

INTEGRATION OF GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM-BASED  
METHOD IN WEIGHT ASSIGNMENT AND PARAMETER JUSTIFICATION  
FOR ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

WAN SHAHIRAH BINTI WAN ADNAN

A project report submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Master of Science (Geoinformatics)

Faculty of Built Environment and Surveying  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

MARCH 2021

## **DEDICATION**

This thesis is dedicated to my father, who support me through my journey in pursuing education and my mother, who endlessly taught me to be patient. I hope that the completion of this master's degree will make them proud. May Allah grant them the highest place in the world hereafter.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In preparing this thesis, I was in contact with many people, researchers, academicians, and practitioners. They have contributed towards my understanding and thoughts. In particular, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my main thesis supervisor, Dr. Norhakim, for encouragement, guidance, critics and friendship. I am also very thankful to the panel lecturers, Dr. Ivin Amri, Dr. Imzan Hassan and Professor Dr. Alias Abdul Rahman for their critics and suggestion., advices and motivation to improve my research. Without their continued support and interest, this thesis would not have been the same as presented here.

My eternal gratitude to all my lecturers who have taught me for the past 3 semesters for their guidance and knowledge shared in the field of geoinformation. My sincere appreciation also extends to all my colleagues and others who have provided assistance in all the class. Their views and tips are useful indeed. Unfortunately, it is not possible to list all of them in this limited space. The journey was not easy with a lot of up and downs. However, I am grateful to all my family member for their belief in me to complete this thesis.

## **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study is to do a comparison study of integration of heuristic AHP and GWR methods in predicting rockfall hazard. Rockfall Hazard rating System (RHRS) has been an established method to monitor the rockfall hazard leading to development of other system to study rockfall across different countries. The data used for this study involves classified slope datasets in East-West Federal Highway from Gerik to Temenggor, Perak. The study shows that the hazard map produced from AHP yield better predictive model due to the high percentage match of 85 % with the original score from the field. Heuristic method produces better results for rockfall prediction using only 10 parameters. Regression method are proven to be unsuitable for predictive model if the dataset is small with only several parameters. Addition of parameters in a larger study area may improve the predictive score for GWR. GWR lower score than OLS suggest that the occurrence of rockfall may not be heavily influenced by the surrounding factors, thus a general parameter's coefficient is enough to predict the rockfall hazard.

## ABSTRAK

Kajian ini dijalankan bertujuan untuk membuat perbandingan di antara integrasi kaedah AHP dan GWR heuristik dalam meramalkan bahaya batu runtuh. Sistem penilaian bahaya tanah runtuh (RHRS) telah menjadi kaedah yang mapan untuk memantau risiko batu runtuh. Rentetan itu, negara-negara lain telah membuat kajian untuk menubuhkan sistem ini untuk mengawal dan meramal kawasan yang berpotensi untuk berlaku runtuh. Data yang digunakan untuk kajian ini melibatkan dataset cerun yang telah diklasifikasikan yang terletak di Lebuhraya Persekutuan Timur-Barat dari Gerik ke Temenggor, Perak. Kajian menunjukkan bahawa peta risiko tanah runtuh yang dihasilkan menggunakan pemberat dari AHP telah menghasilkan model ramalan yang lebih baik berikutan peratusan persamaan yang tinggi sebanyak 85% dengan skor asal dari lapangan. Kaedah heuristik menghasilkan keputusan yang lebih baik untuk ramalan rockfall dengan hanya menggunakan 10 parameter. Kaedah regresi dalam kajian ini terbukti tidak sesuai untuk model ramalan jika set data kecil dengan sebilangan kecil parameter. Penambahan bilangan parameter di kawasan kajian yang lebih besar berpotensi untuk menambahbaik keupayaan model meramalkan cerun yang bahaya. Selain itu, skor teknik GWR yang lebih rendah daripada Teknik OLS menunjukkan bahawa kejadian batu runtuh mungkin tidak banyak dipengaruhi oleh faktor sekitarnya. Oleh itu pemberat parameter umum sudah cukup untuk meramalkan bahaya runtuh di suatu kawasan.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  | <b>TITLE</b>                   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|
|                  | <b>DECLARATION</b>             | <b>iii</b>  |
|                  | <b>DEDICATION</b>              | <b>iv</b>   |
|                  | <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>         | <b>v</b>    |
|                  | <b>ABSTRACT</b>                | <b>vii</b>  |
|                  | <b>ABSTRAK</b>                 | <b>vii</b>  |
|                  | <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>       | <b>viii</b> |
|                  | <b>LIST OF TABLES</b>          | <b>xii</b>  |
|                  | <b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>         | <b>xiii</b> |
|                  | <b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>   | <b>xiii</b> |
|                  | <b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>         | <b>xiv</b>  |
|                  | <b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>      | <b>xv</b>   |
| <b>CHAPTER 1</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION</b>            | <b>1</b>    |
| 1.1              | Introduction                   | 1           |
| 1.2              | Problem Background             | 2           |
| 1.3              | Research Aim                   | 2           |
| 1.4              | Research Question              | 3           |
| 1.5              | Research Objectives            | 3           |
| 1.6              | Research Scope                 | 4           |
| 1.7              | Research Contribution          | 4           |
| <b>CHAPTER 2</b> | <b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>       | <b>5</b>    |
| 2.1              | Introduction                   | 5           |
| 2.2              | Criticism on RHRS              | 6           |
| 2.2.1            | Parameter Justification        | 7           |
| 2.2.2            | Description of Related Studies | 9           |
| 2.3              | Methods in Related Study       | 9           |
| 2.4              | Proposed Solution              | 10          |
| 2.5              | Chapter Summary                | 10          |

