India     | 9.08  | 17.81 |
| New delhi air quality today          | 8.17  | 17.06 |
| Delhi air pollution AQI today        | 2.14  | 9.78  |
| Delhi air quality AQI                | 6.49  | 12.61 |
| Delhi air quality after Diwali       | 1.30  | 7.72  |
| Best air pollution mask for Delhi    | 3.79  | 12.28 |
| Best mask for Delhi air pollution    | 3.79  | 12.28 |
| Mask for Delhi air pollution         | 6.46  | 14.16 |
| Air pollution mask for Delhi         | 6.46  | 14.16 |
| Air pollution causes in Delhi        | 12.38 | 15.83 |
| Causes of Delhi air pollution        | 12.65 | 18.24 |
| What causes Delhi air pollution      | 11.05 | 25.74 |
| Reasons for Delhi air pollution      | 3.44  | 12.61 |
| Delhi air pollution case study pdf   | 6.01  | 22.52 |
| Delhi air pollution before and after | 3.94  | 18.69 |
| Delhi air pollution emergency        | 2.81  | 15.21 |
| Delhi air pollution images           | 4.37  | 11.57 |
| Delhi air pollution odd even policy  | 1.78  | 12.87 |
| Delhi India pollution                | 8.45  | 10.73 |
| Delhi air pollution why              | 9.96  | 13.71 |
| Delhi air pollution mask             | 5.43  | 12.38 |

Table S2 Results of PCA and correlation analysis in Beijing.

| Deleted his date       | Deinster Learner and Eisen | Eiganyalua |                               |             | Pearson correlation coefficient |             | Spearman correlation coefficient |  |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Related big data       | Principal component        | Eigenvalue | Cumulative explained variance | Correlation | Prob.                           | Correlation | Prob.                            |  |
| Other air quality data | 1st                        | 3992.83    | 93.95%                        | 0.88        | 0.00                            | 0.83        | 0.00                             |  |
| Meteorological data    | 1st                        | 0.46       | 98.32%                        | -0.11       | 0.00                            | 0.02        | 0.29                             |  |
|                        | 1st                        | 0.45       | 37.42%                        | 0.71        | 0.00                            | 0.57        | 0.00                             |  |
|                        | 2nd                        | 0.20       | 16.60%                        | -0.01       | 0.78                            | 0.08        | 0.00                             |  |
|                        | 3rd                        | 0.14       | 11.49%                        | -0.15       | 0.00                            | -0.12       | 0.00                             |  |
| SED                    | 4th                        | 0.11       | 8.79%                         | 0.10        | 0.00                            | 0.09        | 0.00                             |  |
|                        | 5th                        | 0.05       | 4.50%                         | 0.06        | 0.01                            | 0.29        | 0.00                             |  |
|                        | 6th                        | 0.05       | 3.89%                         | 0.13        | 0.00                            | 0.12        | 0.00                             |  |
|                        | 7th                        | 0.03       | 2.64%                         | -0.05       | 0.03                            | 0.03        | 0.23                             |  |

Table S3 Results of PCA and correlation analysis in New Delhi.

|                     | Principal |            | Cumulative |             |       |             | Spearman correlation |  |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|-------|-------------|----------------------|--|
| Related big data    | component | Eigenvalue | explained  | coefficient |       | coefficient |                      |  |
|                     |           |            | variance   | Correlation | Prob. | Correlation | Prob.                |  |
| Meteorological data | 1st       | 95.38      | 95.06%     | -0.69       | 0.00  | -0.65       | 0.00                 |  |
|                     | 1st       | 4860.22    | 30.73%     | 0.53        | 0.00  | 0.69        | 0.00                 |  |
|                     | 2nd       | 927.99     | 5.87%      | 0.31        | 0.00  | 0.26        | 0.00                 |  |
|                     | 3rd       | 768.85     | 4.86%      | -0.23       | 0.00  | -0.25       | 0.00                 |  |
|                     | 4th       | 598.99     | 3.79%      | -0.09       | 0.22  | -0.08       | 0.24                 |  |
|                     | 5th       | 575.35     | 3.64%      | 0.14        | 0.04  | 0.11        | 0.11                 |  |
|                     | 6th       | 528.96     | 3.34%      | -0.05       | 0.46  | -0.08       | 0.28                 |  |
|                     | 7th       | 488.06     | 3.09%      | 0.08        | 0.28  | 0.07        | 0.32                 |  |
|                     | 8th       | 462.18     | 2.92%      | 0.06        | 0.39  | 0.01        | 0.91                 |  |
|                     | 9th       | 447.02     | 2.83%      | -0.01       | 0.88  | 0.02        | 0.73                 |  |
|                     | 10th      | 399.05     | 2.52%      | 0.01        | 0.86  | -0.14       | 0.05                 |  |
|                     | 11th      | 363.84     | 2.30%      | -0.09       | 0.21  | -0.10       | 0.14                 |  |
| SED                 | 12th      | 350.81     | 2.22%      | -0.11       | 0.13  | -0.15       | 0.04                 |  |
|                     | 13th      | 317.11     | 2.01%      | 0.04        | 0.60  | 0.07        | 0.29                 |  |
|                     | 14th      | 307.76     | 1.95%      | -0.02       | 0.72  | 0.01        | 0.88                 |  |
|                     | 15th      | 301.74     | 1.91%      | 0.01        | 0.84  | 0.04        | 0.54                 |  |
|                     | 16th      | 290.29     | 1.84%      | 0.03        | 0.69  | -0.02       | 0.76                 |  |
|                     | 17th      | 263.65     | 1.67%      | -0.12       | 0.08  | -0.03       | 0.62                 |  |
|                     | 18th      | 246.03     | 1.56%      | 0.05        | 0.43  | -0.01       | 0.84                 |  |
|                     | 19th      | 226.71     | 1.43%      | -0.06       | 0.35  | -0.10       | 0.16                 |  |
|                     | 20th      | 212.97     | 1.35%      | -0.03       | 0.64  | -0.12       | 0.07                 |  |
|                     | 21st      | 201.87     | 1.28%      | -0.09       | 0.20  | -0.04       | 0.54                 |  |
|                     | 22nd      | 189.45     | 1.20%      | -0.09       | 0.22  | -0.18       | 0.01                 |  |
|                     | 23rd      | 174.21     | 1.10%      | 0.05        | 0.48  | 0.03        | 0.68                 |  |

