

Responses to Referee #1

Thank you very much for your kind and constructive suggestions in such detail. And we deeply appreciate your fairly good patience, the time and energy devoted for reviewing our manuscript. We have modified the manuscript following your kind comments one by one.

Q1: A general effort of editing should be carried out to clarify some passages and improve the readability of the manuscript. On the enclosed copy, I marked statements that need to be corrected and/or rephrased, reporting some suggestions, for which, however, the authors should verify that correctly reflect what they meant.

R1: We have modified the manuscript following your kind comments one by one, see Line 16, 43, 48, 79-84, 85, 141-145, 149-150, 155-159, 169, 181, 185-188, 193-194, 195-197, 204-206, 218, 221, 254, 266, 278, 302, 309-310, 310-312, 312-315, 315-316, 464, 486, 510 and 538 in the revision.

Q2: The geological setting of the study area seems to be too poorly illustrated: an at least schematic map of the study area geology should be provided.

R2: Yes, we have added a geologic map of the study area showing lithology and faults, see Line 84 and 541 in the revision.

Q3: With regard to the statements of lines 156-159, it is unclear to me why an angle of $45^\circ + 1/2$ of friction angle was assumed as representative of sliding surface inclination on slopes where DEM provides angle greater than 60° . Clarification would be desirable.

R3: According to Jibson et al. (1998, 2000), slopes steeper than 60° remain unstable even at high strengths. We assume that Newmark's rigid plastic block is unsuitable for such a steep sliding surface. In this case, sliding occurs along a plane at an angle (α) of $45^\circ + \frac{\phi_b}{2}$ of the friction angle with the horizon. Therefore, we assigned an angle (α) of $45^\circ + \frac{\phi_b}{2}$ to slopes steeper than 60° to avoid too small a value of F_s in the Newmark analysis. We have added a figure to make it clear, see Line 155-159 and 561 in the revision.

Q4: At lines 197-199, the authors declare that the critical acceleration was found to reach, in the study area, a maximum of 14 g in areas of lower susceptibility. This maximum seems to me meaningless for the context of a dynamic slope stability analysis. It could be reported that the areas with lower susceptibility are those with critical acceleration greater than 1 g.

R4: Changes were made in the revision, see Line 195-197 in the revision.

Q5: At lines 262-263, the authors state that “most of the actual triggered landslides lie in the higher confidence-level areas with CF values greater than 0.60”. It would be desirable to have a more quantitative information at this regard: what is the percentage of such landslides?

R5: The quantitative portion of the actual triggered landslides lie in the higher confidence-level areas with CF values greater than 0.60 is 73.2%. Changes were made in the revision, see Line 259-260 in the revision.

Q6: In my opinion, Fig. 15 is poorly significant. The certainty factor CF and the proportion $p(H/E)$ occupied by landslides within areas falling in Newmark Displacement bins are two quantities uniquely related to each other, once the “a priori” probability $p(H)$ is fixed, through the equations (9) and the corresponding inverse functions reported on Fig. 15. Thus, the perfect fitting of black dots along the red curve depends merely by the fact that the black dots are randomly selected samples of the red curve itself. More significant would be to show how CF values are related to the Newmark Displacement values D_n , as Jibson et al. (2000) did for the proportion of landslide cells, corresponding to what is here defined $p(H/E)$, plotted versus D_n . In that study, it was this relation that was modelled through a Weibull curve, whose coefficients were derived by regression (see Fig. 14 of the cited paper). A similar plotting of CF as function of D_n would make possible to evaluate the consistency between these two quantities. Thus, one could obtain hazard estimates also for a seismic scenario different from the one used in the present study, once, following the same procedure described here, the D_n values expected for the new scenario is calculated.

R6: We consider your suggestion seriously and modify the manuscript depicted as follows: (1) for the statistical significance of the function of CF and Newmark displacement, the predicted displacement cells were grouped into bins based on quantile statistics. The breakpoints were 0, 10, 30, 39, 46, 51, 55, 59, 63, and 122. In this way, the number of cells in each bin was equal.; (2) as CF values ranged from -1 to 1, and not from 0 to 1, the Weibull (1939) curve developed by Jaeger and Cook (1969) is unsuitable here. Therefore, we modified the functional form to $CF=2m[1-\exp(-aD^b)]-1$, where CF is the certainty factor, m is the maximum CF value represented by the data, D is predicated displacement, and a and b are regression constants. In each bin, the CF value of Newmark displacement was plotted as a dot. The regression curve based on data from the Ludian earthquake is $CF=1.837[1-\exp(-0.073D^{0.821})]-1$; (3) when the predicted displacement increased, the value of CF increased monotonically, meaning that the confidence level for slope failure grew and landslide would probably occur. Such a procedure is consistent with the interpretation of certainty factor theory. Therefore, we were able to obtain estimates of the hazard different from the one used in this study using the same procedure described here. Changes were made in the revision, see Line 280-298.

