

Self-Supervised Graph Attention Networks for Community-Engaged Lead Contamination Risk Assessment

Supplementary Material

Raphael Anaadumba¹, Nazim A. Belabbaci¹, Yigit Bozkurt², Connor Sullivan²,
Pradeep Kurup^{2,*}, and Mohammad Arif Ul Alam^{1,*}

¹Richard A Miner School of Computer and Information Sciences, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, USA

²Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, USA

pradeep_kurup@uml.edu mohammadariful_alam@uml.edu

Algorithm

Algorithm 1: Within-City Validation Protocol (LOWO) in Flint

```

1: Input: Ward-partitioned dataset  $\{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_9\}$ ; seeds  $\mathcal{S} = \{1, \dots, 5\}$ ;  $K = 5$  folds; max epochs  $E = 100$ ; patience  $p = 5$ 
2: Output: LOWO metrics for each held-out ward  $w$  (mean  $\pm$  std over seeds)
3: for each held-out ward  $w \in \{1, \dots, 9\}$  do
4:    $\mathcal{D}^{\text{test}} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_w$ ;  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{train}} \leftarrow \bigcup_{u \neq w} \mathcal{D}_u$ 
5:   Construct parcel-based training and test graphs using the same deterministic parcel-induced rule
6:    $G^{\text{train}} \leftarrow (\mathcal{D}^{\text{train}}, E^{\text{train}})$ ,  $G^{\text{test}} \leftarrow (\mathcal{D}^{\text{test}}, E^{\text{test}})$  {Parcel-induced edges only; held-out test nodes are excluded from
   training-time message passing.}
7:   for each seed  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  do
8:     Initialize  $K$ -fold split of  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{train}}$  with shuffle=True, random_state= $s$ 
9:     best_val  $\leftarrow +\infty$ ;  $\theta_{w,s}^* \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
10:    for each fold  $k = 1$  to  $K$  do
11:      Split  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{train}}$  into  $\mathcal{D}_k^{\text{train}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_k^{\text{val}}$ 
12:      Create node masks for  $\mathcal{D}_k^{\text{train}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_k^{\text{val}}$  on  $G^{\text{train}}$ ; build NeighborSampler loaders using only the training graph
13:      Initialize GAT model with reconstruction head (SSGAT) and Adam optimizer
14:      using the fixed hyperparameter configuration from the main manuscript
15:      for epoch  $e = 1$  to  $E$  do
16:        Update parameters using  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Total}} = \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_{\text{Recon}}$  on training nodes
17:        Compute validation loss on  $\mathcal{D}_k^{\text{val}}$ 
18:        Apply early stopping with patience  $p$ 
19:      end for
20:      if validation loss for fold  $k < \text{best\_val}$  then
21:        best_val  $\leftarrow$  validation loss;  $\theta_{w,s}^* \leftarrow$  model parameters for this fold
22:      end if
23:    end for
24:    Evaluate  $\theta_{w,s}^*$  on the held-out ward nodes  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{test}}$  and store metrics (Acc., Macro-Prec., Macro-Rec.)
25:    Save checkpoint  $\theta_{w,s}^*$  as checkpoint_{w,s}.pth
26:  end for
27:  Aggregate test metrics for ward  $w$  as mean  $\pm$  std across  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ 
28: end for
29: Return: Ward-wise LOWO performance summary (mean  $\pm$  std over 5 seeds)

