

Artificial Intelligence-Based Forecasting of Water Consumption Patterns in Smart Cities

Dr. Siti Rahmawati

Associate Professor, Center for Urban Data Analytics, Indonesia

Abstract

The development of smart cities has encouraged the integration of digital monitoring infrastructure, intelligent information systems, and data-driven decision-making into urban resource management. Water distribution and consumption monitoring represent important applications of these technologies because municipal water requirements vary according to population activity, weather conditions, economic characteristics, and temporal consumption patterns. Smart metering systems provide opportunities to collect detailed consumption records and investigate changes in water use across different urban service areas. However, accurate demand forecasting remains challenging because consumption behavior exhibits temporal dependencies, nonlinear relationships, irregular fluctuations, and differences among urban communities. The present paper develops a hypothetical methodological framework for investigating artificial intelligence-based forecasting of water consumption patterns in smart cities. The proposed investigation combines historical smart-meter information, meteorological indicators, calendar variables, statistical forecasting, and machine learning techniques. Five forecasting configurations are considered: Seasonal Naïve Forecasting, Seasonal Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average, Random Forest Regression, Gradient Boosting Regression, and Long Short-Term Memory networks.

A fictional dataset containing 11,688 daily aggregated water consumption records from eight urban service zones across a four-year observation period is introduced to demonstrate the intended research design. The methodology incorporates data quality assessment, temporal feature engineering, seasonal consumption analysis, chronological validation, and independent forecasting evaluation. Two illustrative analytical tables present quarterly consumption patterns and comparative prediction errors among the selected methods. Mean absolute error and root mean squared error are considered primary evaluation measures. All numerical values are manually constructed and do not represent collected smart-meter records, executed forecasting experiments, or verified urban consumption patterns. The methodological discussion examines temporal variability, environmental influences, data availability, computational complexity, forecasting uncertainty, and responsible management of consumption information. Particular attention is given to distinguishing short-term demand prediction from long-term infrastructure planning. The paper concludes that artificial intelligence provides a relevant methodological foundation for forecasting urban water consumption, although reliable implementation requires representative observations, reproducible modeling, independent evaluation, and appropriate operational interpretation.

Keywords: Smart Cities, Artificial Intelligence, Water Consumption Forecasting, Smart Water Management, Machine Learning, Urban Water Demand, Smart Metering, Time-Series Forecasting, Random Forest, Long Short-Term Memory.

1. Introduction

Urban water management has become an important area of technological development as cities increasingly adopt digital infrastructure to improve resource monitoring and operational decision-making. Water distribution systems support residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial activities that depend on reliable access to adequate water supplies. Managing these systems requires an understanding of how consumption changes across locations and observation periods. Traditional infrastructure planning frequently relies on historical demand estimates and established operating assumptions. However, the growing availability of digital metering information provides opportunities to investigate water consumption through more detailed computational analysis and develop forecasting procedures suited to changing urban conditions.

Water consumption patterns are influenced by multiple interacting characteristics of urban environments. Residential demand may vary according to household routines, weekly activity schedules, seasonal conditions, and local weather. Commercial and institutional consumption can respond to working days, public holidays, and changes in economic activity. Differences in service-zone composition may also produce distinct demand characteristics. These relationships create temporal patterns that are not necessarily consistent across geographical areas. Consequently, understanding water consumption requires analytical methods capable of examining recurring demand cycles while recognizing irregular variation and differences among consumer groups.

Smart water monitoring technologies provide an increasingly important source of information for examining municipal consumption. Digital water meters and connected data collection systems can record water usage at predefined intervals, allowing utilities to investigate changes in demand across time and location. When appropriately aggregated, these observations can support operational forecasting without requiring detailed disclosure of individual household behavior. However, smart-meter datasets may contain missing readings, communication interruptions, inconsistent reporting intervals, and changes in equipment configuration. Such limitations must be addressed before recorded consumption values can be considered reliable inputs for predictive modeling.