Responses to Referee #2

Thanks very much for your nice comment. And we deeply appreciate your time devoted by reviewing our manuscript. Your constructive comments are invaluable to the improvement of our manuscript. We have modified the manuscript following your comments one by one.

Q1: The English writing should be improved. We suggest to be polished by a native English speaker.

R1: Yes, we have polished the manuscript with the help of a native English speaker, changes were made in the revision.

Q2: The geological map of Ludian earthquake should be added in Fig.1 including tectonic setting and the distribution of the faults.

R2: Yes, we have added a geologic map of the study area showing the distribution of lithology and faults, see Line 84 and 541 in the revision.

Q3: About introducing the CF method, I suggest to fit the Weibull curve as Jibson et al. (2000).

R3: Yes, we modified the Weibull function form developed by Jaeger and Cook (1969) to $CF = 2m[1 - \exp(-aD^b)] - 1$, where CF is the certainty factor, m is the maximum CF value represented by the data, D is predicated displacement, and a and b are regression constants. The CF value of Newmark displacement was plotted as a dot. The regression curve based on data from the Ludian earthquake is $CF = 1.837[1 - \exp(-0.073D^{0.821})] - 1$. With this function, we were able to obtain estimates of the hazard different from the one used in this study using the same procedure described here. Changes were made in the revision, see Line 280-298.

An improved method of Newmark analysis for mapping hazards of coseismic landslides

Mingdong Zang^{1,2,3}, Shengwen Qi^{1,2,3}, Yu Zou^{1,2,3}, Zhuping Sheng⁴, Blanca S. Zamora⁴

¹Key Laboratory of Shale Gas and Geoengineering, Institute of Geology and Geophysics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100029, China

²Institutions of Earth Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100029, China

³University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100029, China

⁴Texas A&M AgriLife Research Center at El Paso, El Paso, Texas 79927, USA

Correspondence to: Shengwen Qi (qishengwen@mail.iggcas.ac.cn)

15 **Abstract.** Coseismic landslides can destroy buildings, dislocate roads, sever pipelines, and cause heavy
16 casualties. It is thus important but challenging to accurately map the hazards posed by coseismic
17 landslides. Newmark's method is widely applied to assess the permanent displacement along a potential
18 slide surface and model the coseismic response of slopes. This paper proposes an improved Newmark
19 analysis for mapping the hazards of coseismic landslides by considering the roughness and effect of size
20 of the potential slide surfaces. This method is verified by data from a case study on the 2014 M_w 6.1 (the
21 United States Geological Survey) Ludian earthquake in Yunnan Province of China. Permanent
22 displacements due to the earthquake ranged from 0 to 122 cm. The predicted displacements were
23 compared with a comprehensive inventory of landslides triggered by the Ludian earthquake to map the
24 spatial variation in the hazards of coseismic landslides using the certainty factor model. The confidence
25 levels of coseismic landslides indicated by the certainty factors ranged from -1 to 0.95. A hazard map of
26 the coseismic landslide was generated based on the spatial distribution of values of the certainty factor. A
27 regression curve relating the predicted displacement and the certainty factor was drawn, and can be
28 applied to predict the hazards of coseismic landslides for any seismic scenario of interest. The area under
29 the curve was used to compare the improved and the conventional Newmark analyses, and revealed the
30 improved performance of the former. This mapping procedure can be used to predict the hazards posed
31 by coseismic landslides, and provide guidelines for decisions regarding the development of infrastructure
32 and post-earthquake reconstruction.