```

Leave One Ward Out	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.
	Multi-Class			Current Action			Historic Action		
Ward 1	0.72 $\pm$ 0.04	0.64 $\pm$ 0.01	0.68 $\pm$ 0.04	0.78 $\pm$ 0.06	0.57 $\pm$ 0.01	0.62 $\pm$ 0.01	0.78 $\pm$ 0.09	0.56 $\pm$ 0.06	0.65 $\pm$ 0.13
Ward 2	0.68 $\pm$ 0.11	0.57 $\pm$ 0.03	0.60 $\pm$ 0.05	0.70 $\pm$ 0.11	0.53 $\pm$ 0.03	0.57 $\pm$ 0.05	0.76 $\pm$ 0.06	0.54 $\pm$ 0.01	0.64 $\pm$ 0.03
Ward 3	0.76 $\pm$ 0.08	0.60 $\pm$ 0.10	0.64 $\pm$ 0.14	0.84 $\pm$ 0.08	0.60 $\pm$ 0.07	0.70 $\pm$ 0.15	0.89 $\pm$ 0.06	0.62 $\pm$ 0.05	0.78 $\pm$ 0.16
Ward 4	0.68 $\pm$ 0.07	0.54 $\pm$ 0.03	0.55 $\pm$ 0.04	0.76 $\pm$ 0.08	0.51 $\pm$ 0.05	0.50 $\pm$ 0.05	0.83 $\pm$ 0.07	0.53 $\pm$ 0.04	0.55 $\pm$ 0.05
Ward 5	0.70 $\pm$ 0.04	0.64 $\pm$ 0.05	0.69 $\pm$ 0.07	0.70 $\pm$ 0.07	0.60 $\pm$ 0.03	0.66 $\pm$ 0.03	0.84 $\pm$ 0.09	0.68 $\pm$ 0.12	0.78 $\pm$ 0.08
Ward 6	0.65 $\pm$ 0.07	0.56 $\pm$ 0.02	0.58 $\pm$ 0.03	0.65 $\pm$ 0.08	0.52 $\pm$ 0.03	0.56 $\pm$ 0.08	0.77 $\pm$ 0.08	0.56 $\pm$ 0.04	0.65 $\pm$ 0.09
Ward 7	0.61 $\pm$ 0.04	0.54 $\pm$ 0.02	0.55 $\pm$ 0.03	0.78 $\pm$ 0.09	0.52 $\pm$ 0.04	0.52 $\pm$ 0.04	0.75 $\pm$ 0.11	0.52 $\pm$ 0.02	0.54 $\pm$ 0.03
Ward 8	0.66 $\pm$ 0.09	0.55 $\pm$ 0.03	0.54 $\pm$ 0.02	0.74 $\pm$ 0.07	0.52 $\pm$ 0.04	0.53 $\pm$ 0.07	0.79 $\pm$ 0.13	0.53 $\pm$ 0.02	0.56 $\pm$ 0.07
Ward 9	0.68 $\pm$ 0.03	0.58 $\pm$ 0.03	0.60 $\pm$ 0.04	0.74 $\pm$ 0.02	0.56 $\pm$ 0.03	0.61 $\pm$ 0.07	0.75 $\pm$ 0.07	0.51 $\pm$ 0.02	0.54 $\pm$ 0.06

Table 1: **Within-City Validation (Self-Supervised).** Ward-wise performance summary across lead contamination risk classification settings: Multi-Class, EPA Current Action, and Historic Action. Results are reported as mean $\pm$ standard deviation across five independent seeds.

