

Development of semi-quantitative earthquake risk assessment models using machine learning, multi-criteria decision-making, and GIS

by **Ratiranjan Jena**

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

under the supervision of Distinguished Professor Biswajeet
Pradhan and Professor Ghassan Beydoun

University of Technology Sydney
Faculty of engineering and IT

April 2021

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I, Ratiranjana Jena declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctoral of Philosophy, in the FEIT at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution. This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature: Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication.

Ratiranjana Jena

Date: 27/04/2020

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs, and all other artwork, is copyright material of University of Technology Sydney unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of University of Technology Sydney.

Copyright © University of Technology Sydney

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my Parents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise belongs to God, the Lord of the world who inspires me everywhere.

There are a number of people without whom this thesis might not have been written, and to whom I am greatly indebted. I express my deep and sincere sense of indebtedness to my Supervisor Distinguished Professor Dr. Biswajeet Pradhan, at School of Information, Systems and Modelling, Faculty of Engineering and IT for his invaluable guidance, painstaking effort, constant encouragement and inspiration during each and every step of my project work throughout the Ph.D. period. Despite his extremely busy schedule, I have always found him accessible for suggestions and discussions.

I would like to thank Prof. Ghassan Beydoun for providing me the academic facilities and constant motivation. I am also grateful to Dr. Nagesh Shukla and all candidature assessment panel members for their discussions and suggestions.

Further, I am very much thankful to the office staff of the department for their help in administrative matters.

I wish to convey my heartiest thanks to my lab mate Abolfazl Abdollahi and all my friends in the lab for their encouragement and moral support during the course of my thesis work.

Last but not least, I am grateful to my parents and my brother for their consistent moral support and inspiration.

LIST OF PAPERS/PUBLICATIONS

Published journal articles

1. Jena, R., Pradhan, B., Beydoun, G., Sofyan, H. & Affan, M. 2020, 'Integrated model for earthquake risk assessment using neural network and analytic hierarchy process: Aceh province, Indonesia', *Geoscience Frontiers*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 613-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gsf.2019.07.006> (IF. 4.202)
2. Jena, R., Pradhan, B., Beydoun, G., Alamri, A.M. & Sofyan, H. 2020, 'Earthquake hazard and risk assessment using machine learning approaches at Palu, Indonesia', *Science of The Total Environment*, p. 141582. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141582> (IF. 6.551)
3. Jena, R., Pradhan, B. & Beydoun, G. 2020, 'Earthquake vulnerability assessment in Northern Sumatra province by using a multi-criteria decision-making model', *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, vol. 46, p. 101518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101518> (IF. 2.896)
4. Jena, R. & Pradhan, B. 2020, 'Integrated ANN-cross-validation and AHP-TOPSIS model to improve earthquake risk assessment', *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, vol. 50, p. 101723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101723> (IF. 2.896)
5. Jena, R., Pradhan, B., Beydoun, G., Al-Amri, A. & Sofyan, H. 2020, 'Seismic hazard and risk assessment: a review of state-of-the-art traditional and GIS models', *Arabian Journal of Geosciences*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-019-5012-x> (IF. 1.327)

Published conference papers

1. Jena, R. & Pradhan, B. 2019, 'Earthquake Vulnerability Assessment using Expert-based Approach in GIS', 2019 6th International Conference on Space Science and Communication (IconSpace), IEEE, pp. 53-6. IEEE. 10.1109/IconSpace.2019.8905929.
2. Jena, R. Pradhan, B., & Beydoun, G. 2019, Structural vulnerability assessment using an artificial neural network for earthquake hazard in Banda Aceh city, Aceh Province, Indonesia, IAG Conference 2019, Hobart, Tasmania. (*Published abstract only*)
3. Jena, R. & Pradhan, B. 2020, 'Earthquake Risk Assessment Using Integrated Influence Diagram–AHP Approach', IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, vol. 540, IOP Publishing, p. 012078. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/540/1/012078>.
4. Jena, R. & Pradhan, B. 2020, 'Earthquake Social Vulnerability Assessment Using Entropy Method', IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, vol. 540, IOP Publishing, p. 012079. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/540/1/012079>.

All the aforementioned papers have been published during my Ph.D. candidature.

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of University of Technology Sydney in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PUBLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS THESIS

Publication citation – incorporated within chapters in a conventional form.