33 *Keywords:* Coseismic landslide; Newmark's method; Barton model; Certainty factor; Hazard mapping

34

35 1 Introduction

36 Earthquakes are recognized as one of the major causes of landslides (Keefer, 1984). Hazards caused by
37 coseismic landslides have drawn increasing attention in recent years (e.g., Jibson et al., 1998, 2000;
38 Khazai and Sitar, 2004; Qi et al., 2010, 2011, 2012; Chen et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2013; Yuan et al., 2014).
39 The damage caused by seismically triggered landslides is sometimes more severe than the direct damage
40 caused by the earthquake (Keefer, 1984). Estimating where a specific shaking is likely to induce a slope
41 failure plays an important role in the regional assessment of coseismic landslides.

42 Pseudostatic analysis formalized by Terzaghi (1950), and finite-element modeling applied by Clough and
43 Chopra (1966) have been employed to assess the seismic stability of slopes in early efforts (Jibson, 2011).
44 Newmark (1965) first introduced a relatively simple and practical method, which is still commonly used
45 nowadays, to estimate the coseismic permanent displacements of slopes (Jibson, 2011). Studies have
46 shown that Newmark's method yields reasonable and practical results when modeling the dynamic
47 performance of natural slopes (Wilson and Keefer, 1983; Wieczorek et al., 1985; Jibson et al., 1998, 2000;
48 Pradel et al., 2005). Rathje and Antonakos (2011) recently presented a unified framework for predicting
49 coseismic permanent sliding displacement based on Newmark's method. Chen et al. (2018) used
50 Newmark's method to calculate the minimum accelerations required for coseismic landslides in the region
51 affected by the 2014 Ludian earthquake. Chen et al. (2019) subsequently developed an easy-operation
52 mapping method to assess hazards posed by coseismic landslides in the zone struck by the 2014 Ludian
53 earthquake using Newmark's method.

54 Such applications generally start from an analysis of the dynamic stability of slopes, which is quantified
55 as the critical acceleration. Barton model (Barton, 1973) has been widely used in rock mechanics and

56 engineering to predict the shear strength of rock joints, which plays a crucial role in the calculation of
57 critical acceleration. However, researchers have not adequately attended to the shear strength of rock
58 joints during the assessment of coseismic landslides. To better estimate the dynamic stability of slopes, in
59 this paper, we introduce the Barton model (Barton, 1973) to Newmark analysis to develop an improved
60 modeling method for mapping the hazards posed by coseismic landslides using data from the 2014 Ludian
61 earthquake in Yunnan Province in southwestern China. As predictions of coseismic landslides are not
62 based on exact results, i.e., the computed permanent displacements, but are also mingled with
63 unformalized expertise, i.e., the interpreted landslides, we present a model of inexact reasoning, i.e., the
64 certainty factor model (CFM), that defies analysis, as an application of sets of inference rules that are
65 expressed in predicate logic (Shortliffe and Buchanan, 1975), to produce a map of the hazards posed by
66 coseismic landslides.

67 This paper briefly introduces the characteristics and spatial distribution of landslides triggered at the
68 chosen site, describes the method of modeling used for the analysis of the stability of seismic slopes,
69 presents the mapping procedure of the confidence level of seismic slope failure, and finally discusses the
70 results of the assessment of seismic hazard as well as a comparison with the conventional Newmark
71 analysis.

72

73 2 Study area

74 The epicenter of the 2014 M_w 6.1 (the United States Geological Survey) Ludian earthquake was located
75 in the southeastern margin of the Tibetan Plateau. A rectangular area lying immediately around the
76 epicenter containing dense concentrations of the induced landslides was chosen for study (Fig. 1). The

elevation of the area ranged from 785 m to 3,085 m above sea level. Three rivers—the Niulanjiang River, Shaba River, and Longquan River—pass through the study area (Fig. 1). The topography ranges from flat in the river valleys to nearly vertical in the slopes on the banks of the rivers. According to Chen et al. (2015), Niulanjiang River flows from the southeast (SE) to the northwest (NW), and incises to a depth between 1,200 m and 3,300 m, resulting in about 80% of the slopes having angles greater than 40° distributed along the banks. The predominant geological units of the study area have an age that varies from the Proterozoic to the Mesozoic, including dolomite, limestone, shale, sandstone, basalt, and slate (Fig. 2).