Artificial intelligence and machine learning provide computational approaches for representing complex relationships within historical water consumption information. Statistical time-series models can capture recurring temporal structures, while ensemble learning algorithms can represent nonlinear interactions among consumption history, weather indicators, and calendar characteristics. Recurrent neural networks provide another approach for processing sequential data through learned temporal representations. Nevertheless, increasingly complex forecasting models do not necessarily produce more accurate predictions under every operating condition. Their effectiveness depends on representative observations, suitable model configuration, and the independence of evaluation data.

The present paper proposes a hypothetical comparative investigation of artificial intelligence-based forecasting of daily water consumption within a smart city environment. The proposed framework considers aggregated smart-meter records from eight fictional service zones and evaluates five alternative forecasting configurations. Historical demand features, calendar characteristics, and

appropriately available meteorological information form the basis of the intended predictive analysis. Two illustrative tables demonstrate how consumption patterns and forecasting errors could be reported. No actual municipal water records were accessed or analyzed, and the numerical examples serve exclusively to establish a methodological framework for future empirical research.

2. Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to examine the methodological application of artificial intelligence for forecasting water consumption patterns in smart cities. The investigation focuses on temporal demand characteristics, comparative forecasting models, and prediction reliability. Three specific objectives establish the analytical direction of the proposed framework and support its application to urban water resource management research.

2.1 Examination of Temporal Urban Water Consumption Patterns

The first objective is to examine how historical smart-meter observations can be organized to identify recurring patterns in urban water consumption. Daily demand records may exhibit differences associated with working days, weekends, seasonal conditions, and particular urban service areas. The proposed investigation considers how temporal aggregation, descriptive statistics, and historical comparisons could represent these characteristics. Particular attention is given to recognizing consumption fluctuations without assuming that every observed difference reflects a permanent change in demand.

The investigation further aims to assess the relationship between consumption history and relevant environmental conditions. Temperature and rainfall may influence selected water uses, particularly in locations where outdoor demand varies with weather. However, these relationships are dependent on local infrastructure, population characteristics, and consumption practices. Consequently, the proposed framework considers meteorological variables as potential predictive indicators rather than universally established determinants. This objective emphasizes the importance of examining temporal patterns within their operational context before developing forecasting models.

2.2 Comparative Evaluation of Artificial Intelligence Forecasting Models

The second objective focuses on establishing a comparative framework for alternative methods of predicting daily urban water consumption. Seasonal Naïve Forecasting, SARIMA, Random Forest, Gradient Boosting, and Long Short-Term Memory networks are selected to represent different forecasting principles. The intended comparison considers prediction accuracy using mean absolute error and root mean squared error. The proposed framework seeks to determine how these methods could be evaluated under common data preparation, forecasting horizons, and independent testing conditions.

A further objective involves examining whether machine learning models provide useful predictive information beyond conventional time-series baselines. Ensemble methods may capture nonlinear relationships among explanatory variables, while recurrent architectures may represent sequential consumption patterns. However, additional model complexity also increases training requirements and opportunities for overfitting. Consequently, the proposed methodology emphasizes appropriate hyperparameter selection, consistent feature availability, and controlled evaluation. This objective encourages model comparison based on reproducible evidence rather than assumptions concerning the advantages of advanced artificial intelligence techniques.

2.3 Assessment of Forecasting Reliability and Smart Water Management Constraints

The third objective is to identify methodological difficulties that may affect water consumption forecasting within smart city environments. Missing meter records, measurement inconsistencies, changes in consumption behavior, and differences among urban service zones can complicate predictive modeling. Temporal dependencies may also generate misleading performance estimates if future observations influence training decisions. The proposed study considers how data quality assessment, chronological partitioning, and suitable forecasting metrics could address selected limitations.

The investigation also considers operational requirements associated with integrating forecasts into municipal water management. Predicted demand values may support planning and operational assessment, but their interpretation depends on forecast uncertainty and the consequences of incorrect estimates. Overprediction and underprediction may affect different management decisions in different ways. Consequently, this objective emphasizes transparent reporting, responsible data processing, and human oversight. These considerations provide a basis for evaluating forecasting techniques beyond their numerical error scores.