Jena, R., Pradhan, B., Beydoun, G., Alamri, A.M. & Sofyan, H. 2020, 'Earthquake hazard and risk assessment using machine learning approaches at Palu, Indonesia', *Science of The Total Environment*, p. 141582. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141582> (IF. 6.551)

Jena, R., Pradhan, B., Beydoun, G., Sofyan, H. & Affan, M. 2020, 'Integrated model for earthquake risk assessment using neural network and analytic hierarchy process: Aceh province, Indonesia', *Geoscience Frontiers*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 613-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gsf.2019.07.006> (IF. 4.202)

| Contributor | Statement of contribution | Thesis chapters |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|
| Ratiranjana Jena | Literature review and analysis (100%) Research direction and manuscript writing (75%) | Chapter 3, 4 and 5 |
| Biswajeet Pradhan | Research direction and manuscript review (15%) | |
| Ghassan Beydoun | Research direction and manuscript review (5%) | |
| Other authors | Research direction and manuscript review (5%) | |

Jena, R., Pradhan, B. & Beydoun, G. 2020, 'Earthquake vulnerability assessment in Northern Sumatra province by using a multi-criteria decision-making model', *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, vol. 46, p. 101518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101518> (IF. 2.896)

| Contributor | Statement of contribution | Thesis chapters |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|
| Ratiranjana Jena | Literature review and analysis (100%) Research direction and manuscript writing (75%) | Chapter 3, 4 and 5 |
| Biswajeet Pradhan | Research direction and manuscript review (20%) | |
| Ghassan Beydoun | Research direction and manuscript review (5%) | |

Jena, R. & Pradhan, B. 2020, 'Integrated ANN-cross-validation and AHP-TOPSIS model to improve earthquake risk assessment', *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, vol. 50, p. 101723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101723> (IF. 2.896)

| Contributor | Statement of contribution | Thesis chapters |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Ratiranjana Jena | Literature review and analysis (100%) Research direction and manuscript writing (75%) | Chapter 3, 4 and 5 |
| Biswajeet Pradhan | Research direction and manuscript review (25%) | |

Jena, R., Pradhan, B., Beydoun, G., Al-Amri, A. & Sofyan, H. 2020, 'Seismic hazard and risk assessment: a review of state-of-the-art traditional and GIS models', Arabian Journal of Geosciences, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-019-5012-x> (IF. 1.327)

