# Supplementary Information

## A Machine Learning Approach to Wastewater Treatment: Gaussian Process Regression and Monte Carlo Analysis

Table S-1: Range of parameters given to CCD under RSM

	Name	Unit	Low	High
Α	CFA-ZnF	Mg/100 mL	5	15
В	H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	mM	5	15
С	MB	ppm	5	15

Source	Sum of	df	Mean	F-value	p-value	Remarks
	Squares		Square		Prob>F	
Model	6807.81	9	756.42	91.38	< 0.0001	Significant
A-catalyst	1394.87	1	1394.87	168.51	< 0.0001	
dose						
B-oxidant	1421.97	1	1421.97	171.78	< 0.0001	
dose						
C-dye conc.	195.80	1	195.80	23.65	0.0007	
AB	330.14	1	330.14	39.88	< 0.0001	
AC	5.408E-	1	5.408E-	6.533E-004	0.9801	
	003		003			
BC	7.938E-	1	7.938E-	9.590E-004	0.9759	
	003		003			
A <sup>2</sup>	1905.50	1	1905.50	230.20	< 0.0001	
B <sup>2</sup>	1892.05	1	1892.05	228.57	< 0.0001	
C <sup>2</sup>	122.72	1	122.72	14.82	0.0032	
Residual	82.78	10	8.28			
Lack of Fit	48.63	5	9.73	1.42	0.3538	Not
						significant
Pure Error	34.15	5	6.83			
Cor Total	6890.59	19		•		
Std. Dev.	2.88		R-squared		0.9880	
Mean	77.26		Adj. R-squared		0.9772	
C.V.	3.72		Pred. R-squared		0.9394	
Press	417.90		Adeq. Precision		27.718	

Table S-2 ANOVA results of the quadratic model for degradation of MB using CFA-ZnFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>

Final Equation in Terms of Coded Factors (CFA-ZnFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>

Degradatio =+ 93.59 + 9.43 × A + 10.19 × B - 2.67 × C  $0.069 \times B \times C - 12.71 \times A^2 - 9.84 \times B^2 - 3.25$ 

#### 2 ICE Plots for Predictor Effects

The Individual Conditional Expectation (ICE) plots in the Figure S-1 illustrate how the predictors 3 4 CFA-ZnF, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and MB individually affect degradation. ICE plots are valuable for visualizing individual predictor relationships with the response variable while considering interactions with 5 other predictors. The ICE plot of CFA-ZnF showed that as the concentration of CFA-ZnF 6 increases, the degradation also increases, presenting a positive correlation. This trend is evident as 7 8 most individual lines (gray) and the average trend line (red) display an upward trajectory, peaking around a CFA-ZnF value of 10. This means that higher levels of CFA-ZnF are linked to improved 9 10 degradation efficiency. The grey lines denote the conditional expectation for individual data point in the dataset. Each grey line illustrates how the predicted response (degradation) varies with the 11 value of the corresponding predictor (CFA-ZnF, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, or MB) while keeping the rest of the 12 predictors constant. This helps visualize the variability and individual effects of the predictors on 13 14 the response variable at different points. The red line provides the summary of the overall effect of the predictor. The ICE plot corresponding to H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, also exhibits a positive correlation with 15 degradation. As the concentration of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> increases, degradation increases as well, with a 16 noticeable peak around the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> value of 10-15. The consistency of this trend across individual 17 lines and the average trend line highlights the significant role of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the degradation process. 18 In contrast, the third plot for MB negatively correlates with degradation. As the concentration of 19 MB increases, degradation decreases, which is indicated by the downward trend in both the 20 individual lines and the average trend line. This suggests that higher concentrations of MB inhibit 21 the degradation process. Overall, these ICE plots clearly represent how each predictor individually 22 affects the degradation process. The positive correlations observed for CFA-ZnF and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> 23 underscore their critical roles in enhancing degradation, while the negative correlation for MB 24 highlights its inhibitory effect. 25