3. Review of Literature

3.1 Historical Foundations of Urban Water Demand Analysis

Zhou et al. (2000) investigated daily urban water demand in Melbourne and examined the influence of temporal trends, seasonal patterns, climatic factors, and autocorrelation. Jain et al. (2001) subsequently investigated short-term water demand forecasting using artificial neural networks and conventional statistical models. Arbués et al. (2003) reviewed residential water demand estimation and emphasized the importance of explanatory variables, model specification, and econometric considerations. These contributions established foundational approaches for examining the relationship between historical consumption and urban environmental or socioeconomic conditions.

Bougadis et al. (2005) compared regression, time-series, and neural network techniques for short-term municipal water demand forecasting. Gato et al. (2007) investigated temperature and rainfall thresholds in urban water demand modeling. Adamowski (2008) examined artificial neural networks for forecasting peak daily water requirements, while Worthington and Hoffman (2008) reviewed empirical approaches to residential demand modeling. Together, these studies indicate that urban water consumption reflects temporal, environmental, and behavioral relationships that require careful consideration during forecasting model development.

3.2 Development of Machine Learning and Adaptive Forecasting

Ghiassi et al. (2008) investigated a dynamic artificial neural network model for forecasting urban water demand across different temporal scales. Herrera et al. (2010) compared predictive approaches for hourly consumption forecasting using urban water demand records. Adamowski and Karapataki (2010) examined regression and neural network methods for peak water demand forecasting. These studies demonstrated the relevance of computational learning techniques to municipal water demand prediction and emphasized the importance of comparing models under appropriate forecasting conditions.

Polebitski and Palmer (2010) investigated seasonal residential water demand at a spatially disaggregated scale. Tiwari and Adamowski (2013) examined ensemble wavelet-bootstrap-neural network approaches and uncertainty assessment. Bakker et al. (2013) developed an adaptive short-term

drinking water demand forecasting model, while Romano and Kapelan (2014) investigated adaptive forecasting for smart water distribution management. These contributions established important connections between temporal prediction, computational adaptation, and operational water system requirements.

3.3 Artificial Intelligence Methods and Forecast Evaluation

Breiman (2001) introduced Random Forest as an ensemble learning approach capable of representing nonlinear relationships among explanatory variables. Friedman (2001) developed Gradient Boosting through sequential prediction optimization. Gers et al. (2000) investigated Long Short-Term Memory networks for continual sequence prediction. These contributions established relevant methodological foundations for comparing ensemble-based and recurrent learning approaches. Their application to water consumption forecasting depends on the availability of representative temporal data, suitable training procedures, and appropriate evaluation conditions.

Hyndman and Koehler (2006) examined forecast accuracy measures and emphasized the importance of suitable error metrics. Cawley and Talbot (2010) investigated model-selection bias, while Bergstra and Bengio (2012) examined randomized hyperparameter optimization. House-Peters and Chang (2011) reviewed urban water demand modeling through a framework involving coupled human and environmental systems. Donkor et al. (2014) reviewed urban demand forecasting techniques, and Hutton and Kapelan (2015) examined probabilistic uncertainty assessment. These contributions support transparent prediction evaluation and careful interpretation of forecasting errors.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design and Forecasting Framework

The present paper adopts a hypothetical comparative quantitative design for examining daily urban water consumption forecasting. Five models are considered: Seasonal Naïve Forecasting, Seasonal Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average, Random Forest Regression, Gradient Boosting Regression, and Long Short-Term Memory networks. Each method would estimate consumption one day ahead using information available at the prediction origin. The proposed framework combines descriptive consumption-pattern analysis with independent predictive evaluation. No actual computational experiments or municipal water measurements were used.

The intended analytical procedure consists of data preparation, temporal feature construction, forecasting model development, parameter optimization, and independent testing. Seasonal Naïve Forecasting would provide a day-of-week reference, while SARIMA would represent statistical temporal dependence. Random Forest and Gradient Boosting would use structured historical and calendar features. LSTM would examine sequential consumption information. All models would be evaluated against equivalent target observations. Forecasting parameters would be selected using development information without accessing future test outcomes.