Leave-One-Ward-Out	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.
	Multi-Class			Current Action			Historic Action		
Ward 1	0.64 $\pm$ 0.05	0.54 $\pm$ 0.03	0.55 $\pm$ 0.04	0.72 $\pm$ 0.08	0.54 $\pm$ 0.04	0.57 $\pm$ 0.07	0.71 $\pm$ 0.11	0.54 $\pm$ 0.03	0.61 $\pm$ 0.04
Ward 2	0.70 $\pm$ 0.09	0.54 $\pm$ 0.05	0.56 $\pm$ 0.06	0.76 $\pm$ 0.10	0.54 $\pm$ 0.03	0.60 $\pm$ 0.07	0.82 $\pm$ 0.08	0.52 $\pm$ 0.02	0.54 $\pm$ 0.03
Ward 3	0.78 $\pm$ 0.08	0.62 $\pm$ 0.09	0.67 $\pm$ 0.12	0.80 $\pm$ 0.09	0.56 $\pm$ 0.04	0.63 $\pm$ 0.09	0.89 $\pm$ 0.06	0.66 $\pm$ 0.11	0.84 $\pm$ 0.14
Ward 4	0.64 $\pm$ 0.07	0.54 $\pm$ 0.03	0.56 $\pm$ 0.05	0.80 $\pm$ 0.08	0.52 $\pm$ 0.04	0.54 $\pm$ 0.04	0.86 $\pm$ 0.03	0.54 $\pm$ 0.04	0.56 $\pm$ 0.08
Ward 5	0.69 $\pm$ 0.05	0.67 $\pm$ 0.04	0.71 $\pm$ 0.03	0.72 $\pm$ 0.10	0.63 $\pm$ 0.05	0.75 $\pm$ 0.09	0.84 $\pm$ 0.09	0.66 $\pm$ 0.07	0.79 $\pm$ 0.01
Ward 6	0.64 $\pm$ 0.10	0.57 $\pm$ 0.06	0.58 $\pm$ 0.04	0.72 $\pm$ 0.05	0.55 $\pm$ 0.03	0.60 $\pm$ 0.05	0.71 $\pm$ 0.07	0.55 $\pm$ 0.02	0.60 $\pm$ 0.03
Ward 7	0.63 $\pm$ 0.09	0.53 $\pm$ 0.02	0.54 $\pm$ 0.03	0.82 $\pm$ 0.05	0.54 $\pm$ 0.04	0.53 $\pm$ 0.05	0.80 $\pm$ 0.15	0.51 $\pm$ 0.03	0.53 $\pm$ 0.06
Ward 8	0.67 $\pm$ 0.11	0.54 $\pm$ 0.02	0.54 $\pm$ 0.02	0.69 $\pm$ 0.07	0.50 $\pm$ 0.01	0.50 $\pm$ 0.01	0.78 $\pm$ 0.07	0.53 $\pm$ 0.03	0.57 $\pm$ 0.08
Ward 9	0.65 $\pm$ 0.05	0.54 $\pm$ 0.04	0.56 $\pm$ 0.05	0.78 $\pm$ 0.05	0.55 $\pm$ 0.04	0.56 $\pm$ 0.04	0.72 $\pm$ 0.08	0.54 $\pm$ 0.01	0.61 $\pm$ 0.04

Table 2: **Within-City Validation (Supervised)**. Ward-wise supervised GAT performance under the Leave-One-Ward-Out (LOWO) protocol. Results are reported as mean $\pm$ standard deviation across five independent seeds.

Leave-One-Ward-Out	Multi-Class			Current Action			Historic Action		
	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.
Ward 1	0.81 $\pm$ 0.0013	0.68 $\pm$ 0.0131	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0028	0.90 $\pm$ 0.0005	0.89 $\pm$ 0.0320	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0003	0.93 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.63 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.51 $\pm$ 0.0000
Ward 2	0.82 $\pm$ 0.0023	0.58 $\pm$ 0.0165	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0047	0.92 $\pm$ 0.0005	0.62 $\pm$ 0.0107	0.51 $\pm$ 0.0003	0.95 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.83 $\pm$ 0.0231	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0061
Ward 3	0.83 $\pm$ 0.0014	0.68 $\pm$ 0.0115	0.54 $\pm$ 0.0024	0.92 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.84 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.95 $\pm$ 0.0008	0.83 $\pm$ 0.1370	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0004
Ward 4	0.82 $\pm$ 0.0025	0.76 $\pm$ 0.0262	0.55 $\pm$ 0.0032	0.90 $\pm$ 0.0007	0.74 $\pm$ 0.0187	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0029	0.93 $\pm$ 0.0004	0.85 $\pm$ 0.0298	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0002
Ward 5	0.80 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.71 $\pm$ 0.0135	0.54 $\pm$ 0.0031	0.89 $\pm$ 0.0014	0.75 $\pm$ 0.0345	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0043	0.92 $\pm$ 0.0009	0.73 $\pm$ 0.0278	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0062
Ward 6	0.79 $\pm$ 0.0014	0.67 $\pm$ 0.0113	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0022	0.89 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.65 $\pm$ 0.0144	0.51 $\pm$ 0.0003	0.93 $\pm$ 0.0005	0.74 $\pm$ 0.0196	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0003
Ward 7	0.79 $\pm$ 0.0018	0.63 $\pm$ 0.0122	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0021	0.90 $\pm$ 0.0005	0.68 $\pm$ 0.0149	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0016	0.93 $\pm$ 0.0004	0.80 $\pm$ 0.0245	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0002
Ward 8	0.79 $\pm$ 0.0016	0.65 $\pm$ 0.0160	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0020	0.89 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.80 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.93 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.84 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.51 $\pm$ 0.0000
Ward 9	0.79 $\pm$ 0.0020	0.66 $\pm$ 0.0154	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0020	0.89 $\pm$ 0.0009	0.65 $\pm$ 0.0139	0.52 $\pm$ 0.0022	0.93 $\pm$ 0.0004	0.71 $\pm$ 0.0125	0.53 $\pm$ 0.0002