| Contributor | Statement of contribution | Thesis chapters |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| Ratiranjan Jena | Literature review and analysis (100%) Research direction and manuscript writing (75%) | Chapter 1 and 2 |
| Biswajeet Pradhan | Research direction and manuscript review (15%) | |
| Ghassan Beydoun | Research direction and manuscript review (5%) | |
| Other authors | Research direction and manuscript review (5%) | |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| SUBJECT | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| MAIN PAGE | |
| CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY | i |
| COPYRIGHT FORM | ii |
| DEDICATION | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT | iv |
| LIST OF PUBLICATIONS | v |
| PUBLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THE THESIS | vi |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | viii |
| LIST OF TABLES | xii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xiii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xv |
| ABSTRACT | xvi |
| CHAPTERS | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1. General introduction | 1 |
| 1.2. Research background | 3 |
| 1.3. Earthquakes in Indonesia | 6 |
| 1.4. Problem statement | 9 |
| 1.5. Research gaps | 12 |
| 1.6. Scope of study | 13 |
| 1.7. Research aim and objectives | 15 |
| 1.7.1. Objective 1 | 16 |
| 1.7.2. Objective 2 | 16 |
| 1.7.3. Objective 3 | 17 |
| 1.8. Research questions | 18 |
| 1.8.1. Questions pertaining to objective 1 | 18 |
| 1.8.2. Questions pertaining to objective 2 | 18 |
| 1.8.3. Questions pertaining to objective 3 | 19 |
| 1.9. Motivation behind this research | 19 |
| 1.10. Novelty and main contribution of the research | 21 |
| 1.11. Thesis organization | 22 |
| 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | 25 |
| 2.1. Introduction | 25 |
| 2.2. Seismic hazard-damage assessment models | 27 |
| 2.3. Traditional approaches | 32 |
| 2.3.1. Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment | 32 |
| 2.3.2. Uniform hazard spectrum (UHS) | 35 |
| 2.3.3. Hazard curves and maps | 36 |
| 2.3.4. Deaggregation | 37 |
| 2.3.5. Logic tree | 37 |
| 2.3.6. Uncertainty and accuracy of PSHA | 39 |
| 2.4. Deterministic seismic hazard assessment | 39 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 2.4.1. Uncertainty of DSHA | 40 |
| 2.4.1. Accuracy of DSHA | 41 |
| 2.5. GIS-based models | 41 |
| 2.5.1. GTIS (Geotechnical Information System) | 41 |
| 2.5.2. Fault-specific GIS-based seismic hazard analysis | 42 |
| 2.5.3. Intelligent simulation system using artificial intelligence | 44 |
| 2.5.4. Vulnerability mapping using the FEMA-RVS method | 45 |
| 2.5.5. GIS-based risk assessment | 46 |
| 2.5.6. Integrated model for seismic vulnerability assessment. | 47 |
| 2.5.7. Soil liquefaction potential analysis | 48 |
| 2.5.8. Seismic micro-zonation analysis | 49 |
| 2.5.9. Seismic amplification susceptibility analysis | 50 |
| 2.5.10. Unified risk assessment | 50 |
| 2.5.11. Holistic model for seismic risk analysis | 51 |
| 2.5.12. Arithmetic and weighted overlay approach to seismic hazard assessments | 51 |
| 2.6. Machine learning techniques in the prediction of earthquake | 53 |
| 2.6.1. Support Vector Machine (SVM): a method of seismic detector | 54 |
| 2.6.2. Artificial Neural Network (ANN) for earthquake prediction | 56 |
| 2.6.3. Deep learning techniques | 57 |
| 2.7. AHP-based seismic analysis | 58 |
| 2.8. Previous works on earthquake prediction and probability, vulnerability, and risk assessment | 59 |
| 2.8.1. Probability assessment | 60 |
| 2.8.2. Vulnerability assessment | 62 |
| 2.8.3. Risk assessment | 65 |
| 2.9. Strength and limitations of models | 67 |
| 2.10. Data required for the models | 71 |
| 2.11. Software used for the hazard and risk analysis | 72 |
| 2.12. Current earthquake research issues | 74 |
| 2.13. Summary | 74 |
| | |
| 3 | |
| MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY | 77 |
| 3.1. Introduction | 77 |
| 3.2. Multi-criteria decision-making | 77 |
| 3.2.1. Integrated AHP-VIKOR Approach | 78 |
| 3.2.1.1. AHP approach | 78 |
| 3.2.1.2. VIKOR method | 80 |
| 3.2.1.3. Integration of AHP-VIKOR | 82 |
| 3.3. Hybrid AHP-TOPSIS model | 83 |
| 3.3.1. AHP algorithm | 83 |
| 3.3.2. TOPSIS algorithm | 85 |
| 3.4. ANN architecture | 88 |