4.2 Hypothetical Smart-Meter Dataset and Feature Engineering

For illustrative purposes, the proposed study assumes a fictional dataset containing daily aggregated water consumption observations from eight urban service zones between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2015. The period contains 1,461 calendar days, producing 11,688 zone-day records. Each record

represents the total volume of metered water consumption within a service zone, expressed in cubic meters per day. These records are manually specified as part of the hypothetical research design and do not represent actual smart-meter measurements.

The proposed preprocessing procedure would examine missing readings, duplicated observations, inconsistent reporting intervals, and unexpected measurement changes. Predictive features would include consumption lags, rolling historical averages, day-of-week indicators, public-holiday information, and selected meteorological variables. Weather-related inputs for next-day prediction would be restricted to observations available before the forecast date or forecasts issued at that time. The methodology would avoid using actual future weather measurements. Service-zone identifiers would also be considered where appropriate to represent differences in consumption patterns.

4.3 Model Development and Performance Evaluation

The proposed dataset would be separated chronologically into model development observations from 2012–2014, validation observations from January–June 2015, and independent testing observations from July–December 2015. This arrangement provides 8,768 training records, 1,448 validation records, and 1,472 test records. Seasonal Naïve Forecasting would predict demand using the corresponding day from the previous week. SARIMA would use appropriately selected seasonal parameters, while machine learning models would receive consistent historical information.

The intended evaluation would report mean absolute error and root mean squared error in cubic meters per service zone per day. MAE would describe average absolute forecasting deviation, whereas RMSE would place greater emphasis on larger prediction errors. An implemented investigation should also assess forecast bias, high-demand periods, uncertainty intervals, and computational efficiency. Error metrics would be calculated across equivalent zone-day observations to support comparability. The present manuscript uses manually constructed values solely to demonstrate reporting procedures.

5. Analysis

5.1 Illustrative Assessment of Urban Water Consumption Patterns

Urban water consumption may exhibit recurring temporal patterns associated with seasonal conditions, daily routines, and changes in community activity. Identifying these patterns provides a basis for constructing informative forecasting features and understanding differences among observation periods. Table 1 presents hypothetical quarterly consumption characteristics across the proposed four-year dataset. Each observation represents one service zone on one calendar day. The reported average consumption values have been manually assigned to demonstrate a possible analytical presentation rather than calculated from actual records.

The illustrative table demonstrates how average daily consumption could differ among calendar quarters. The constructed example assigns the highest average to April–June, followed by July–September, October–December, and January–March. However, this pattern does not establish a universal seasonal relationship because urban water use depends on local climate and service-zone characteristics. A genuine investigation would require measured observations and suitable statistical analysis before interpreting differences as meaningful. The hypothetical values therefore provide a descriptive reporting example.

Table 1: Hypothetical Quarterly Water Consumption Patterns in Smart City Service Zones

Calendar Period	Observation Records	Mean Daily Consumption per Zone (m ³)	Illustrative Consumption Profile
January–March	2,888	4,850	Relatively lower demand
April–June	2,912	5,430	Higher demand
July–September	2,944	5,260	Moderately elevated demand
October–December	2,944	4,970	Moderate demand
Total	11,688	—	—

The illustrative differences highlight how temporal characteristics could inform forecasting model development. Nevertheless, quarterly averages may conceal variation among weekdays, weekends, individual service zones, and unusually high-demand days.

5.2 Illustrative Comparison of Artificial Intelligence Forecasting Models

Forecasting performance can be evaluated by comparing estimated daily water consumption with independent reference observations. Mean absolute error summarizes the average absolute difference between predicted and observed values, while root mean squared error gives greater influence to larger deviations. Table 2 presents hypothetical forecast errors for five selected models. The conceptual test period contains 1,472 service zone-day records. These numerical values were manually constructed and do not represent actual predictions or results obtained through algorithm execution.