An inventory of 1,416 landslides triggered by the 2014 Ludian earthquake (Fig. 1) was compiled by visual inspection through comparisons between pre-earthquake satellite images obtained from Google Earth (January 30, 2014) and 0.2-m high-resolution post-earthquake aerial images (August 7, 2014; data provided by the Digital Mountain and Remote Sensing Applications Center, Institute of Mountain Hazards and Environment, Chinese Academy of Sciences, and Beijing Anxiang Power Technology Co., LTD.). A majority of landslides triggered by the earthquake were shallow, flow-like landslides (shallower than 3 m), developing in particularly dense concentrations along steeply incised river valleys. The total area of these interpreted landslides was 7.01 km² within a study area of 705 km². A detailed study showed that 846 of the mapped landslides were greater than 1,000 m² in area, occupying 6.74 km² and accounting for 96.1% of the total area of landslides, of which 279 were greater in area than 5,000 m², occupying 5.37 km² and accounting for 76.6% of the total landslide area.

96

97 3 Methodology

98 3.1 Modeling method

99 In the context of the analysis of the dynamic stability of a slope, Newmark (1965) proposed a permanent
100 displacement analysis that bridges the gap between simplistic pseudostatic analysis and sophisticated, but
101 generally impractical, finite element modeling (Jibson, 1993). Newmark's method simulates a landslide
102 as a rigid plastic friction block with a known critical acceleration on an inclined plane (Fig. 3), and
103 calculates the cumulative permanent displacement of the block as it is subjected to an acceleration-time
104 history of an earthquake. Newmark (1965) showed that the dynamic stability of a slope is related to the
105 critical acceleration of a potential landslide block, and can be expressed as a simple function of the static
106 factor of safety and the geometry of the landslide (Jibson et al., 1998, 2000):

$$a_c = (F_S - 1)g \sin \alpha \quad (1)$$

107 where a_c is the critical acceleration in terms of g , the acceleration due to the Earth's gravity, F_S is the
108 static factor of safety, and α is the angle from the horizontal at which the center of the slide block moves
109 when displacement first occurs (Jibson et al., 1998, 2000). For a planar slip surface parallel to the slope,
110 this angle generally approximates to the angle of the slope.

111 Natural slopes often develop a group of shallow unloading joints (Fig. 4) parallel to the surface due to
112 valley incisions (Gu, 1979; Hoek and Bray, 1981). Studies have shown that rock slopes behave as
113 collapsing and sliding failures of shallow unloading joints under strong earthquakes, and 90% of
114 coseismic landslides are shallow falls and slides (Harp and Jibson, 1996; Khazai and Sitar, 2003; Dai et
115 al., 2011; Tang et al., 2015). According to Qi et al. (2012), two typical kinds of landslides are triggered
116 by earthquakes, i.e., (a) shallow, flow-like landslides with depth less than 3 m in general, and (b) rock
117 falls thrown by the shaking caused by the earthquake, usually occurring at the crest of the slope. For both

types, **unstable blocks of rock** are often cut and activated along the rock joints. Therefore, the static factor of safety in terms of the critical acceleration in these conditions is related to the peak shear strength of the rock joints. For the purpose of **regional analysis**, we use a limit-equilibrium model of an infinite slope (Fig. 2) **by** referring to the simplification of **Newmark's method by of Jibson et al. (1998, 2000)**. The value of the static factor of safety against sliding **given** by the ratio of **resistance** to **the** driving forces is determined by conventional analysis **without considering** accelerations, expressed as:

$$F_s = \frac{\text{Resisting force}}{\text{Driving force}} = \frac{\tau L}{mg \sin \alpha} = \frac{\tau L}{\gamma L t \sin \alpha} = \frac{\tau}{\gamma t \sin \alpha} \quad (2)$$

where τ is **the** peak shear strength of the rock joint, γ is **the** unit weight of the rock mass, and t is the thickness of the failure rock block.

For a Newmark analysis, it **is** customary to describe the shear strength of rocks **instead of** rock joints in terms of Coulomb's constants—friction angle (ϕ) and cohesion (c). However, both are not only stress dependent, but also scale dependent (Barton and Choubey, 1977). According to Barton (1973), a more satisfactory empirical relationship for predicting the peak shear strength of a joint can be written as follows:

$$\tau = \sigma_n \tan [JRC \log_{10} \left(\frac{JCS}{\sigma_n} \right) + \phi_b] \quad (3)$$

where σ_n is **the** effective normal stress, JRC is **the** joint roughness coefficient, JCS is **the** joint wall compressive strength, **and** ϕ_b is the basic friction angle—the angle of frictional sliding resistance between rock joints—which can be obtained from residual shear tests on natural joints (Barton, 1973).