Table S4 Results of augmented Dickey-Fuller test, co-integration test and Granger causality test in Beijing.

| Panel A | Panel A: Stationarity via augmented Dickey-Fuller test                 |                                      |                |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| No.     | Related big data   | T-statistic                          | Prob.          |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1       | PM <sub>2.5</sub>  | -4.63                                | 0.0001***      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2       | Other air quality data   | -3.39                                | 0.0114**       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3       | SED  | -3.51                                | 0.0076***      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panel 1 | Panel B: Co-integration between PM <sub>2.5</sub> and related big data |                                      |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| No.     | Related big data   | T-statistic                          | Prob.          |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1       | Other air quality data   | -5.54                                | 1.49E-05***    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2       | SED  | -5.89                                | 2.80E-06***    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panel ( | C-I: H0: Related big data does not Granger ca                          | ause PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentration |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| No.     | Related big data   | T-statistic                          | Prob.          |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1       | Other air quality data   | 153.29                               | 2.2e-16***     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2       | SED  | 5.39                                 | $0.02038^{**}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panel ( | C-II: H0: PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentration does not Grang               | er cause related big data            |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| No.     | Related big data   | T-statistic                          | Prob.          |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1       | Other air quality data   | 121.40                               | 2.2e-16***     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2       | SED  | 65.97                                | 8.367e-16***   |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: \*\*\*, \*\* and \* denote the significances at 1%, 5% and 10%, respectively.

**Table S5** Results of augmented Dickey-Fuller test, co-integration test and Granger causality test in New Delhi.

| Panel A | Panel A: Stationarity via augmented Dickey-Fuller test                                  |                                      |              |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| No.     | Related big data  | T-statistic                          | Prob.        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1       | PM <sub>2.5</sub>   | -4.37                                | 3.39E-04***  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2       | Meteorological data   | -4.97                                | 2.58E-05***  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3       | SED   | -4.78                                | 5.94E-05***  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panel E | 3: Co-integration between PM <sub>2.5</sub> and related                                 | big data                             |              |  |  |  |  |  |
| No.     | Related big data  | T-statistic                          | Prob.        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1       | Meteorological data   | -6.38                                | 2.31E-07***  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2       | SED   | -3.46                                | 0.0362**     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panel ( | C-I: H0: Related big data does not Granger ca   | ause PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentration |              |  |  |  |  |  |
| No.     | Related big data  | T-statistic                          | Prob.        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1       | Meteorological data   | 8.33                                 | 0.004309***  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2       | SED   | 16.80                                | 5.989e-05*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panel ( | Panel C-II: H0: PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentration does not Granger cause related big data |                                      |              |  |  |  |  |  |
| No.     | Related big data  | T-statistic                          | Prob.        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1       | Meteorological data   | 25.29                                | 1.075e-06*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2       | SED   | 1.16                                 | 0.28         |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: \*\*\*, \*\* and \* denote the significances at 1%, 5% and 10%, respectively.

Table S6 Timescales of the common modes extracted by MEMD for Beijing and New Delhi.

| D 14 D      | ••• (3)                          |                        | , J                 |         |
|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Panel A: Be | ijing (days)<br>                 |                        |                     |         |
| Mode        | PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentrations | Other air quality data | Meteorological data | SED     |
| IMFs 1      | 2.07                             | 1.74                   | 1.75                | 2.03    |
| IMFs 2      | 4.80                             | 3.92                   | 4.93                | 3.92    |
| IMFs 3      | 7.60                             | 7.60                   | 6.19                | 7.60    |
| IMFs 4      | 12.59                            | 12.59                  | 14.04               | 19.21   |
| IMFs 5      | 36.50                            | 36.50                  | 30.42               | 36.50   |
| IMFs 6      | 91.25                            | 91.25                  | 87.00               | 91.25   |
| IMFs 7      | 182.50                           | 182.50                 | 182.50              | 182.50  |
| IMFs 8      | $>=T_1$                          | $>=T_1$                | $>=T_1$             | $>=T_1$ |
| IMFs 9      | $>=T_1$                          | $>=T_1$                | $>=T_1$             | $>=T_1$ |
| Residues    | $>=T_1$                          | $>=T_1$                | $>=T_1$             | $>=T_1$ |
| Panel B: Ne | w Delhi (weeks)                  |                        |                     |         |
| Mode        | PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentrations | Meteorological data    | SED                 |         |
| IMFs 1      | 1.99                             | 1.85                   | 1.51                |         |
| IMFs 2      | 3.51                             | 3.72                   | 2.35                |         |
| IMFs 3      | 6.52                             | 6.64                   | 4.68                |         |
| IMFs 4      | 13.04                            | 13.04                  | 13.52               |         |
| IMFs 5      | 26.07                            | 24.33                  | 26.07               |         |
| IMFs 6      | 52.14                            | 52.14                  | 60.83               |         |
| IMFs 7      | 91.25                            | 91.25                  | 91.25               |         |

Residues  $>=T_2$   $>=T_2$   $>=T_2$ Notes:  $T_1 = 182.5$  (days) and  $T_2 = 91.25$  (weeks) denote the length of the sample period for Beijing and New Delhi, respectively.