The illustrative comparison assigns the lowest forecast errors to Gradient Boosting, followed by LSTM, Random Forest, SARIMA, and the seasonal baseline. This constructed pattern demonstrates how statistical and artificial intelligence methods could be compared under a common evaluation framework. However, the hypothetical differences cannot establish that nonlinear algorithms provide superior forecasting performance. Genuine evaluation would require implemented models, representative consumption records, independent testing, and uncertainty assessment.

Table 2: Hypothetical Comparative Forecasting Performance of Artificial Intelligence Models

Forecasting Model	Mean Absolute Error (m ³ /day)	Root Mean Squared Error (m ³ /day)
Seasonal Naïve Forecasting	540	720
SARIMA	465	620
Random Forest	410	555

Regression		
Gradient Boosting Regression	380	516
LSTM Neural Network	395	540

The illustrative results show how two complementary error measures could support comparison. They do not establish statistically significant differences, and the values should not be interpreted as verified forecasting improvements for smart city water systems.

6. Discussion

6.1 Temporal Consumption Characteristics and Urban Demand Behavior

Urban water consumption reflects recurring routines and changing requirements across residential, commercial, and institutional activities. Historical demand records may contain weekly cycles, seasonal variation, and differences among urban service zones. These characteristics can provide useful inputs for short-term forecasting. However, their interpretation depends on local operating conditions and the composition of the customer population. The proposed framework therefore emphasizes examining temporal consumption patterns before selecting predictive features or interpreting apparent changes in demand.

The hypothetical quarterly profiles demonstrate a possible pattern of demand variation across the calendar year. Nevertheless, seasonal differences cannot be attributed exclusively to temperature or rainfall because consumption is influenced by multiple factors. Changes in occupancy, commercial activity, conservation practices, and service arrangements may also affect demand. Consequently, a genuine investigation should examine relevant contextual variables and uncertainty before establishing explanations for observed patterns. The illustrative table supports methodological discussion but does not provide evidence concerning any actual urban population.

6.2 Artificial Intelligence Models and Forecasting Performance

Machine learning approaches can represent complex relationships among historical consumption observations, meteorological information, and calendar characteristics. Random Forest uses ensembles of decision trees, while Gradient Boosting develops predictive models through sequential optimization. LSTM networks provide an alternative method for examining temporal dependencies through recurrent computation. These techniques differ in their learning assumptions and computational requirements. Their usefulness depends on the quantity and quality of historical records, the forecast horizon, and the stability of consumption patterns.

The hypothetical performance comparison assigns favorable numerical errors to Gradient Boosting and LSTM. However, these values are not empirical findings and cannot establish that either method would outperform simpler alternatives in a real urban water system. A completed study should examine whether observed performance differences remain consistent across service zones, seasons, and high-demand periods. Model complexity, training requirements, and forecast interpretability would also influence practical selection. Consequently, reliable comparison requires more than ranking models according to one illustrative error table.

6.3 Forecast Uncertainty and Smart City Decision Support

Water consumption forecasts may support operational decisions concerning pumping schedules, storage management, and the coordination of water supply services. However, a predicted consumption value represents an estimate rather than a guaranteed future requirement. Forecast uncertainty can arise from incomplete monitoring records, changes in customer behavior, weather forecast errors, and unexpected operational events. Consequently, effective decision support requires attention to uncertainty and the possible consequences of prediction errors under different operating conditions.

The methodological literature emphasizes the relevance of uncertainty-aware forecasting. Tiwari and Adamowski (2013) investigated forecasting uncertainty through ensemble methods, while Hutton and Kapelan (2015) examined probabilistic approaches to short-term demand prediction. These contributions indicate that point forecasts alone may provide insufficient information for selected water management decisions. Future empirical studies should therefore evaluate prediction intervals, forecast bias, and reliability during unusual demand conditions. The present hypothetical framework identifies these requirements without claiming operational validation.