| 3.5. PGA, source to site distance and intensity calculation | 90 |
| 3.6. Overall methodology | 91 |
| 3.7. Implementation of the methodology | 94 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 3.7.1. Objective 1 | 94 |
| 3.7.2. Objective 2 | 96 |
| 3.7.2.1. Performance evaluation | 98 |
| 3.7.2.1. Performance metrics | 99 |
| 3.7.3. Objective 3 | 100 |
| 3.8. Study area | 102 |
| 3.9. Characteristics of the Banda Aceh city | 106 |
| 3.10. Geology of the study area | 107 |
| 3.11. Palu city as a case study (for evaluating the transferability of the developed models) | 109 |
| 3.12. Data acquisition | 110 |
| 3.12.1. Data and thematic layers used for objective 1 | 112 |
| 3.12.2. Data and thematic layers used for objective 2 | 113 |
| 3.12.3. Data and thematic layers used for objective 3 | 117 |
| 3.13. Factors used in this study and the importance | 122 |
| 3.13.1. Probability and hazard indicators | 122 |
| 3.13.1.1. Environmental indicators | 122 |
| 3.13.1.2. Seismic indicators | 123 |
| 3.13.2. Vulnerability indicators | 124 |
| 3.13.2.1. Social indicators | 124 |
| 3.13.2.2. Physical indicators | 125 |
| 3.14. Software for modeling implementation | 126 |
| 3.15. Several mitigation processes | 128 |
| 3.16. Summary | 129 |
| 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 131 |
| 4.1. Introduction | 131 |
| 4.2. Objective 1 | 131 |
| 4.2.1. Social vulnerability | 131 |
| 4.2.2. Structural vulnerability | 134 |
| 4.2.3. Geotechnical vulnerability | 136 |
| 4.2.4. Final vulnerability map | 138 |
| 4.2.5. Discussion | 142 |
| 4.2.6. Validation | 145 |
| 4.3. Objective 2 | 146 |
| 4.3.1. Probability estimation using MLP | 146 |
| 4.3.2. Hazard estimation | 150 |
| 4.3.3. Vulnerability index estimation | 152 |
| 4.3.4. Risk estimation | 155 |
| 4.3.5. Validation | 161 |
| 4.4. Objective 3 | 163 |
| 4.4.1. Crustal fault and subduction zone characteristics | 163 |
| 4.4.2. Predictive performance, probability, and hazard mapping | 164 |
| 4.4.3. Vulnerability mapping | 167 |
| 4.4.4. Risk mapping | 171 |
| 4.4.5. Validation | 176 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 4.5 Results of case study (Palu city) | 178 |
| 4.5.1. Relationship between Mw, PGA and intensity variation | 178 |
| 4.5.2. Silhouette clustering analysis | 179 |
| 4.5.3. Pure locational clustering (PLC) approach | 182 |
| 4.5.4. Probability assessment | 183 |
| 4.5.5. Vulnerability mapping | 185 |
| 4.5.7. Risk estimation | 188 |
| 4.6. Summary | 190 |
| | |
| 4 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK RECOMMENDATIONS | 192 |
| 5.1. General | 192 |
| 5.2. Conclusions of objective 1 | 193 |
| 5.3. Conclusions of objective 2 | 194 |
| 5.4. Conclusions of objective 3 | 196 |
| 5.5. Conclusions of Palu case study | 197 |
| 5.6. Research drawbacks and limitations | 198 |
| 5.7. Recommendation for future work | 199 |
| REFERENCES | 200 |
| APPENDIXES | 222 |
| BIODATA/CV OF STUDENT | 225 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 1.1 Total death and injuries in Indonesia due to earthquakes. | 6 |
| 2.1 Various local and global programs used for earthquake hazards, risk analysis, and loss estimation purposes. | 29 |
| 2.2 Continuation of models used for earthquake hazard, risk analysis, and loss estimation purpose. | 31 |
| 2.3 Comparative analysis of strengths and limitations of traditional methods. | 66 |
| 2.4 Comparative analysis of strengths and limitations of various GIS-based models/modules/platforms. | 68 |
| 2.5 Data required for the seismic risk analysis. | 72 |
| 2.6 Applications of various GIS, hazard, and risk software. | 73 |
| 3.1 Parameters and stopping criteria for the ANN model | 97 |
| 3.2 Accuracy assessment and the parameters of the k-fold ANN model. | 101 |
| 3.3 Data used for vulnerability assessment in objective 1. | 113 |
| 3.4 Selected input data layers from literature and data types used in objective 2. | 114 |
| 3.5 Probability and vulnerability indicators for ERA used in objective 3. | 118 |
| 3.6 Detailed software and their characteristics used for the risk assessment. | 127 |
| 4.1 Decision matrix, priority and rank evaluation for the criteria of social vulnerability. | 132 |
| 4.2 Decision matrix, priority, and rank evaluation for the criteria of structural vulnerability. | 135 |