**Table S7** Results of DM test between different types of models in terms of S-statistic in New Delhi.

| Panel A: Effectiveness of meteorological data |                                     |                        |              |             |            |          |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------|--|
| Targets                                       | Benchmarks                          | Forecasting techniques |              |             |            |          |  |
| (with meteorological data)                    | (without meteorological data)       | LR                     | SVR          | BPNN        | ELM        | RVFL     |  |
| M2-2  | M1                                  | 0.51                   | 1 24*        | 0.40        | 1.27*      | 0.50     |  |
| (with meteorological data)                    | (single models)                     | -0.51                  | -1.34*       | -0.40       | -1.27*     | -0.58    |  |
| M2-2  | M2-3                                | 0.72                   | -2.93***     | 0.35        | -0.62      | -0.73    |  |
| (with meteorological data)                    | (with SED)                          | 0.72 -2.93             |              | 0.55        | -0.02      | -0.73    |  |
| Panel B: Effectiveness of multi-source bi     | g data analysis                     |                        |              |             |            |          |  |
| Targets                                       | Benchmarks                          | Forecastin             | g techniques |             |            |          |  |
| (with multi-source big data)                  | (without multi-source big data)     | LR                     | SVR          | BPNN        | ELM        | RVFL     |  |
| M0  | M4-2                                | -4.41***               | -2.04**      | -2.02**     | -4.22***   | 1 7¢***  |  |
| (with MEMD)                                   | (with meteorological data and BEMD) | -4.41                  | -2.04        |             | -4.22      | -4.76*** |  |
| M0  | M4-3                                | -3.46***               | -3.03***     | 1 21*       | -2.70***   | 2.04***  |  |
| (with MEMD)                                   | (with SED and BEMD)                 | -3.40                  | -5.05        | 3*** -1.31* | -2.70      | -3.94*** |  |
| M3  | M1                                  | -1.47*                 | -1.30*       | 1 00**      | ** -2.06** | -0.20    |  |
|   |                                     |                        | -1.30        | -1.80**     |            |          |  |

**Table S7** Results of DM test between different types of models in terms of S-statistic in New Delhi (Continued).

| Panel C: Effectiveness of multi-scale analysis |                                |                        |                   |                  |          |                      |  |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------|----------------------|--|
| Targets  | Benchmarks                     | Forecasting techniques |                   |                  |          |                      |  |
| (with multi-scale analysis)                    | (without multi-scale analysis) | LR                     | SVR               | BPNN             | ELM      | RVFL                 |  |
| M0   | М3                             | 5.00***                | .99*** -6.14***   | 4*** -4.12***    | -5.36*** | -6.30***             |  |
| (with multi-source big data and MEMD)          | (with multi-source big data)   | -5.99                  |                   |                  |          |                      |  |
| M4-2   | M2-2                           | -5.71***               | ** -2.99***       | -4.06***         | -3.93*** | -4.82***             |  |
| (with meteorological data and BEMD)            | (with meteorological data)     | -5./1                  |                   |                  |          |                      |  |
| M4-3   | M2-3                           | c oc***                | -5.25*** -5.12*** | 5.12*** -4.15*** | -4.66*** | <b>7</b> 0 c***      |  |
| (with SED and BEMD)                            | (with SED)                     | -5.25                  |                   |                  |          | -5.06 <sup>***</sup> |  |

Notes:\*\*\*, \*\* and \* denote the significances at 1%, 5% and 10%, respectively.

**Table S8** IR between different types of methods regarding MAPE in Beijing.

| Panel A: Effectiveness of Internet big data |        |        |        |        |         |  |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--|
| Targets (with SED)                          | M2-3   |        |        |        |         |  |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                    | M1     |        |        |        |         |  |
| Horizon                                     | One    | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |  |
| LR  | 16.07% | 23.18% | 25.27% | 25.15% | 23.05%  |  |
| SVR   | 9.82%  | 8.08%  | 24.87% | 24.72% | 18.23%  |  |
| BPNN  | 26.78% | 18.86% | 27.36% | 29.37% | 25.63%  |  |
| ELM   | 12.51% | 23.20% | 28.96% | 32.20% | 25.63%  |  |
| RVFL  | 11.54% | 22.63% | 31.87% | 35.52% | 27.12%  |  |
| Targets (with SED)                          | M2-3   |        |        |        |         |  |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                    | M2-1   |        |        |        |         |  |
| Horizon                                     | One    | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |  |
| LR  | 0.34%  | 10.87% | 16.66% | 18.41% | 12.92%  |  |
| SVR   | 0.25%  | 2.75%  | 4.75%  | 12.30% | 5.62%   |  |
| BPNN  | 1.68%  | 10.26% | 23.84% | 17.12% | 14.75%  |  |
| ELM   | 2.04%  | 10.19% | 18.03% | 23.11% | 14.75%  |  |
| RVFL  | 5.96%  | 11.42% | 20.65% | 29.34% | 18.25%  |  |
| Targets (with SED)                          | M2-3   |        |        |        |         |  |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                    | M2-2   |        |        |        |         |  |
| Horizon                                     | One    | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |  |
| LR  | 16.17% | 21.77% | 24.55% | 25.03% | 22.46%  |  |
| SVR   | 14.88% | 10.01% | 21.48% | 21.56% | 17.48%  |  |
| BPNN  | 15.53% | 17.47% | 31.48% | 32.01% | 25.42%  |  |
| ELM   | 15.96% | 25.16% | 29.39% | 33.55% | 27.17%  |  |
| RVFL  | 12.43% | 23.35% | 31.42% | 36.47% | 27.59%  |  |