|                  |   |           |
|------------------|---|-----------|
| <b>CHAPTER 3</b> | <b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| 3.1              | Introduction                              | 11        |
| 3.2              | Study Area                                | 11        |
| 3.3              | Operational Framework/Research Workflow   | 13        |
| 3.4              | Data Preparation                          | 21        |
| 3.5              | Parameter Justification                   | 15        |
| 3.6              | Data Acquisition for Weightage            | 15        |
| 3.6.1            | Analytical Hierarchy Process              | 16        |
| 3.6.2            | Regression Analysis                       | 18        |
| 3.7              | Justification                             | 20        |
| 3.8              | Performance measurement                   | 21        |
| 3.8.1            | Cross Validation                          | 21        |
| 3.8.2            | Internal Validation                       | 22        |
| 3.9              | Chapter Summary                           | 22        |
| <b>CHAPTER 4</b> | <b>RESEARCH DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION</b> | <b>23</b> |
| 4.1              | Introduction                              | 23        |
| 4.2              | Proposed Solution                         | 23        |
| 4.3              | Experiment Design                         | 24        |
| 4.4              | Chapter Summary                           | 25        |
| <b>CHAPTER 5</b> | <b>RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION</b>   | <b>27</b> |
| 5.1              | Introduction                              | 27        |
| 5.2              | Research Results and Analysis             | 27        |
| 5.2.1            | Parameter                                 | 27        |
| 5.2.2            | Classification                            | 30        |
| 5.2.3            | Weightage Derivation                      | 31        |
| 5.3              | Hazard Map                                | 35        |
| 5.4              | Validation                                | 38        |
| 5.4.1            | Cross Validation                          | 38        |
| 5.4.2            | Internal Validation                       | 41        |
| 5.5              | Limitation                                | 42        |
| 5.6              | Future Works                              | 42        |
| <b>CHAPTER 6</b> | <b>CONCLUSION</b>                         | <b>43</b> |
| 6.1              | Introduction                              | 43        |