| 4.3 Decision matrix, priority, and rank evaluation for the criteria of geo-technical vulnerability. | 137 |
| 4.4 Decision matrix for ranking the alternatives by using the VIKOR method. | 139 |
| 4.5 Normalized decision matrix and ranking of alternatives by using the VIKOR method. | 139 |
| 4.6 Estimation of population and area under vulnerable zones in Banda Aceh City. | 141 |
| 4.7 Prediction results using ANN. | 149 |
| 4.8 Decision matrix for vulnerability assessment. | 152 |
| 4.9 Evaluation of weights and rank of layers. | 153 |
| 4.10 Estimated earthquake population risk and area. | 157 |
| 4.11 Estimation of earthquake risk area of Banda Aceh. | 158 |
| 4.12 Estimation of population under risk in nine zones of Banda Aceh. | 159 |
| 4.13 Types of fault and magnitude generating capacity with slip rates in Indonesia. | 164 |
| 4.14 Priority estimation and ranking of vulnerability factors. | 168 |
| 4.15 Normalized decision matrix for alternatives ranking using TOPSIS. | 170 |
| 4.16 Vectors analysis and matrix creation using TOPSIS. | 171 |
| 4.17 Closeness coefficient and rank estimation of alternatives. | 171 |
| 4.18 Estimation of area and population under earthquake risk. | 175 |
| 4.19 Table of experts' profiles for the AHP-TOPSIS approach. | 176 |
| 4.20 Feedback summary on earthquake vulnerability and risk map obtained from opinions of different categories of people. | 177 |
| 4.21 Priority and rank of criteria for vulnerability assessment. | 188 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1.1 Sundaland block of Eurasian Plate and tectonics. | 5 |
| 1.2 The traditional methodology for seismic hazard assessment. | 6 |
| 2.1 Classification of hazard damage assessment models. | 28 |
| 2.2 Overall model for probabilistic seismic hazard assessment. (This is an adaptation form Figure 8.1 of Chapter 8, Earthquake Engineering Handbook W.F. Chen and Charles Scawthorn). | 34 |
| 2.3 Overall model for deterministic seismic hazard assessment. | 40 |
| 2.4 Methodology for fault-specific GIS-based seismic hazard analysis. | 43 |
| 2.5 Steps for the simulation based on GIS and artificial intelligence. | 44 |
| 2.6 Methodology of RVS FEMA for vulnerability analysis. | 46 |
| 2.7 Methodology for earthquake risk assessment. | 47 |
| 2.8 Steps for the integrated seismic vulnerability assessment. | 48 |
| 2.9 Weighted overlay technique for the earthquake potential analysis. | 52 |
| 2.10 A general SVM methodology for the earthquake prediction. | 55 |
| 2.11 (a) The phases of a neural network for earthquake prediction, (b) the general model of neural network adopted from (Jena et al. 2019). | 56 |
| 2.12 Processes for making the decision in AHP. | 58 |
| 3.1 Architecture of hybrid AHP-TOPSIS approach. | 84 |
| 3.2 Network architecture for probability assessment. | 88 |
| 3.3 Overall methodological flowchart for earthquake risk assessment. | 93 |
| 3.4 Methodological flowchart of the MCDM model for objective 1. | 96 |
| 3.5 Methodological flowchart of the developed model for objective 2. | 99 |
| 3.6 Methodological flowchart of the improved model for objective 3. | 102 |
| 3.7 Location of Banda Aceh. | 105 |
| 3.8 Geology map of the study area. | 108 |
| 3.9 Location of Palu city. | 110 |
| 3.10 Location of Banda Aceh city distributing the sub-districts and the data collection zone. | 111 |
| 3.11 Criteria for probability mapping using ANN. (a) slope, b) curvature, c) elevation, d) aspect, e) lithology, f) amplification factor, g) distance from faults, h) fault density, i) depth density, j) epicenter density, k) PGA density, l) magnitude density, and m) distance from epicenter. | 115 |
| 3.12 Criteria for vulnerability mapping using AHP. (a) building density, b) district offices density, c) density of educated people, d) environmental infrastructure, e) major offices, f) population density, g) distance from service centers, h) stadium, i) transportation nodes, j) distribution universities and k) distribution of village chiefs. | 116 |
| 3.13 Input layers for probability index estimation. (a) lithology with an amplification factor, (b) slope angle, (c) fault density, (d) depth density, (e) proximity to epicenter, (f) elevation, (g) epicenter density, (h) magnitude density, and (i) PGA (Peak ground acceleration) density. | 117 |