**Table S8** *IR* between different types of methods regarding *MAPE* in Beijing (Continued).

| Panel B: Effectiveness of multi-source big        | **         |         |        | <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u> | ,       |
|---|------------|---------|--------|---|---------|
| Targets (with multi-source big data)              | M0         |         |        |   |         |
| <b>Benchmarks</b> (without multi-source big data) | M4-1       |         |        |   |         |
| Horizon   | One        | Two     | Three  | Four  | Average |
| LR  | -1.42%     | 3.67%   | 9.68%  | 14.59%  | 7.56%   |
| SVR   | 10.01%     | 10.05%  | 14.31% | 11.14%  | 11.55%  |
| BPNN  | 9.33%      | 10.92%  | 4.01%  | 2.12%   | 5.05%   |
| ELM   | 12.15%     | 8.03%   | 11.36% | 22.45%  | 14.26%  |
| RVFL  | 7.73%      | 5.97%   | 7.25%  | 12.68%  | 8.64%   |
| Targets (with SED)                                | M0         |         |        |   |         |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                          | M4-2       |         |        |   |         |
| Horizon   | One        | Two     | Three  | Four  | Average |
| LR  | -4.87%     | 1.08%   | 4.43%  | 10.11%  | 4.44%   |
| SVR   | 6.82%      | 4.69%   | 6.80%  | 4.38%   | 5.59%   |
| BPNN  | 3.72%      | 5.79%   | 1.08%  | 1.08%   | 2.78%   |
| ELM   | 19.48%     | 17.94%  | 5.24%  | 3.98%   | 11.37%  |
| RVFL  | 6.57%      | 11.94%  | 3.95%  | 5.61%   | 7.02%   |
| Targets (with SED)                                | <b>M</b> 0 |         |        |   |         |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                          | M4-3       |         |        |   |         |
| Horizon   | One        | Two     | Three  | Four  | Average |
| LR  | 5.63%      | 7.55%   | 11.95% | 14.03%  | 10.21%  |
| SVR   | 16.86%     | 11.31%  | 11.80% | 5.54%   | 11.01%  |
| BPNN  | 16.94%     | 9.06%   | 12.41% | 2.81%   | 9.97%   |
| ELM   | 16.75%     | 6.90%   | 2.68%  | 10.78%  | 9.09%   |
| RVFL  | 14.64%     | 6.34%   | 5.80%  | 10.03%  | 9.05%   |
| Targets (with SED)                                | М3         |         |        |   |         |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                          | M1         |         |        |   |         |
| Horizon   | One        | Two     | Three  | Four  | Average |
| LR  | 19.13%     | 22.74%  | 20.67% | 18.18%  | 20.24%  |
| SVR   | 9.32%      | -11.49% | 5.41%  | 9.45%   | 3.30%   |
| BPNN  | 21.72%     | 20.44%  | 22.95% | 17.86%  | 20.65%  |
| ELM   | 7.86%      | 17.28%  | 23.03% | 20.69%  | 18.33%  |
| RVFL  | 9.91%      | 18.89%  | 24.06% | 21.28%  | 19.57%  |

Table S8 IR between different types of methods regarding MAPE in Beijing (Continued).

| Panel C: Effectiveness of multi-scale analysis |            |        |        |        |         |
|--|------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)            | <b>M</b> 0 |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)      | M3         |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon  | One        | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR   | 37.01%     | 48.06% | 48.07% | 49.46% | 46.48%  |
| SVR  | 36.19%     | 49.41% | 48.24% | 42.65% | 45.04%  |
| BPNN   | 58.33%     | 50.93% | 46.94% | 47.56% | 48.11%  |
| ELM  | 47.34%     | 53.81% | 49.77% | 48.13% | 49.93%  |
| RVFL   | 45.20%     | 53.12% | 50.44% | 49.28% | 49.84%  |
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)            | M4-1       |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)      | M2-1       |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon  | One        | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR   | 40.36%     | 51.67% | 49.13% | 47.23% | 47.74%  |
| SVR  | 28.88%     | 33.66% | 27.57% | 31.92% | 30.64%  |
| BPNN   | 38.28%     | 54.08% | 55.35% | 48.35% | 50.29%  |
| ELM  | 38.15%     | 51.43% | 49.67% | 39.84% | 45.33%  |
| RVFL   | 43.12%     | 53.70% | 52.74% | 49.89% | 50.47%  |
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)            | M4-2       |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)      | M2-2       |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon  | One        | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR   | 51.48%     | 58.69% | 56.48% | 53.92% | 54.98%  |
| SVR  | 41.39%     | 42.07% | 45.10% | 43.41% | 43.19%  |
| BPNN   | 50.07%     | 57.85% | 61.02% | 58.08% | 57.53%  |
| ELM  | 42.12%     | 54.64% | 59.44% | 58.01% | 54.82%  |
| RVFL   | 47.70%     | 57.22% | 60.56% | 58.32% | 56.89%  |
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)            | M4-3       |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)      | M2-3       |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon  | One        | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR   | 35.69%     | 43.50% | 37.38% | 35.74% | 38.21%  |
| SVR  | 22.83%     | 30.82% | 26.11% | 26.98% | 26.96%  |
| BPNN   | 31.47%     | 47.10% | 35.75% | 37.24% | 38.50%  |
| ELM  | 33.38%     | 46.57% | 44.07% | 31.99% | 39.52%  |
| RVFL   | 34.62%     | 47.52% | 41.36% | 31.17% | 39.14%  |