Table 3: **Within-City Validation (Random Forest).** Ward-wise random forest performance under the Leave-One-Ward-Out protocol. Results are reported as mean $\pm$ standard deviation across five independent runs.

Leave-One-House-Out	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	Prec.	Rec.
	Multi-Class			Current Action			Historic Action		
1	0.78 $\pm$ 0.04	0.58 $\pm$ 0.05	0.63 $\pm$ 0.04	0.73 $\pm$ 0.05	0.51 $\pm$ 0.04	0.56 $\pm$ 0.05	0.69 $\pm$ 0.09	0.59 $\pm$ 0.06	0.64 $\pm$ 0.06
2	0.81 $\pm$ 0.03	0.63 $\pm$ 0.05	0.68 $\pm$ 0.05	0.75 $\pm$ 0.03	0.52 $\pm$ 0.02	0.57 $\pm$ 0.03	0.69 $\pm$ 0.05	0.60 $\pm$ 0.02	0.68 $\pm$ 0.04
3	0.78 $\pm$ 0.04	0.60 $\pm$ 0.04	0.65 $\pm$ 0.04	0.73 $\pm$ 0.02	0.51 $\pm$ 0.02	0.55 $\pm$ 0.02	0.71 $\pm$ 0.06	0.62 $\pm$ 0.05	0.67 $\pm$ 0.05
4	0.79 $\pm$ 0.01	0.59 $\pm$ 0.02	0.65 $\pm$ 0.02	0.74 $\pm$ 0.02	0.52 $\pm$ 0.03	0.55 $\pm$ 0.04	0.73 $\pm$ 0.05	0.63 $\pm$ 0.05	0.69 $\pm$ 0.05
5	0.80 $\pm$ 0.02	0.61 $\pm$ 0.04	0.66 $\pm$ 0.03	0.72 $\pm$ 0.02	0.51 $\pm$ 0.03	0.55 $\pm$ 0.04	0.72 $\pm$ 0.03	0.62 $\pm$ 0.05	0.68 $\pm$ 0.05
6	0.79 $\pm$ 0.03	0.60 $\pm$ 0.04	0.65 $\pm$ 0.04	0.72 $\pm$ 0.02	0.53 $\pm$ 0.03	0.57 $\pm$ 0.04	0.68 $\pm$ 0.02	0.57 $\pm$ 0.03	0.62 $\pm$ 0.03
7	0.81 $\pm$ 0.02	0.60 $\pm$ 0.01	0.65 $\pm$ 0.02	0.72 $\pm$ 0.02	0.52 $\pm$ 0.04	0.57 $\pm$ 0.04	0.74 $\pm$ 0.05	0.60 $\pm$ 0.06	0.66 $\pm$ 0.05
8	0.80 $\pm$ 0.02	0.62 $\pm$ 0.02	0.67 $\pm$ 0.02	0.74 $\pm$ 0.03	0.52 $\pm$ 0.04	0.56 $\pm$ 0.03	0.72 $\pm$ 0.03	0.63 $\pm$ 0.04	0.69 $\pm$ 0.03
9	0.78 $\pm$ 0.01	0.61 $\pm$ 0.02	0.66 $\pm$ 0.02	0.73 $\pm$ 0.05	0.52 $\pm$ 0.06	0.57 $\pm$ 0.07	0.71 $\pm$ 0.06	0.62 $\pm$ 0.03	0.68 $\pm$ 0.04

Table 4: **Cross-City Validation (Andover LOHO)**. Cross-city validation results under the Leave-One-House-Out (LOHO) protocol in Andover. Results are reported as mean $\pm$ standard deviation across five independent seeds.