6.2 Achievement of Project Objectives 43

6.3 Suggestions for Improvement and Future Works 44

**REFERENCES 45**



## LIST OF TABLES

| <b>TABLE NO.</b> | <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>PAGE</b> |
|------------------|---|-------------|
| Table 2.1        | Literature Study on Rockfall Parameter used in respective RHRS  | 8           |
| Table 3.1        | Exponential scoring definition adapted from Pierson, 1991.  | 13          |
| Table 3.2        | Category for Total Hazard Score   | 14          |
| Table 3.3        | Literature on rockfall study that cite the significant of the parameter or use the parameter in rockfall monitoring | 15          |
| Table 3.4        | Pairwise comparison based on Saaty Scale (1980)   | 17          |
| Table 3.5        | Calculation for weightage based on PCM method adapted from Saaty, 1980  | 17          |
| Table 5.1        | The parameters of each slope is categorized based on this class. Modified from Pierson, 1994 and mRHRS              | 30          |
| Table 5.2        | Spatial Moran's I Summary Result  | 32          |
| Table 5.3        | Summary result from OLS with 8 parameters input   | 33          |
| Table 5.4        | Summary raster overlay result for AHP, OLS and GWR  | 34          |
| Table 5.5        | Weight and coefficient of parameters obtained from the study  | 35          |
| Table 5.6        | Summary raster overlay result for AHP, OLS and GWR  | 39          |
| Table 5.7        | R <sup>2</sup> value from the two regression methods with the same parameters.                                      | 41          |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| <b>FIGURE NO.</b> | <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|-------------------|--|-------------|
| Figure 2.1        | Different contribution of factors on the total final rating in CHRHS (Budetta & Nappi, 2013) | 7           |
| Figure 3.1        | Geology of the area made up of metasedimentary and limestone rock                            | 12          |
| Figure 3.2        | General research workflow of the study   | 13          |
| Figure 3.3        | Example of exponential scoring of one of the parameters.                                     | 14          |
| Figure 3.3        | Example of ordinary least square in ArcGIS environment                                       | 19          |
| Figure 4.1        | Main component in Rockfall Hazard Rating System  | 24          |
| Figure 4.2        | Flow from data preparation to map output   | 25          |
| Figure 5.1        | Scatter Plot matrix  | 30          |
| Figure 5.2        | The AHP results of the contribution of parameters on rockfall based on expert's opinion.     | 31          |
| Figure 5.3        | Summary OLS results in ArcGIS  | 33          |
| Figure 5.4        | The weight obtained from AHP (top) and OLS (bottom).   | 36          |
| Figure 5.5        | Hazard map of slope from AHP method  | 37          |
| Figure 5.6        | Hazard map from OLS  | 37          |
| Figure 5.7        | Hazard map from GWR  | 38          |
| Figure 5.81       | Differences of original hazard map with hazard map with AHP methods.                         | 39          |
| Figure 5.82       | Differences of original hazard map with hazard map with OLS methods.                         | 39          |
| Figure 5.83       | Differences of original hazard map with hazard map with OLS methods                          | 40          |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|       |   |  |
|-------|---|--|
| AHP   | - | Analytical Hierarchy Process           |
| GWR   |   | Geographical Weighted Regression       |
| GIS   | - | Geographical Information System        |
| SMCE  | - | Spatial Multi-Criteria Evaluation      |
| RHRS  | - | Rockfall Hazard Rating System          |
| mRHRS | - | Modified Rockfall Hazard Rating System |
| CRHRS | - | Colorado Rockfall Hazard Rating System |
| RHRSI | - | Rockfall Hazard Rating System India    |
| PCM   | - | Pairwise Comparison Matrix             |
| EBF   | - | Evidence Belief Function               |
| OLS   | - | Ordinary Least Square                  |
| AICc  | - | Akaike Information criterion           |
| WLC   | - | Weighted Linear Combination            |
| WOE   | - | Weight of Evidence                     |
| GIS   | - | Geographic Information System          |

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

|               |   |                            |
|---------------|---|----------------------------|
| $i,$          | - | Location                   |
| $\gamma$      | - | Rockfall Incidence Rates   |
| $\beta$       | - | Vector of Regression       |
| $x$           | - | Velocity                   |
| $\varepsilon$ | - | Random Error Term          |
| $0$           | - | Intercept                  |
| $f$           | - | Factor of Normalized Score |
| $w$           | - | Parameter's Weight         |
| $S$           | - | Sum of Hazard Score        |
| $R^2$         | - | R-squared                  |