**Table S9** *IR* between different types of methods regarding *MAPE* in New Delhi.

| Panel A: Effectiveness of meteorological data            |            |         |        |
|--|------------|---------|--------|
| Targets (with meteorological data)                       | M2-2       | M2-2    |        |
| Benchmarks (without meteorological data)                 | M1         | M2-3    |        |
| Horizon  | One        | One     |        |
| LR   | -1.23%     | 9.23%   |        |
| SVR  | 9.08%      | -14.75% |        |
| BPNN   | 3.97%      | 5.89%   |        |
| ELM  | 5.89%      | 0.05%   |        |
| RVFL   | 0.96%      | -0.78%  |        |
| Panel B: Effectiveness of multi-source big data analysis |            |         |        |
| Targets (with multi-source big data)                     | <b>M</b> 0 | M0      | М3     |
| Benchmarks (without multi-source big data)               | M4-2       | M4-3    | M1     |
| Horizon  | One        | One     | One    |
| LR   | 31.82%     | 13.63%  | 8.19%  |
| SVR  | 11.15%     | 0.59%   | 1.68%  |
| BPNN   | 18.57%     | 11.57%  | 12.25% |
| ELM  | 35.37%     | 13.96%  | 14.87% |
| RVFL   | 32.82%     | 17.79%  | 0.36%  |
| Panel C: Effectiveness of multi-scale analysis           |            |         |        |
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)                      | <b>M</b> 0 | M4-2    | M4-3   |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)                | М3         | M2-2    | M2-3   |
| Horizon  | One        | One     | One    |
| LR   | 63.17%     | 51.01%  | 57.40% |
| SVR  | 59.34%     | 50.52%  | 61.46% |
| BPNN   | 52.75%     | 46.99%  | 48.13% |
| ELM  | 58.93%     | 42.52%  | 56.81% |
| RVFL   | 66.10%     | 49.23%  | 58.84% |

Table S10 IR between different types of methods regarding RMSE in Beijing.

| Panel A: Effectiveness of Internet big data |         |        | -      |        |         |
|---|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Targets (with SED)                          | M2-3    |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                    | M1      |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon                                     | One     | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR  | 4.57%   | 6.78%  | 8.00%  | 8.66%  | 7.19%   |
| SVR   | 1.18%   | 6.05%  | 0.39%  | -3.04% | 1.16%   |
| BPNN  | 10.25%  | 5.86%  | 7.28%  | 10.33% | 8.37%   |
| ELM   | -5.76%  | 5.56%  | 8.05%  | 4.57%  | 3.73%   |
| RVFL  | 5.55%   | 8.94%  | 8.22%  | 8.08%  | 7.85%   |
| Targets (with SED)                          | M2-3    |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                    | M2-1    |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon                                     | One     | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR  | 3.40%   | 3.75%  | 5.31%  | 5.77%  | 4.65%   |
| SVR   | -1.01%  | -5.18% | -5.66% | 1.85%  | -2.48%  |
| BPNN  | -3.97%  | 1.66%  | 5.24%  | 4.29%  | 2.28%   |
| ELM   | -13.55% | -4.45% | 1.13%  | 1.28%  | -3.16%  |
| RVFL  | 2.72%   | 2.47%  | 1.85%  | 4.03%  | 2.78%   |
| Targets (with SED)                          | M2-3    |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without SED)                    | M2-2    |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon                                     | One     | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR  | 5.51%   | 6.51%  | 6.81%  | 7.65%  | 6.70%   |
| SVR   | 3.07%   | -3.06% | -0.42% | 1.83%  | 0.25%   |
| BPNN  | 5.51%   | 6.20%  | 11.46% | 14.19% | 9.73%   |
| ELM   | -5.46%  | 4.06%  | 6.68%  | 7.34%  | 3.77%   |
| RVFL  | 6.18%   | 9.22%  | 8.27%  | 10.65% | 8.77%   |

**Table S10** *IR* between different types of methods regarding *RMSE* in Beijing (Continued).

| Panel B: Effectiveness of multi-source big data analysis |            |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
|--|------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Targets (with multi-source big data)                     | M0         |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmarks (without multi-source big data)               | M4-1       |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| Horizon  | One        | Two    | Three   | Four   | Average |  |  |  |  |
| LR   | 7.25%      | 20.96% | 29.68%  | 30.20% | 24.14%  |  |  |  |  |
| SVR  | 13.74%     | 25.50% | 31.52%  | 28.98% | 26.44%  |  |  |  |  |
| BPNN   | 8.70%      | 14.63% | 21.36%  | 27.66% | 19.62%  |  |  |  |  |
| ELM  | 7.61%      | 22.36% | 30.77%  | 34.67% | 26.52%  |  |  |  |  |
| RVFL   | 8.49%      | 13.02% | 20.62%  | 29.11% | 19.55%  |  |  |  |  |
| Targets (with multi-source big data)                     | <b>M</b> 0 |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmarks (without multi-source big data)               | M4-2       |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| Horizon  | One        | Two    | Three   | Four   | Average |  |  |  |  |
| LR   | 3.52%      | 1.14%  | 4.44%   | 9.57%  | 5.01%   |  |  |  |  |
| SVR  | 11.25%     | 7.03%  | 9.14%   | 11.46% | 9.73%   |  |  |  |  |
| BPNN   | 2.73%      | 3.65%  | 2.95%   | 12.56% | 5.97%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELM  | 22.99%     | 22.10% | 7.58%   | 20.04% | 18.06%  |  |  |  |  |
| RVFL   | 9.47%      | 10.81% | 6.67%   | 12.93% | 10.05%  |  |  |  |  |
| Targets (with multi-source big data)                     | <b>M</b> 0 |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmarks (without multi-source big data)               | M4-3       |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| Horizon  | One        | Two    | Three   | Four   | Average |  |  |  |  |
| LR   | 10.29%     | 17.30% | 26.12%  | 28.04% | 21.94%  |  |  |  |  |
| SVR  | 18.19%     | 22.65% | 30.51%  | 28.72% | 26.03%  |  |  |  |  |
| BPNN   | 10.40%     | 6.92%  | 17.76%  | 25.69% | 16.57%  |  |  |  |  |
| ELM  | 9.45%      | 8.69%  | 10.99%  | 22.69% | 13.89%  |  |  |  |  |
| RVFL   | 14.03%     | 8.73%  | 12.93%  | 23.54% | 15.50%  |  |  |  |  |
| Targets (with multi-source big data)                     | М3         |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmarks (without multi-source big data)               | M1         |        |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| Horizon  | One        | Two    | Three   | Four   | Average |  |  |  |  |
| LR   | 2.04%      | 7.17%  | 9.44%   | 10.12% | 7.58%   |  |  |  |  |
| SVR  | 0.23%      | -9.07% | -10.09% | -2.08% | -5.71%  |  |  |  |  |
| BPNN   | 8.38%      | 8.91%  | 9.04%   | 6.23%  | 8.11%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELM  | 8.04%      | 11.90% | 10.99%  | 8.28%  | 9.92%   |  |  |  |  |
| RVFL   | 5.90%      | 10.41% | 10.64%  | 8.90%  | 9.18%   |  |  |  |  |