The effective normal stress (σ_n) generated by **gravity** acting on the rock block is as follows:

$$\sigma_n = \frac{mg \cos \alpha}{L} = \frac{\gamma L t \cos \alpha}{L} = \gamma t \cos \alpha \quad (4)$$

135 Considering the impact of size on JRC and JCS , the formulations developed by Barton and Bandis (1982)
 136 are shown as below:

$$JRC_n = JRC_0 \left(\frac{L_n}{L_0} \right)^{-0.02 JRC_0} \quad (5)$$

$$JCS_n = JCS_0 \left(\frac{L_n}{L_0} \right)^{-0.03 JRC_0} \quad (6)$$

137 where the nomenclature adopted incorporates (0) and (n) for values of the laboratory scale and the in-situ
 138 scale, respectively.

139 Hence, the static factor of safety (F_S) of a slope can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} F_S &= \frac{\tau}{\gamma t \sin \alpha} = \frac{\sigma_n \tan [JRC_n \log_{10} \left(\frac{JCS_n}{\sigma_n} \right) + \phi_b]}{\gamma t \sin \alpha} \\ &= \frac{\gamma t \cos \alpha \tan [JRC_n \log_{10} \left(\frac{JCS_n}{\gamma t \cos \alpha} \right) + \phi_b]}{\gamma t \sin \alpha} \\ &= \frac{\tan [JRC_n \log_{10} \left(\frac{JCS_n}{\gamma t \cos \alpha} \right) + \phi_b]}{\tan \alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

140 After calculating the angle of the slope and static factor of safety, the critical acceleration of the slope can
 141 be determined. Once the time history of the earthquake' acceleration has been selected, portions of the
 142 record lying above the critical acceleration a_c (Fig. 5a) are integrated once to derive a velocity profile
 143 (Fig. 5b); the time history of velocity is then integrated a second time to obtain the profile of cumulative

displacement of the block (Fig. 5c). Users finally determine the dynamic performance of the slope based on the magnitude of the Newmark displacement (Jibson et al., 1998, 2000; Jibson, 2011). The detailed procedure of conducting a Newmark analysis with the Barton model is discussed in the following sections.

3.2 Static factor-of-safety map

Considering that the mapped landslides greater in area than 1,000 m² occupied 96.1% of the total landslide area, we selected a 30 m × 30 m digital elevation model (DEM) from the ASTER Global Digital Elevation Model (<https://doi.org/10.5067/ASTER/ASTGTM.002>, last accessed July 16, 2018), which facilitated the subsequent hazard analysis. A basic slope algorithm was applied to the DEM to produce a slope map (Fig. 6), where the slope was identified as the steepest downhill descent from a cell to its neighbors (Burrough and McDonell, 1998). The slopes ranged from greater than 60° along the banks of the Niulanjiang River, Shaba River, and Longquan River, to less than 20° in low mountains and hills in the north and east.

According to Jibson et al. (1998, 2000), slopes steeper than 60° remain unstable even at high strengths.

We assume that Newmark's rigid plastic block is unsuitable for such a steep sliding surface. In this case, sliding occurs along a plane at an angle (α) of $45^\circ + \frac{\phi_b}{2}$ of the friction angle with the horizon (Fig. 7).

Therefore, we assigned an angle (α) of $45^\circ + \frac{\phi_b}{2}$ to slopes steeper than 60° to avoid too small a value of F_s in the Newmark analysis.

The digital geological map from the China Geological Survey (CGS) was rasterized at a 30-m grid spacing to assign material properties throughout the study area. According to the literature, JRC_0 and JCS_0 depend strongly on lithology (Coulson, 1972; Barton and Choubey, 1977; Bandis et al., 1983; Bilgin and Pasamehmetoglu, 1990; Priest, 1993; Singh et al., 2012; Alejano et al., 2012, 2014; Giusepone, 2014;

Yong et al., 2018). Representative values of γ , JRC_0 , JCS_0 , and ϕ_b assigned to each rock type exposed in the study area were estimated using the test data listed in Table 1. The selected values were near the middle of the ranges represented in the references. These JRC_0 and JCS_0 values were considered in a laboratory scale for a length of 100 mm as L_0 . For each grid cell in the regional analysis, the length of the engineering dimension, L_n , can generally be set as a 10-fold range of L_0 . This is because the value of JRC_n/JRC_0 (JCS_n/JCS_0) is nearly constant when the value of L_n/L_0 is greater than 10 (Bandis et al., 1981). The values of JRC_n and JCS_n , then, were calculated by inserting the values of JRC_0 and JCS_0 , and L_0 , and L_n into Eqs. (5) and (6), respectively. Figures 8 and 9 show the spatial distributions of JRC_n and JCS_n , respectively. The basic-friction-angle (ϕ_b) map and unit-weight (γ) map are shown in Figs. 10 and 11, respectively.