## LIST OF APPENDICES

| <b>APPENDIX</b> | <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|-----------------|--|-------------|
| Appendix A      | AHP form questionnaire distributed                         | 52          |
| Appendix B      | Calculation for Consistency Index in the AHP questionnaire | 53          |
| Appendix C      | Secondary Data Slope for the road                          | 54          |

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction

Rockfall is a common bedrock mass movement on steep slopes including free falling, rolling, bouncing, and sliding motion (Davies, 2007). Various natural or man-made factors causes fractures in rocks. In constructing new road network, often the mass of rock is blasted to create pathway. This instability of rock slope is what could lead to the rockfall to become a hazard. Rockfall has been a problem for many countries especially near the road network since rock cutting for road construction causes instability in the rock terrain. Fractures is a feature in rock that represent the plane of weakness and breaks in rock mass. It is one of the factors that control the slope instability. Pierson in 1993 defined Rock Hazard Rating System as a proactive tool that allows transportation agencies to rationally address their rockfall hazard.

Therefore, most of the transportation agency globally had begun to adopt a rock hazard rating system to identify and monitor the condition of the slope along the highway. Rock hazard analysis has been discussed since 1984 from a study by C.O Browner and Duncan Wyllie (Pierson, 1993). Since then, many Rockfall Hazard rating System have been developed. Among them were Oregon-RHRS (Pierson, 1993), RHRON (Franklin & Senior, 1997), and Missouri RHRS (Youssef et al, 2003) (Aqeel, 2018). Most of these methods applied the GIS-based regression statistical analysis and multivariate analysis. Advancement in technology has witnessed the incorporation remote sensing and Rock Activity Index (RAI) method; a point-cloud-derived method for assessing landslide and rockfall hazard. Yet, the simulation was still based on system developed by Pierson (1993). (Dunham et al.,2017). In conclusion, it is necessary to address the spatial analysis algorithm behind the GIS-based predictive modelling.

## **1.2 Problem Background**

There has been a lot of study on GIS-based method on landslide and rockfall susceptibility mapping (Shakoor,2009; Michoud et al., 2012; Shahabi & Hashim,2014; Saroglou, 2019). The current Rockfall Hazard Rating System has applied subjective and quantitative method to categorize slope hazard. The heterogeneity of risk scales adopted across rock hazard system raise an issue on how the hazard is defined as it could lead to an overestimation or underestimation of rockfall risk along the road. Moreover, the common RHRS are likely to underestimate the risk due to the steps in the algorithm which just simply sum up the scores of all the categories. Effort to monitor this risk hazard has mostly been done through landslide method such as geotechnical approach, direct method like mapping and indirect method including univariate, bivariate or multivariate regression analysis (Marquinez et.al., 2003, Zhu & Huang,2006).

## **1.3 Research Aim**

Research aims to do a comparison study of integration of heuristic AHP and GWR methods in acquiring weightage for each parameter for rockfall hazard prediction. This research's objective is also to observe the parameter used to assess the rockfall risk in the study area based on literature studies and statistical method. Thus, this study has proposed an integration of geospatial analysis by implementing two different GIS-based methods in the weighting component of Rockfall Hazard Rating System in order to generate better predictive model for rock slope hazard mapping.

## **1.4 Research Question**

The research questions for this study are as below:

1. Is the original rock hazard rating system suitable for the road condition and weather in Malaysia?
2. Which modified version should be adjusted to suit the condition of Malaysian road?
3. Is there any parameter that should be removed from the current analysis to improve the performance?
4. Can Jenk natural break or other classification method provide better distinction of the hazard class?
5. Which GIS-based method has the highest accuracy to produce the best rockfall predictive model?
6. Which rock hazard rating system is the best and should be integrated with better performing GIS-based method?