| 3.14 Input layers for vulnerability index estimation. (a) household density, (b) building surface area, (c) building quality, (d) building heights, (e) proximity to road, (f) building types, (g) proximity to buildings, (h) building density, and (i) population density. (Building density and population density maps were reproduced after (Jena et al., 2019). | 121 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.1 | Social vulnerability map. | 133 |
| 4.2 | Structural vulnerability map. | 134 |
| 4.3 | Geotechnical vulnerability map. | 137 |
| 4.4 | Earthquake vulnerability map (EVM) by using the AHP and VIKOR method. | 140 |
| 4.5 | Graphical presentation of earthquake vulnerability with area and population. | 144 |
| 4.6 | Injury and fatalities in Indonesia due to earthquakes on the basis of; a) magnitude, b) location, c) intensity, and d) depth. | 145 |
| 4.7 | Training data used for earthquake probability mapping. | 147 |
| 4.8 | Accuracy assessment curve for the earthquake probability map. | 148 |
| 4.9 | Earthquake probability map. | 149 |
| 4.10 | Earthquake hazard map. | 151 |
| 4.11 | Earthquake vulnerability map. | 154 |
| 4.12 | Earthquake risk map. | 155 |
| 4.13 | Estimated number of population and area within the risk zones. | 156 |
| 4.14 | Validation of earthquake mapping result: A. Earthquake events in Aceh province (set of earthquakes in different zones of a, b, c); B. Zoomed image of Aceh with earthquakes; C. Position of Banda Aceh and events in Aceh province; D. Earthquake probability map and presented as low to high with the set of earthquakes to validate the Probability result; E. Histogram of probability map that shows the high and low probabilities. | 162 |
| 4.15 | (a) Average slip rate and maximum magnitude earthquake observed in crustal and subduction area faults. (b) Average fault dip and length below the ground surface. | 163 |
| 4.16 | Probability index estimation in Aceh province using a fourfold ANN-CV model. | 166 |
| 4.17 | Earthquake vulnerability map derived using the hybrid AHP-TOPSIS model. | 169 |
| 4.18 | Risk map obtained from fourfold ANN-CV and hybrid AHP-TOPSIS model. | 172 |
| 4.19 | (a) Accuracy curve for probability index estimation, and (b) Maximum, minimum and resulted priority of vulnerability criteria. | 173 |
| 4.20 | Relationship between Mw, PGA and intensity variation. | 178 |
| 4.21 | Cross-correlation shows (red signal portray p-values while the blue signal is the correlation spectrum) a) epicentral distance vs source-to-site distance, b) PGA vs depth, c) Mw vs intensity, d) Mw vs PGA. | 180 |
| 4.22 | Silhouette clustering analysis: a) Relative change of values for five indicators (A) epicentral distance, (B) source to site distance, (C) magnitude (Mw), (D) PGA, (E) intensity, (F) depth of earthquake focus, b) PGA vs Intensity. | 181 |
| 4.23 | (a) Locational clustering analysis using earthquake longitude and event gap, (b) Dendrogram shows between Euclidean distance and clusters. | 182 |
| 4.24 | Factors for probability assessment. | 184 |
| 4.25 | Probability results from ANN-CV approach. | 184 |
| 4.26 | Factors influencing EVA. | 186 |
| 4.27 | Vulnerability map resulted from AHP approach. | 188 |
| 4.28 | Risk map resulted from integrated ANN-CV and AHP-TOPSIS approach. | 189 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|--------|--|
| AHP | Analytic Hierarchy Process |
| ANN | Artificial Neural Network |
| ANN-CV | Artificial Neural Network-Cross Validation |
| AUC | Area Under the Curve |
| CR | Consistency Ratio |
| DEM | Digital Elevation Model |
| ERA | Earthquake Risk Assessment |
| EVA | Earthquake Vulnerability Assessment |
| EHA | Earthquake Hazard Assessment |
| GIS | Geospatial Information System |
| HCA | Hierarchical clustering Analysis |
| LiDAR | Light Detection and Ranging |
| LULC | Land Use / Land Cover |
| MCDM | Multi-criteria Decision Making |
| MLP | Multi-Layer Perceptron |
| MMI | Modified Mercalli Intensity |
| MSL | Mean Sea Level |
| PGA | Peak Ground Acceleration |
| PLC | Pure Locational Clustering |
| RI | Random Index |
| ROC | Receiver Operating Curves |
| SVM | Support Vector Machine |
| TOPSIS | Technique of Order Preference Similarity to the Ideal Solution |
| VIKOR | ViseKriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje (Multi-criteria Optimization and Compromise Solution) |
| WGS | World Geodetic System |