**Table S10** *IR* between different types of methods regarding *RMSE* in Beijing (Continued).

| Panel C: Effectiveness of multi-scale analysis |        |        |        |        |         |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)            | M0     |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)      | M3     |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon  | One    | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR   | 41.79% | 43.51% | 36.14% | 35.97% | 39.18%  |
| SVR  | 44.47% | 52.45% | 47.94% | 39.01% | 46.29%  |
| BPNN   | 49.54% | 43.10% | 36.35% | 39.87% | 40.81%  |
| ELM  | 43.94% | 45.99% | 39.08% | 39.23% | 41.88%  |
| RVFL   | 44.37% | 45.16% | 39.34% | 40.34% | 42.12%  |
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)            | M4-1   |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)      | M2-1   |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon  | One    | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR   | 37.77% | 31.51% | 15.35% | 14.95% | 23.88%  |
| SVR  | 34.35% | 22.07% | 11.21% | 16.49% | 19.97%  |
| BPNN   | 35.97% | 36.58% | 24.75% | 16.81% | 27.84%  |
| ELM  | 40.10% | 32.22% | 15.77% | 11.74% | 23.66%  |
| RVFL   | 41.08% | 39.49% | 26.97% | 19.95% | 31.07%  |
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)            | M4-2   |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)      | M2-2   |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon  | One    | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR   | 41.48% | 46.81% | 38.69% | 35.66% | 40.52%  |
| SVR  | 38.77% | 38.81% | 36.41% | 33.00% | 36.53%  |
| BPNN   | 45.38% | 46.40% | 43.03% | 38.30% | 43.02%  |
| ELM  | 33.25% | 37.95% | 40.44% | 32.32% | 36.14%  |
| RVFL   | 42.55% | 45.08% | 41.95% | 39.32% | 42.14%  |
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)            | M4-3   |        |        |        |         |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)      | M2-3   |        |        |        |         |
| Horizon  | One    | Two    | Three  | Four   | Average |
| LR   | 33.39% | 31.98% | 14.91% | 12.45% | 22.42%  |
| SVR  | 31.48% | 28.64% | 17.20% | 15.23% | 22.34%  |
| BPNN   | 37.25% | 40.86% | 24.07% | 15.38% | 28.86%  |
| ELM  | 46.17% | 44.82% | 33.74% | 24.45% | 36.85%  |
| RVFL   | 35.52% | 40.88% | 32.17% | 22.67% | 32.49%  |

**Table S11** *IR* between different types of methods regarding *RMSE* in New Delhi.

| Panel A: Effectiveness of meteorological data            |            |         |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|------------|---------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Targets (with meteorological data)                       | M2-2       | M2-2    |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmarks (without meteorological data)                 | M1         | M2-3    |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Horizon  | One        | One     |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| LR   | 8.97%      | 1.67%   |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| SVR  | 13.02%     | -21.59% |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| BPNN   | 4.61%      | 0.39%   |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELM  | 12.51%     | -2.46%  |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| RVFL   | 9.18%      | -2.01%  |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panel B: Effectiveness of multi-source big data analysis |            |         |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Targets (with multi-source big data)                     | M0         | M0      | М3     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmarks (without multi-source big data)               | M4-2       | M4-3    | M1     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Horizon  | One        | One     | One    |  |  |  |  |  |
| LR   | 24.47%     | 9.44%   | 13.10% |  |  |  |  |  |
| SVR  | 13.20%     | 8.26%   | 11.08% |  |  |  |  |  |
| BPNN   | 19.81%     | 12.67%  | 8.63%  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELM  | 26.48%     | 6.66%   | 19.56% |  |  |  |  |  |
| RVFL   | 25.37%     | 10.80%  | 8.04%  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panel C: Effectiveness of multi-scale analysis           |            |         |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Targets (with multi-scale analysis)                      | <b>M</b> 0 | M4-2    | M4-3   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmarks (without multi-scale analysis)                | M3         | M2-2    | M2-3   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Horizon  | One        | One     | One    |  |  |  |  |  |
| LR   | 57.64%     | 46.46%  | 54.58% |  |  |  |  |  |
| SVR  | 57.46%     | 49.90%  | 61.01% |  |  |  |  |  |
| BPNN   | 55.65%     | 47.03%  | 51.17% |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELM  | 52.52%     | 40.62%  | 54.35% |  |  |  |  |  |
| RVFL   | 60.25%     | 46.07%  | 55.77% |  |  |  |  |  |

Table S12 MAPE and RMSE between different types of models using different lag periods in Beijing.