## **1.5 Research Objectives**

The objectives of the research are:

- a) To identify the GIS based statistical method to be used in the algorithm for Rockfall Hazard Rating System
- b) To compare the different risk scale system and scoring system in the algorithm of Rockfall Hazard Rating System
- c) To review the existing rock hazard rating system analysis and integrate with geospatial analysis by comparing different GIS-based methods for rockfall susceptibility mapping
- d) To assess the improvement of the new modified Rockfall Hazard Rating System statistically in predictive modelling of rockfall by using categorized rock slope dataset. To assess and compare the performance of the predictive model using AHP and regression technique.



## REFERENCES

- Aditian, A., Kubota, T., & Shinohara, Y. (2018). Comparison of GIS-based landslide susceptibility models using frequency ratio, logistic regression, and artificial neural network in a tertiary region of Ambon Indonesia. *Geomorphology*, 318, pp.101-111. doi: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2018.06.006
- Aini,S., Mohd,S. A., Saaban,S. (2015) Analysing Elephant Habitat Parameters Using GIS, Remote Sensing and Analytical Hierarchy Process in Peninsular Malaysia. *Pertanika J.Sci. & Technology*. 23(1): 37-50
- Anis, Z., Wissem, G., Vali, V., Smida, H., & Mohamed Essghaier, G. (2019). GIS-based landslide susceptibility mapping using bivariate statistical methods in North-western Tunisia. *Open Geosciences*, 11(1), 708-726. doi: 10.1515/geo-2019-0056
- Ansari, M., Ahmad, M., Singh, R., & Singh, T. (2015). Rockfall Hazard Rating System along SH-72: a case study of Poladpur–Mahabaleshwar road (Western India), Maharashtra, India. *Geomatics, Natural Hazards And Risk*, 7(2), 649-666. doi: 10.1080/19475705.2014.1003416
- Aqeel, A. (2018). Rockfall Hazard Rating System(s) in Saudi Arabia – A Review. *Journal Of Geography And Geology*, 10(4), 1. doi:10.5539/jgg.v10n4p1
- Baillifard, F., Jaboyedoff, M., & Sartori, M. (2003). Rockfall hazard mapping along a mountainous road in Switzerland using a GIS-based parameter rating approach. *Natural Hazards And Earth System Science*, 3(5), 435-442. doi: 10.5194/nhess-3-435-2003

- Barredol JI, Benavidesz A, Herhl J, Van Westen CJ (2000) Comparing heuristic landslide susceptibility assessment techniques using GIS in the Tirajana basin, Gran Canaria Island, Spain. *J Appl Earth Observ Geoinf* 2:9–23
- Brewer, M., Butler, A. and Cooksley, S., 2016. The relative performance of AIC, AICC and BIC in the presence of unobserved heterogeneity. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(6), 679-692.
- Brunsdon. C., Fotheringham, A.S., Charlton, M.E. (1998) Spatial nonstationarity and autoregressive models. *Environment and Planning A*, 30, 957-973
- Budetta, P., & Nappi, M. (2013). Comparison between qualitative rockfall risk rating systems for road affected by high traffic intensity. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 13(6), 1643-1653. doi: 10.5194/nhess-13-1643-2013
- Chau, K., Wong, R., Liu, J., & Lee, C. (2003). Rockfall Hazard Analysis for Hong Kong Based on Rockfall Inventory. *Rock Mechanics And Rock Engineering*, 36(5), 383-408. doi: 10.1007/s00603-002-0035-z
- Chau, K., & Chan, J. (2005). Regional bias of landslide data in generating susceptibility maps using logistic regression: Case of Hong Kong Island. *Landslides*, 2(4), 280-290. doi: 10.1007/s10346-005-0024-x
- Davies, T. (2017) *Landslide Hazards, Risks, And Disasters*. Oxford: ELSEVIER.
- Dorren, L., & Seijmonsbergen, A. (2003) Comparison of three GIS-based models for predicting rockfall runout zones at a regional scale. *Geomorphology*, 56(1-2), 49-64. doi: 10.1016/s0169-555x(03)00045-x
- Dunham, L., Wartman, J., Olsen, M., O'Banion, M., & Cunningham, K. (2017). Rockfall Activity Index (RAI): A lidar-derived, morphology-based method for hazard assessment. *Engineering Geology*, 221, 184-192. doi: 10.1016/j.enggeo.2017.03.009