DEVELOPMENT OF SEMI-QUANTITATIVE EARTHQUAKE RISK ASSESSMENT MODELS USING MACHINE LEARNING, MULTI-CRITERIA DECISION-MAKING, AND GIS

By

RATIRANJAN JENA

October 2020

Supervisor: Professor Biswajeet Pradhan,

Abstract

Catastrophic natural hazards, such as earthquakes, pose serious threats to properties and human lives in urban areas. Earthquake risk assessment (ERA) is specifically required for areas with complicated tectonics because of the catastrophic nature of mega-events that result in a massive death toll. Therefore, ERA is indispensable in disaster management. The prerequisite for earthquake risk estimation is probability, hazard and vulnerability assessment. Several research gaps such as failure to establish comprehensive GIS-based models, not much work on ERA has been done in city scale using integrated geospatial information system (GIS) techniques, use of limited conditioning factors, and little research on optimization of factors are specified in literature. Therefore, this study aims to develop models and estimate risk in city scale that is necessary to reduce future fatalities. The study evaluates the earthquake vulnerability by using the multi-criteria decision-making approach through a novel integrated analytical hierarchy process and ViseKriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje method using a geographical information system in the first objective. This research develops an integrated model by using the artificial neural network–analytic hierarchy process for constructing the ERA map in the second objective. The third objective presents a novel combination of artificial neural network cross-validation (fourfold ANN-CV) with a hybrid analytic hierarchy process-Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (AHP-TOPSIS) method to improve the ERA and applied to Aceh, Indonesia to test.

Firstly, in the objective 1, several factors were used to produce social vulnerability, structural vulnerability, and geotechnical vulnerability indices. Subsequently, the adopted approaches were integrated and applied to estimate the criteria weight, priority ranking,

and alternatives of criterion by applying the pair-wise comparison at all levels. Finally, vulnerability layers were superimposed to estimate the earthquake vulnerability index and produce the vulnerability map. The proposed method for earthquake vulnerability assessment (EVA) provides useful information that could assist in earthquake disaster mitigation.

Secondly, in the objective 2, the aim of the ERA was to quantify urban population risk that may be caused by impending earthquakes. The ANN is used for probability mapping, whereas AHP is used to assess urban vulnerability after the hazard map is created with the aid of earthquake intensity variation thematic layering. The risk map is subsequently created by combining the probability, hazard, and vulnerability maps. Then, the risk levels of various zones are obtained. The validation process reveals that the proposed model can map the earthquake probability based on historical events with an accuracy of 84%. The model is applied to the city of Banda Aceh in Indonesia, a seismically active zone of Aceh province frequently affected by devastating earthquakes. The findings of this research are useful for government agencies and decision-makers, particularly in estimating risk dimensions in urban areas and for future studies to project the preparedness strategies for Banda Aceh.

Thirdly, in the objective 3, this study explored and specified the major indicators needed to improve the predictive accuracy in probability mapping. Previous studies have suggested that neural networks improve the probability mapping on a city scale. The network architecture design with the probability index remains unexplored in case of an earthquake-based probability study. First, probability mapping was conducted and used for hazard assessment in the next step. Second, a vulnerability map was created based on social and structural factors. Finally, hazard and vulnerability indices were multiplied to produce the ERA, and the population and areas under risk were calculated. The proposed model achieved an improve accuracy of 85.4%. The model's performance changes based on the input parameters, indicating the selection and importance of input layers on network architecture selection. The proposed model was found to generalize better results than traditional and some existing probabilistic models.

The proposed models are transferable to other regions by localizing the input parameters

that contribute to earthquake risk mitigation and prevention planning. Therefore, as a case study, the third model was implemented to estimate the earthquake risk based on probability and hazard in Palu region along with cross-correlation among the derived parameters, Silhouette clustering (SC), pure locational clustering (PLC) based on hierarchical clustering analysis (HCA). There is no specific or simple way of identifying risks as the definition of risk varies with time and space. The main aim of this study was to conduct the clustering analysis to identify the earthquake prone areas, to estimate probability based on ANN-CV technique, and to assess earthquake risk. Using ANN-CV model the probability assessment was conducted while SC and PLC were implemented to understand the spatial clustering, Euclidean distance among clusters, spatial relationship and cross-correlation among the estimated Mw, PGA and intensity including events depth. Finally, AHP was implemented for the vulnerability assessment. To this end, earthquake probability assessment (EPA) and earthquake vulnerability assessment (EVA) results were employed to generate risk. These results obtained from this research have important implications for future large-scale risk assessment, land use planning and hazard mitigation.

The current research designs novel combination of multi-criteria decision making (MCDM), machine learning and GIS to develop models such as AHP-VIKOR, neural network-AHP and k-fold neural network cross-validation (Fourfold ANN-CV) with a hybrid AHP-TOPSIS method for probability, hazard, vulnerability, risk estimation and the ERA improvement in a city scale.

Keywords: Earthquake, probability, hazard, vulnerability, risk, machine learning, multi-criteria decision making, integrated models development