| <b>~</b> | Т    | LI   | 2     | SVR  | SVR ELM |      |       | RVFL |       |      | ВР    |  |
|----------|------|------|-------|------|---------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--|
| Lag      | Type | MAPE | RMSE  | MAPE | RMSE    | MAPE | RMSE  | MAPE | RMSE  | MAPE | RMSE  |  |
|          | M1   | 1.21 | 27.16 | 0.96 | 25.81   | 1.11 | 28.27 | 1.10 | 28.32 | 1.16 | 28.49 |  |
|          | M2-1 | 0.99 | 26.66 | 0.87 | 25.81   | 1.05 | 33.28 | 0.97 | 26.32 | 0.95 | 27.57 |  |
|          | M2-2 | 1.21 | 27.23 | 1.03 | 26.19   | 1.11 | 28.13 | 1.10 | 27.13 | 1.13 | 27.37 |  |
|          | M2-3 | 1.01 | 25.87 | 0.86 | 25.67   | 0.94 | 37.05 | 1.00 | 30.47 | 1.02 | 26.68 |  |
| Lag=2    | M3   | 0.94 | 26.40 | 0.87 | 25.87   | 0.92 | 26.56 | 0.95 | 25.34 | 1.00 | 25.63 |  |
|          | M4-1 | 0.65 | 18.02 | 0.56 | 16.55   | 0.69 | 23.65 | 0.61 | 16.85 | 0.58 | 16.82 |  |
|          | M4-2 | 0.62 | 16.73 | 0.55 | 15.25   | 0.79 | 53.91 | 0.61 | 16.16 | 0.64 | 16.56 |  |
|          | M4-3 | 0.68 | 18.18 | 0.61 | 16.64   | 0.61 | 16.11 | 0.65 | 16.66 | 0.65 | 16.93 |  |
|          | M0   | 0.69 | 16.43 | 0.53 | 14.35   | 0.57 | 16.37 | 0.58 | 15.05 | 0.59 | 16.04 |  |
|          | M1   | 1.18 | 26.86 | 0.96 | 25.76   | 1.09 | 27.79 | 1.06 | 27.38 | 1.14 | 27.59 |  |
|          | M2-1 | 0.97 | 26.56 | 0.86 | 25.72   | 0.96 | 26.10 | 0.97 | 25.94 | 0.97 | 26.17 |  |
|          | M2-2 | 1.18 | 27.14 | 1.03 | 26.07   | 1.10 | 28.02 | 1.08 | 27.07 | 1.15 | 27.62 |  |
|          | M2-3 | 1.02 | 25.85 | 0.87 | 25.66   | 1.00 | 29.29 | 1.02 | 25.73 | 1.00 | 25.48 |  |
| Lag=3    | M3   | 0.95 | 26.47 | 0.86 | 25.54   | 1.02 | 25.71 | 1.01 | 25.43 | 0.94 | 25.92 |  |
|          | M4-1 | 0.62 | 16.76 | 0.60 | 15.29   | 0.65 | 16.49 | 0.61 | 15.69 | 0.65 | 15.93 |  |
|          | M4-2 | 0.59 | 16.18 | 0.56 | 15.59   | 0.66 | 22.94 | 0.63 | 17.33 | 0.60 | 15.41 |  |
|          | M4-3 | 0.66 | 17.26 | 0.62 | 16.04   | 0.63 | 15.87 | 0.65 | 16.29 | 0.64 | 16.42 |  |
|          | M0   | 0.65 | 16.14 | 0.53 | 14.38   | 0.56 | 14.93 | 0.59 | 15.53 | 0.59 | 15.90 |  |
|          | M1   | 1.18 | 26.88 | 0.97 | 25.80   | 1.12 | 27.79 | 1.11 | 27.17 | 1.09 | 26.98 |  |
|          | M2-1 | 1.01 | 26.63 | 0.90 | 25.63   | 0.99 | 26.43 | 1.01 | 25.97 | 1.02 | 26.18 |  |
|          | M2-2 | 1.19 | 27.19 | 1.03 | 26.19   | 1.11 | 27.50 | 1.10 | 27.17 | 1.12 | 27.15 |  |
|          | M2-3 | 0.97 | 25.53 | 0.88 | 25.46   | 0.93 | 26.56 | 0.94 | 25.53 | 0.95 | 25.95 |  |
| Lag=5    | M3   | 0.95 | 26.15 | 0.91 | 25.58   | 0.98 | 25.37 | 0.98 | 25.45 | 0.95 | 25.77 |  |
|          | M4-1 | 0.60 | 16.58 | 0.56 | 15.96   | 0.58 | 15.77 | 0.60 | 15.22 | 0.64 | 16.02 |  |
|          | M4-2 | 0.58 | 15.91 | 0.57 | 16.34   | 0.60 | 15.71 | 0.60 | 15.22 | 0.60 | 16.91 |  |
|          | M4-3 | 0.64 | 17.11 | 0.62 | 16.69   | 0.63 | 16.33 | 0.63 | 16.67 | 0.63 | 16.57 |  |
|          | M0   | 0.64 | 15.98 | 0.56 | 15.18   | 0.58 | 15.35 | 0.59 | 15.13 | 0.60 | 16.05 |  |
|          | M1   | 1.16 | 26.72 | 0.96 | 25.75   | 1.14 | 27.55 | 1.12 | 26.85 | 1.10 | 26.63 |  |
|          | M2-1 | 1.01 | 26.60 | 0.90 | 25.64   | 1.00 | 26.21 | 1.01 | 25.85 | 1.14 | 26.76 |  |
|          | M2-2 | 1.17 | 27.08 | 1.03 | 26.21   | 1.12 | 28.13 | 1.13 | 27.67 | 1.14 | 28.12 |  |
|          | M2-3 | 0.97 | 25.55 | 0.89 | 25.46   | 0.96 | 26.31 | 0.94 | 25.70 | 0.94 | 25.90 |  |
| Lag=6    | M3   | 0.96 | 26.24 | 0.93 | 25.81   | 0.97 | 25.70 | 0.96 | 25.85 | 0.98 | 26.50 |  |
|          | M4-1 | 0.60 | 16.73 | 0.61 | 16.91   | 0.58 | 17.01 | 0.60 | 15.23 | 0.64 | 16.34 |  |
|          | M4-2 | 0.58 | 15.92 | 0.57 | 16.52   | 0.58 | 15.51 | 0.60 | 15.44 | 0.89 | 20.58 |  |
|          | M4-3 | 0.64 | 17.18 | 0.58 | 15.92   | 0.63 | 16.49 | 0.63 | 16.67 | 0.67 | 17.07 |  |
|          | M0   | 0.64 | 16.06 | 0.57 | 15.40   | 0.59 | 15.46 | 0.60 | 15.23 | 0.66 | 16.38 |  |
|          |      |      |       |      |         |      |       |      |       |      |       |  |