For the sake of simplicity, the thickness of the modeled block t was taken to be 3 m, which reflected the typical slope failures of the Ludian earthquake. The static factor-of-safety map was produced by combining these data layers (α , JRC_n , JCS_n , ϕ_b , and γ) in Eq. (7). In the initial iteration of the calculation, grid cells in steep areas with static factors of safety smaller than one indicated that the slopes were statically unstable, but did not necessarily mean that they were moving under shaking induced by the earthquake. In this condition, to avoid conservative results, we neither increased the strengths of the rock types with statically unstable cells nor adjusted the strengths of other rock types to preserve the differences in relative strength between them (as in Jibson et al., 1998, 2000). Instead, we assigned a minimal static factor of safety of 1.01, merely above limit equilibrium (Jibson et al., 1998, 2000), to these slopes to avoid a negative value of the critical acceleration a_c . According to Keefer (1984), most landslides triggered by earthquakes occur with a slope of at least 5° . The static factors of safety resulting

185 from slopes of angles smaller than 5° were very high. These slopes were unlikely to fail under the Ludian
186 earthquake, and did not produce a statistically significant sample in the analysis. Therefore, slopes less
187 steep than 5° were not analyzed in the second iteration. After the adjustment, the static factors of safety
188 ranged from 1 to 17.4, as shown in Fig. 12.

189 3.3 Critical acceleration map

190 According to Newmark (1965), a pseudostatic analysis in terms of the static factor of safety and the slope
191 angle was employed to calculate the critical acceleration of a potential landslide. The map of critical
192 acceleration (Fig. 13) was generated by combining the static factor of safety and the slope angle in Eq.
193 (1). The critical accelerations were derived from the intrinsic properties of the slope (topography and
194 lithology), regardless of the given shaking. Therefore, the map of critical acceleration indicated the
195 susceptibility of coseismic landslides (Jibson et al., 1998, 2000). The calculated critical accelerations
196 ranged from nearly zero in areas that were more susceptible to coseismic landslides to greater than 1 g
197 in areas that were less susceptibility.

198 3.4 Shake map

199 There were 23 strong-motion stations within 100 km of the epicenter of the Ludian earthquake (Fig. 14).
200 Each station's record contained the three components of the peak ground acceleration (PGA), south–north
201 direction, east–west direction, and up–down direction, as listed in Table 2 (the dataset was provided by
202 the China Earthquake Data Center, <http://data.earthquake.cn>, last accessed June 16, 2016). We calculated
203 the average PGA of the two horizontal components of each strong-motion recording and plotted a
204 contour map (Fig. 15) using an inverse distance-weighted (IDW) interpolation algorithm. It determined
205 the cell values using a linearly weighted combination of a set of sample stations with weights inversely

206 proportional to distance (Watson and Philip, 1985). In addition, given that input stations far from the
207 epicenter, where the prediction was made, might have had poor or no spatial correlation, we eliminated
208 the input stations beyond 100 km from the epicenter from the calculation.

209 3.5 Newmark displacement map

210 In case of a landslide in practice, it is impossible to conduct a rigorous Newmark analysis when
211 accelerometer records are unavailable. It is also impractical and time consuming to produce a
212 displacement in each cell during the regional analysis. Therefore, empirical regressions (Ambraseys and
213 Menu, 1988; Bray and Travarasrou, 2007; Jibson, 2007; Saygili and Rathje, 2008; Rathje and Saygili,
214 2009; Hsieh and Lee, 2011) have been proposed to estimate Newmark displacement as a function of the
215 critical acceleration and peak ground acceleration, or the Arias intensity. Rathje and Saygili (2009)
216 developed a vector model for displacement in terms of the critical acceleration (a_c), peak ground
217 acceleration (PGA), and moment magnitude (M_w) based on an analysis of over 2,000 strong motion
218 recordings:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln D = & 4.89 - 4.85 \left(\frac{a_c}{PGA} \right) - 19.64 \left(\frac{a_c}{PGA} \right)^2 + 42.49 \left(\frac{a_c}{PGA} \right)^3 - 29.06 \left(\frac{a_c}{PGA} \right)^4 \\ & + 0.72 \ln(PGA) + 0.89(M_w - 6) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