- Fábián, Z., (2014) Method of the Geographically Weighted Regression and an example for its Application. *Regional Statistics*, 4(1), pp.61-75.
- Fotheringham, A.S., Charlton, A.S., Brunson, M. (1998) Geographically Weighted Regression: A Natural Evolution of the Expansion Method for Spatial Data Analysis. *Environment and Planning A*, 30(11), pp. 1905-1927
- Gasim, M., Toriman, M. and Juahir, H.. (2015) Phenomenon of Slope Failure Occurrences along Gerik-Jeli Highway, Malaysia. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 15(3), pp. 545-551.
- Hong, H., Pradhan, B., Sameen, M. I., Chen, W., & Xu, C. (2017). Spatial prediction of rotational landslide using geographically weighted regression, logistic regression, and support vector machine models in Xing Guo area (China). *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, 8(2), 1997–2022. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2017.1403974>
- Jamaluddin, T.T., & Deraman, M.F. (2000). Relict structures and cut slope failures in highly to completely weathered rocks along Jalan Tg. Siang, Kota Tinggi, Johor. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of Malaysia*, 46, 305-312.
- Kim, Y.J., Kim, W.Y., Yu, I.H., Seo, D.J. and Yang, Y.K. (1992) Analysis of Regional Geologic Hazards (Landslide) Using GIS Technology, in Proceedings XVIIth ISPRS Congress Technical Commission IV: Cartographic and Data Base Applications of Photogrammetry and Machine Vision, L.W. Fritz and J.R. Lucas, 2–14 August 1992, Washington, D.C., USA, International Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Bethesda, 675–680.
- Kayastha, P., Dhital, M.R., De Smedt, F. (2013). Application of the analytical hierarchy process (AHP) for landslide susceptibility mapping: A case study from the Tinau watershed, west Nepal. *Computers & Geosciences* 52, 398–408

- Lee S, Pradhan B (2006) Probabilistic landslide susceptibility s and risk mapping on Penang Island, Malaysia. *J Earth System Sci* 115(6):661–672
- Losasso, L., & Sdao, F. (2018) The artificial neural network for the rockfall susceptibility assessment. A case study in Basilicata (Southern Italy). *Geomatics, Natural Hazards And Risk*, 9(1), 737-759. doi: 10.1080/19475705.2018.1476413
- Maerz, N.H., Youssef, A. and Fennessey, T.W. (2005) New Risk–Consequence Rockfall Hazard Rating System for Missouri Highways Using Digital Image Analysis, *Environmental & Engineering Geoscience*, 11(3): 229-249.
- Marquínez, J., Menéndez Duarte, R., Farias, P., & Jiménez Sánchez, M. (2003) Predictive GIS-Based Model of Rockfall Activity in Mountain Cliffs. *Natural Hazards*, 30(3), 341-360. doi: 10.1023/b:nhaz.0000007170.21649.e1
- Menéndez-Duarte, Rosana & Marquínez, J. (2002). The influence of environmental and lithologic factors on rockfall at a regional scale: an evaluation using GIS. *Geomorphology*. 43. 117-136. 10.1016/S0169-555X(01)00126-X.
- Mezughí, Tareq & Akhir, Juhari & Ghani Rafek, Abdul & Abdullah, Ibrahim. (2012). Analytical Hierarchy Process Method for Mapping Landslide Susceptibility to an Area along the E-W Highway (Gerik-Jeli), Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Earth Sciences*. 5. 13-24. 10.3923/ajes.2012.13.24.
- Michoud, C., Derron, M., Horton, P., Jaboyedoff, M., Baillifard, F., & Loye, A. et al. (2012) Rockfall hazard and risk assessments along roads at a regional scale: example in Swiss Alps. *Natural Hazards And Earth System Sciences*, 12(3), 615-629. doi: 10.5194/nhess-12-615-2012
- Nandi A, Shakoor A (2009) A GIS-based landslide susceptibility evaluation using bivariate and multivariate statistical analyses. *Eng Geol* 110:11–20