Table S13 MAPE and RMSE between different types of models using different lag periods in New Delhi.

| T     | Trimo | Type LR |       | SV   | SVR   |      | ELM   |      | RVFL  |      | BP    |  |
|-------|-------|---------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--|
| Lag   | Type  | MAPE    | RMSE  | MAPE | RMSE  | MAPE | RMSE  | MAPE | RMSE  | MAPE | RMSE  |  |
|       | M1    | 0.14    | 29.91 | 0.14 | 31.07 | 0.14 | 30.99 | 0.14 | 30.14 | 0.15 | 29.58 |  |
|       | M2-2  | 0.15    | 29.48 | 0.14 | 29.27 | 0.14 | 28.79 | 0.15 | 28.76 | 0.14 | 27.92 |  |
|       | M2-3  | 0.13    | 26.65 | 0.14 | 28.62 | 0.16 | 36.05 | 0.17 | 38.56 | 0.14 | 29.16 |  |
| Lag=2 | M3    | 0.13    | 26.72 | 0.13 | 28.02 | 0.15 | 32.20 | 0.16 | 33.77 | 0.13 | 28.48 |  |
|       | M4-2  | 0.08    | 15.71 | 0.07 | 15.22 | 0.07 | 14.51 | 0.07 | 15.05 | 0.08 | 15.96 |  |
|       | M4-3  | 0.08    | 14.86 | 0.08 | 17.25 | 0.07 | 13.94 | 0.07 | 13.96 | 0.07 | 15.09 |  |
|       | M0    | 0.06    | 11.97 | 0.06 | 11.59 | 0.06 | 11.70 | 0.06 | 11.27 | 0.06 | 12.82 |  |
|       | M1    | 0.15    | 31.47 | 0.14 | 32.60 | 0.15 | 30.78 | 0.15 | 30.87 | 0.17 | 34.97 |  |
|       | M2-2  | 0.16    | 30.15 | 0.15 | 29.36 | 0.15 | 28.71 | 0.15 | 29.40 | 0.14 | 28.05 |  |
|       | M2-3  | 0.14    | 27.92 | 0.14 | 30.11 | 0.16 | 34.16 | 0.16 | 33.73 | 0.16 | 36.17 |  |
| Lag=3 | M3    | 0.14    | 27.29 | 0.14 | 28.93 | 0.14 | 27.82 | 0.16 | 31.95 | 0.13 | 27.67 |  |
|       | M4-2  | 0.08    | 15.22 | 0.08 | 15.33 | 0.08 | 16.13 | 0.08 | 15.14 | 0.08 | 16.66 |  |
|       | M4-3  | 0.07    | 14.60 | 0.08 | 16.67 | 0.07 | 13.32 | 0.07 | 13.73 | 0.07 | 13.94 |  |
|       | M0    | 0.05    | 11.27 | 0.06 | 12.28 | 0.05 | 11.00 | 0.05 | 10.43 | 0.06 | 13.45 |  |
|       | M1    | 0.15    | 31.14 | 0.15 | 32.29 | 0.15 | 31.03 | 0.15 | 31.28 | 0.15 | 30.59 |  |
|       | M2-2  | 0.16    | 29.64 | 0.15 | 28.60 | 0.14 | 26.93 | 0.15 | 28.21 | 0.14 | 29.64 |  |
|       | M2-3  | 0.14    | 27.48 | 0.14 | 30.06 | 0.13 | 27.51 | 0.15 | 30.58 | 0.14 | 27.54 |  |
| Lag=5 | M3    | 0.14    | 27.01 | 0.15 | 29.71 | 0.13 | 25.53 | 0.15 | 30.02 | 0.13 | 25.24 |  |
|       | M4-2  | 0.08    | 15.27 | 0.08 | 15.85 | 0.08 | 15.39 | 0.08 | 14.83 | 0.08 | 16.06 |  |
|       | M4-3  | 0.07    | 13.68 | 0.08 | 15.95 | 0.07 | 13.53 | 0.07 | 13.15 | 0.08 | 15.81 |  |
|       | M0    | 0.05    | 10.93 | 0.07 | 13.77 | 0.06 | 12.39 | 0.05 | 10.41 | 0.07 | 14.65 |  |
|       | M1    | 0.15    | 32.09 | 0.14 | 32.80 | 0.16 | 33.07 | 0.16 | 33.38 | 0.15 | 32.18 |  |
|       | M2-2  | 0.16    | 29.80 | 0.15 | 29.87 | 0.15 | 27.57 | 0.16 | 29.05 | 0.15 | 28.92 |  |
|       | M2-3  | 0.13    | 27.42 | 0.14 | 30.72 | 0.13 | 28.26 | 0.15 | 31.13 | 0.13 | 29.26 |  |
| Lag=6 | M3    | 0.14    | 26.83 | 0.16 | 31.50 | 0.13 | 26.06 | 0.16 | 30.82 | 0.14 | 28.44 |  |
|       | M4-2  | 0.08    | 15.54 | 0.08 | 16.33 | 0.08 | 15.58 | 0.08 | 15.03 | 0.08 | 16.70 |  |
|       | M4-3  | 0.07    | 13.78 | 0.08 | 15.77 | 0.08 | 14.00 | 0.07 | 13.40 | 0.09 | 15.66 |  |
|       | M0    | 0.05    | 10.93 | 0.07 | 14.04 | 0.06 | 13.95 | 0.05 | 10.75 | 0.07 | 16.41 |  |