219 where D is the predicted displacement in units of cm , and a_c and PGA are in units of g .
220 This model is a preferred displacement model at a site where acceleration-time recordings are not
221 available. Incorporating multiple parameters of ground motion into the analysis typically results in less
222 variation in the prediction of displacement (Rathje and Saygili, 2009).

223 The Newmark displacement of each cell was calculated by combining the corresponding values of the
 224 critical acceleration, peak ground acceleration, and moment magnitude in Eq. (8). The predicted
 225 displacements ranged from 0 cm to 122 cm, as shown in Fig. 16.

226 3.6 Coseismic landslide hazard map

227 According to Jibson et al. (1998, 2000), predicted displacements provide an index of the seismic
 228 performance of slopes, where larger predicted displacements relate to a greater incidence of slope failures.
 229 But the displacements do not correspond directly to measurable slope movements in the field. To produce
 230 a coseismic landslide hazard map, we chose a model of inexact reasoning, the certainty factor model
 231 (CFM), created by Shortliffe and Buchanan (1975) and improved by Hecherman (1986), to explore the
 232 relationship between the occurrences of landslides and their predicted displacements. The CFM was
 233 created as a numerical method, initially used in MYCIN, a backward-chaining expert system in medicine
 234 (Shortliffe and Buchanan, 1975), for managing uncertainty in a rule-based system. In this model, the
 235 certainty factor CF represents the net confidence in a hypothesis H based on the evidence E
 236 (Hecherman, 1986). Certainty factors range between -1 and 1. A CF with a value of -1 means a total lack
 237 of confidence, whereas a CF with a value of 1 means total confidence. Values greater than zero favor
 238 the hypothesis while those less than zero favor its negation. According to Hecherman (1986), the
 239 probabilistic interpretation of CF is as follows:

$$CF = \begin{cases} \frac{p(H|E) - p(H)}{p(H|E)[1 - p(H)]}, & p(H|E) > p(H) \\ \frac{p(H|E) - p(H)}{p(H)[1 - p(H|E)]}, & p(H|E) < p(H) \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

240 where CF is the certainty factor, $p(H|E)$ denotes the conditional probability for a posterior hypothesis
241 that relies on evidence, the posterior probability, and $p(H)$ is the prior probability before any evidence
242 is known. In the displacement analysis, $p(H|E)$ was defined as the proportion of the area of the landslide
243 within a specific displacement area, and $p(H)$ was defined as the proportion of the landslide area within
244 the entire study area, excluding slopes less steep than 5° . In this way, the values of CF represented the
245 confidence level for coseismic landslides. Positive values corresponded to an increase in the confidence
246 level in slope failure while negative quantities corresponded to a decrease in this confidence. Higher
247 positive values indicated higher confidence levels for coseismic landslides.

248 Given the above definition, we produced a coseismic landslide hazard map in terms of the certainty factors.
249 First, displacement cells every 1 cm were grouped into bins such that all cells with displacements between
250 0 cm and 1 cm were grouped into the first bin, those with displacements between 1 cm and 2 cm were
251 grouped into the second bin, and so on. The displacements were grouped into 123 bins, from 0 cm to 122
252 cm. We then calculated the proportion of cells occupied by areas of landslides in each bin. This proportion
253 was considered the posterior probability of each bin as defined. The prior probability calculated by
254 dividing the entire landslide area by the entire study area was the same in each bin. Finally, the values of
255 CF were computed in each bin by using Eq. (9) to combine the corresponding values of the posterior and
256 prior probabilities. The certainty factors ranged from -1 to 0.95. The values of CF indicated the
257 confidence level of the occurrence of a landslide for each bin in the study area, and provided the basis for
258 producing the coseismic landslide hazard map.