- Pantelidis, L. (2010) A critical review of highway slope instability risk assessment systems. *Bulletin of Engineering Geology And The Environment*, 70(3), 395-400. doi: 10.1007/s10064-010-0328-5
- Pierson, L.A., and Van Vickle, R. (1993) Rockfall Hazard Rating System Participant's Manual: Federal Highway Administration Publication SA-93-057, 104.
- Saaty, T.L. (1980) The Analytic Hierarchy Process: Planning, Priority Setting, Resources Allocation. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Santi, P., Russell, C., Higgins, J., & Spriet, J. (2009) Modification and statistical analysis of the Colorado Rockfall Hazard Rating System. *Engineering Geology*, 104(1-2), 55-65. doi: 10.1016/j.enggeo.2008.08.009
- Saroglou, H., Marinos, V., Marinos, P., & Tsiambaos, G. (2012) Rockfall hazard and risk assessment: an example from a high promontory at the historical site of Monemvasia, Greece. *Natural Hazards And Earth System Sciences*, 12(6), 1823-1836. doi: 10.5194/nhess-12-1823-2012
- Saroglou, C. (2019) GIS-Based Rockfall Susceptibility Zoning in Greece. *Geosciences*, 9(4), 163. doi: 10.3390/geosciences9040163
- Sassa, K., Mikoš, M. and Yin, Y., 2017. Advancing Culture of Living with Landslides. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Shahabi, H., & Hashim, M. (2015). Landslide susceptibility mapping using GIS-based statistical models and Remote sensing data in tropical environment. *Scientific Reports*, 5(1). doi: 10.1038/srep09899
- Shirzadi, A., Saro, L., Hyun Joo, O. et al. (2012). A GIS-based logistic regression model in rock-fall susceptibility mapping along a mountainous road: Salavat Abad case study, Kurdistan, Iran. *Nat Hazards* 64, 1639–1656

- Triana, K., & Hermawan, K. (2020). Slope mass rating-based analysis to assess rockfall hazard on Yogyakarta Southern Mountain, Indonesia. *Geoenvironmental Disasters*, 7(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40677-020-00164-w>
- Verma, A. K., Sardana, S., Sharma, P., Dinpuia, L., & Singh, T. N. (2019). Investigation of rockfall-prone road cut slope near Lengpui Airport, Mizoram, India. *Journal of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering*, 11(1), 146–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrmge.2018.07.007>
- Wang, Ku & Zhang, Chuanrong & Li, Weidong. (2012). Comparison of Geographically Weighted Regression and Regression Kriging for Estimating the Spatial Distribution of Soil Organic Matter. *GIScience & Remote Sensing*. 49. 915-932. [10.2747/1548-1603.49.6.915](https://doi.org/10.2747/1548-1603.49.6.915).
- Yuan, Y., Wang, S., & Liu, S. (2015) Sensitivity Analysis of the Factors Affecting Rockfall Distance. 2015 3rd International Conference on Mechatronics, Robotics and Automation (ICMRA).
- Youssef, A., Maerz, N., Fritz, M.A., & Boulevard, M. (2004). A Risk-Consequence Hazard Rating System for Missouri Highway Rock Cuts.
- Youssef, A., & Norbert, M. (2012) Development, justification, and verification of a rock fall hazard rating system. *Bulletin of Engineering Geology and The Environment -BULL ENG GEOL ENVIRON*.71. [10.1007/s10064-010-0339-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10064-010-0339-2).
- Zare, Mohammad & Jouri, Mohammad & Salarian, Tina & Askarizadeh, Diana & Miarrostami, Soodeh. (2014). Comparing of bivariate statistic, AHP and combination methods to predict the landslide hazard in northern aspect of Alborz Mt. (Iran). *International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences*. 7. 543-554.

Zhu, L., & Huang, J. (2006). GIS-based logistic regression method for landslide susceptibility mapping in regional scale. *Journal of Zhejiang University-SCIENCE A*, 7(12), 2007-2017. doi: 10.1631/jzus.2006.a2007