7. Challenges

7.1 Smart-Meter Data Quality and Consumption Record Reliability

Smart-meter datasets may contain missing readings, communication interruptions, duplicated records, and discrepancies arising from device configuration or reporting procedures. These limitations can introduce irregularities into historical consumption information and affect predictive model development. In particular, incomplete daily measurements may distort lagged features or create artificial changes in demand. Consequently, reliable forecasting requires systematic assessment of data completeness, consistency, and temporal alignment before model training. These safeguards are important even when large quantities of observations are available.

Data preparation introduces additional methodological decisions concerning missing-value treatment, measurement correction, and aggregation. Excessive interpolation may conceal unusual consumption events, while inappropriate handling of meter resets can create misleading demand values. Aggregating records also requires clear definitions of service-zone boundaries and consumption units. The proposed framework therefore emphasizes documented preprocessing procedures and sensitivity assessment. A future empirical investigation should evaluate whether forecast performance remains reliable under alternative data preparation methods and different levels of record completeness.

7.2 Changing Consumption Behavior and Temporal Model Stability

Urban water demand may change in response to weather conditions, public holidays, population activities, conservation measures, and alterations in service arrangements. These developments can modify the temporal relationships represented in historical consumption records. A forecasting model trained during one period may therefore become less reliable when applied to different operating conditions. Seasonal adjustments and periodic model evaluation can address selected difficulties, but their effectiveness depends on the type and extent of the underlying change.

Model adaptation presents further challenges because frequent retraining can introduce instability when recent observations contain unusual or unrepresentative patterns. Conversely, retaining an outdated forecasting model may reduce predictive accuracy as consumption behavior evolves. The

proposed methodology therefore emphasizes controlled model updates and independent performance assessment. Future research should investigate how different algorithms respond to changes in demand characteristics and determine whether adaptive forecasting produces meaningful improvements under representative urban conditions.

7.3 Computational Integration, Privacy, and Operational Interpretation

Artificial intelligence-based forecasting requires coordination between data acquisition systems, computational platforms, and municipal water management processes. Differences in technical infrastructure may influence the availability and timeliness of consumption information. Complex models can also require substantial computational resources during training and maintenance. Consequently, algorithm selection should consider processing requirements and operational compatibility alongside prediction accuracy. A model that performs favorably in offline testing may require additional development before it can support routine utility operations.

Privacy and responsible data processing represent additional considerations because detailed consumption patterns may reveal information about household routines. Aggregating data at the service-zone level can reduce exposure of individual records, although privacy safeguards remain necessary. Forecast interpretation also requires caution because changes in metered consumption do not automatically establish leakage, unauthorized use, or infrastructure failure. The proposed framework therefore emphasizes appropriate access controls, transparent analysis, and professional oversight. These requirements support responsible application of artificial intelligence within urban water services.

8. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence provides a methodological foundation for forecasting water consumption patterns within smart city environments. The present paper developed a hypothetical comparative framework incorporating historical smart-meter information, temporal feature construction, meteorological indicators, and five forecasting approaches. Seasonal Naïve Forecasting and SARIMA were considered alongside Random Forest, Gradient Boosting, and LSTM networks. The proposed research design demonstrates how short-term urban water demand forecasting could be organized through consistent data preparation, chronological validation, and independent performance assessment.

The illustrative tables demonstrate possible methods for presenting quarterly consumption patterns and comparative forecasting errors. However, all numerical values were manually constructed and do not represent collected municipal water records or completed artificial intelligence experiments. Establishing meaningful predictive performance would require authentic consumption observations, implemented forecasting procedures, independent testing, and uncertainty analysis. Consequently, the hypothetical results cannot support claims concerning actual seasonal demand characteristics or the operational superiority of any particular forecasting model.

Overall, the study identifies data quality, temporal variability, model adaptability, computational requirements, and information privacy as important considerations in smart city water consumption forecasting. Future empirical investigations should examine these factors through representative datasets and reproducible experimental procedures. Artificial intelligence may contribute to informed water management when forecasts are evaluated appropriately and integrated with established operational practices. Nevertheless, reliable conclusions regarding forecasting effectiveness and resource

management benefits must be supported by independently verified evidence rather than illustrative numerical comparisons.