27 Figure S-1 Individual Conditional Expectation (ICE) Plots for Predictors

#### 28 Shapley Summary Analysis

The provided Figure S-2 contains two Shapley Summary Plots, which illustrate the importance 29 and effect of each predictor-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, CFA-ZnF, and MB-on the degradation process. Shapley 30 values, derived from cooperative game theory, quantify the contribution of each predictor to the 31 model's output. The left plot is a Shapley Summary Plot that highlights individual Shapley values 32 for each predictor across different observations. Each point represents an individual Shapley value, 33 with the color indicating the predictor's value (low to high). For H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, most Shapley values are 34 positive, suggesting a generally positive impact on degradation. The spread of points along the 35 positive axis indicates varying degrees of contribution, with higher values of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (yellow points) 36 generally associated with higher positive Shapley values. Similarly, CFA-ZnF also shows 37 predominantly positive Shapley values, indicating its positive influence on degradation. The color 38 gradient for CFA-ZnF points shows a trend where higher values of the predictor lead to higher 39 Shapley values. In contrast, MB exhibits mostly negative Shapley values, signifying its inhibitory 40 effect on degradation. The yellow points associated with higher MB values align with more 41 negative Shapley values, reinforcing the negative correlation observed in the previous plots. The 42 right plot is a Shapley Summary Box Plot, which provides a more aggregated view of the 43 distribution of Shapley values for each predictor. For H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, the box plot shows a wide range of 44 positive Shapley values, with the interquartile range (IQR) lying significantly above zero. This 45 indicates that H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> consistently contributes positively to degradation across different observations. 46 The CFA-ZnF box plot similarly shows positive Shapley values with a slightly narrower IQR, 47 48 reinforcing its positive role in degradation. The MB box plot, however, reveals predominantly

49 negative Shapley values, with the IQR situated below zero. This further substantiates MB's 50 negative influence on the degradation process. Overall, the Shapley Summary Plots provide a 51 detailed and nuanced understanding of each predictor's role.  $H_2O_2$  and CFA-ZnF are consistently 52 shown to positively impact degradation, with their contributions varying across different levels of 53 the predictors. Conversely, MB is confirmed as an inhibitor, with higher values leading to more 54 substantial negative impacts on degradation. These insights are critical for fine-tuning the 55 degradation process and optimizing the conditions to maximize efficiency.



57 Figure S-2 Shapley Summary Plots for Predictor Contributions

58 The image displays Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations (LIME) for 20 query

59 points, each illustrating the impact of three predictors (1, 2, and 3) on the response variable. Each

60 bar chart represents the LIME values for a specific query point, indicating the contribution of

61 each predictor to the model's prediction for that point.

Predictors 1 and 2: Most query points show a strong positive LIME value, suggesting a significant positive influence on the degradation response.

64
2. Predictor 3: Often shows negative LIME values, indicating a negative impact on the response variable.

66 The consistent pattern across multiple query points highlights the robustness of the predictors'

67 effects, with predictors 1 and 2 generally enhancing degradation, while predictor 3 tends to

68 decrease it. This visualization supports the earlier correlation findings and provides insights into

69 the predictors' roles in the model's decision-making process.



70

71 Figure 3 LIME analysis for 20 query points, showing the impact of three predictors on degradation

### 72 Predictor Contributions by Interpretability Methods

The provided Figure S-3 illustrates the percentage contribution of three predictors—CFA-ZnF, 73 H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and MB-toward the degradation process, evaluated using four different interpretability 74 methods: Shapley Values, Permutation Importance, LIME Values, and F-test Scores. Each method 75 offers a unique perspective on the relative importance of these predictors. The top-left pie chart 76 depicts the contributions based on Shapley Values, a method rooted in cooperative game theory 77 that fairly distributes the total prediction value among the features. According to this chart, CFA-78 ZnF and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> have nearly equal importance, contributing 44.06% and 44.26% respectively, while 79 MB's contribution is significantly lower at 11.68%. In the top-right pie chart, which represents 80 Permutation Importance, the contributions are somewhat different. Here, CFA-ZnF has a slightly 81 higher contribution at 48.71%, followed closely by H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> at 46.52%. MB again shows the least 82 importance, contributing only 4.77%. This method assesses feature importance by measuring the 83 increase in the model's prediction error when the feature's values are randomly shuffled. 84

The bottom-left pie chart shows the contributions based on LIME (Local Interpretable Model-85 agnostic Explanations) Values. This method explains individual predictions by approximating the 86 model locally with an interpretable model. According to this chart, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> has the highest 87 contribution at 42.88%, followed by CFA-ZnF at 42.34 %, and MB at 14.78%. Finally, the bottom-88 right pie chart represents the contributions based on F-test Scores, which evaluate the statistical 89 significance of each feature. Here, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> has the highest contribution at 47.99%, followed closely 90 by CFA-ZnF at 47.36%, while MB remains the least important predictor with a contribution of 91 92 4.65%. In summary, across all four interpretability methods, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and CFA-ZnF consistently show substantial contributions to the degradation process, with their relative importance varying 93 94 slightly depending on the method used. MB, on the other hand, consistently appears as the least influential predictor. This consistency across different interpretability methods highlights the 95 96 robustness of the findings and reinforces the critical roles of CFA-ZnF and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the degradation 97 process.

98





Percentage Contribution of Each Predictor Based on LIME Values







100

Figure S-4 Percentage Contribution of Each Predictor Based on Different Interpretability 101 102 Methods

103 Figure S-5 represents the

99



105 Figure S-5 Characterization analysis (a) FTIR analysis, (b) XRD analysis, (c) XPR survey scans, 106 (d and e) SEM EDX analysis of CFA-ZnF (1:1)