References

1. Adamowski, J. (2008). Peak daily water demand forecast modeling using artificial neural networks. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 134(2), 119–128. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9496\(2008\)134:2\(119\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9496(2008)134:2(119))
2. Adamowski, J., & Karapataki, C. (2010). Comparison of multivariate regression and artificial neural networks for peak urban water-demand forecasting: Evaluation of different ANN learning algorithms. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 15(10), 729–743. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)HE.1943-5584.0000245](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-5584.0000245)
3. Adamowski, J., Chan, H. F., Prasher, S. O., Ozga-Zielinski, B., & Sliusarieva, A. (2012). Comparison of multiple linear and nonlinear regression, autoregressive integrated moving average, artificial neural network, and wavelet artificial neural network methods for urban water demand forecasting in Montreal, Canada. *Water Resources Research*, 48(1), W01528. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010WR009945>
4. House-Peters, L. A., & Chang, H. (2011). Urban water demand modeling: Review of concepts, methods, and organizing principles. *Water Resources Research*, 47(5). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010WR009624>
5. Donkor, E. A., Mazzuchi, T. A., Soyer, R., & Roberson, J. A. (2014). Urban water demand forecasting: Review of methods and models. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 140(2), 146–159. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)WR.1943-5452.0000314](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000314)
6. Ghalekhondabi, I., Ardjmand, E., Young, W. A., & Weckman, G. R. (2017). Water demand forecasting: Review of soft computing methods. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 189, Article 313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-017-6030-3>
7. Bougadis, J., Adamowski, K., & Diduch, R. (2005). Short-term municipal water demand forecasting. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 131(2), 140–147. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9496\(2005\)131:2\(140\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9496(2005)131:2(140))
8. Herrera, M., Torgo, L., Izquierdo, J., & Pérez-García, R. (2010). Predictive models for forecasting hourly urban water demand. *Journal of Hydrology*, 387(1–2), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.04.005>
9. Ghiassi, M., Zimbra, D. K., & Saidane, H. (2008). Urban water demand forecasting with a dynamic artificial neural network model. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 134(2), 138–146.
10. House-Peters, L. A., & Chang, H. (2009). Urban water demand modeling: Review of concepts, methods, and organizing principles. *Water Resources Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010WR009624>
11. Kavya, M., Mathew, A., Raja Shekar, P., & Sarwesh, P. (2023). Short term water demand forecast modelling using artificial intelligence for smart water management. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 96, Article 104610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104610>

12. Ghannam, S., & Hussain, F. (2023). Comparison of deep learning approaches for forecasting urban short-term water demand: A Greater Sydney Region case study. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 275, Article 110660. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2023.110660>
13. Malialis, K., Mavri, N., Vrachimis, S. G., Kyriakou, M. S., Eliades, D. G., & Polycarpou, M. M. (2024). Urban water consumption forecasting using deep learning and correlated district metered areas. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.00158>
14. El Hanjri, M., Kabbaj, H., Kobbane, A., & Abouaomar, A. (2023). Federated learning for water consumption forecasting in smart cities. In 2023 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICC45041.2023.10279576>
15. Maußner, C., Oberascher, M., Autengruber, A., Kahl, A., & Sitzenfrei, R. (2025). Explainable artificial intelligence for reliable water demand forecasting to increase trust in predictions. *Water Research*, 268, Article 122779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2024.122779>
16. Forecasting urban household water demand with statistical and machine learning methods using large space-time data: A comparative study. (2018). *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 102, 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.01.002>
17. Influence of exogenous factors on water demand forecasting models during the COVID-19 period. (2023). *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 117, Article 105617. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2022.105617>
18. Interval forecasting for urban water demand using PSO optimized KDE distribution and LSTM neural networks. (2022). *Applied Soft Computing*, 122, Article 108875. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2022.108875>
19. ANN-based residential water end-use demand forecasting model. (2013). *Expert Systems with Applications*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417412009736>
20. The role of deep learning in urban water management: A critical review. (2023). *Water Research*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0043135422009204>