259 As shown in the hazard map (Fig. 17), 73.2% of landslides triggered by the Ludian earthquake were in
260 areas with higher confidence levels, with CF values greater than 0.6. The interpreted landslides were

covered on the map to demonstrate their goodness of fit for the predicted confidence levels for coseismic landslides (Fig. 17).

4 Results and discussion

The predicted displacements represent the cumulative sliding displacements for a given time history of acceleration. Based on the statistically significant sizes of the areas, displacements less than 60 cm, which was around the middle of the range of displacement, occupied about 80% of the study area while displacements greater than 80 cm occupied a very small area. Jibson et al. (1998, 2000) assumed that shallow falls and slides in brittle, weakly cemented materials fail at a relatively small displacement, whereas slumps and block slides in more compliant materials likely fail at a larger displacement. That is to say, the study area was more susceptible to rock falls and shallow, disrupted slides that fail at a relatively small displacement. By contrast, it was subjected with a lower probability to coherent, deep-seated slides that would fail at a larger displacement. Indeed, the majority of landslides triggered by the Ludian earthquake were shallow, disrupted slides and rock falls (Zhou et al., 2016). Although a few catastrophic rock avalanches, such as the Hongshiyan landslide (Chang et al., 2017), occurred in the field, they did not produce statistically significant samples that could meaningfully contribute to the model, which is consistent with the statistical results as discussed above. Therefore, the model should relate well to typical kinds of earthquake-induced landslides in the study area, thus demonstrating its usefulness in predicting the probability of other types of landslides.

According to Jibson et al. (1998, 2000), a function of CF and Newmark displacement would make it possible to predict the spatial variation in coseismic landslides in any scenario of interest involving the

282 ground shaking. As mentioned above, 80% of the study area featured predicted displacements of less than
 283 60 cm. The numbers of the Newmark displacement cells were uneven. There were more cells in 1 cm bins
 284 for smaller displacements and fewer cells in 1 cm bins for larger ones. This might have affected the
 285 statistical significance of the function of CF and Newmark displacement. Therefore, the predicted
 286 displacement cells were grouped into bins based on quantile statistics. The breakpoints were 0, 10, 30, 39,
 287 46, 51, 55, 59, 63, and 122. In this way, the number of cells in each bin was equal. Figure 18 shows, in
 288 each bin, the CF value of the Newmark displacement as plotted as a dot. As CF values ranged from -1
 289 to 1, and not from 0 to 1, the Weibull (1939) curve developed by Jaeger and Cook (1969) is unsuitable
 290 here. Therefore, we modified the functional form as below:

$$CF = 2m[1 - \exp(-aD^b)] - 1 \quad (10)$$

291 where CF is the certainty factor, m is the maximum CF value represented by the data, D is predicted
 292 displacement, and a and b are regression constants. The regression curve based on data from the
 293 Ludian earthquake is

$$CF = 1.837[1 - \exp(-0.073D^{0.821})] - 1 \quad (11)$$

294 From the curve shown in Fig. 18, when the predicted displacement increased, the value of CF increased
 295 monotonically, meaning that the confidence level for slope failure grew and landslide would probably
 296 occur. Such a procedure is consistent with the interpretation of certainty factor theory. Therefore, we were
 297 able to obtain estimates of the hazard different from the one used in this study using the same procedure
 298 described here.

299 When fitting the results of shear tests using Coulomb's linear relation, the shear strengths varied widely
300 from high normal stress in the laboratory to low normal stress in the field (Barton, 1973). We introduced
301 the Barton model to the Newmark analysis to reduce the variation in shear strength in terms of Coulomb's
302 constants. We also considered the impact of scale effects by using Eqs. (5) and (6) to prevent Newmark's
303 method from underestimating the shear strength of geological units in regional analysis. In addition, for
304 the Barton model, the joint roughness coefficient (JRC) was estimated from tilt tests, or by matching
305 Barton's joint standard roughness profiles regarded by the International Society for Rock Mechanics
306 (ISRM, 1978). The joint wall compressive strength (JCS) was estimated by Schmidt hammer index tests.
307 These tests helped make a quick estimate of the shear strength in situ, which can facilitate the use of
308 Newmark's method in an emergency hazard and risk assessment after an earthquake.
309 It is difficult for a statically stable slope to fail under an earthquake. Earthquakes usually cause slopes to
310 fail in the state of limit equilibrium. For this reason, it is important to characterize the shear strength of
311 the slope accurately. The shear strengths were assigned to the geological units using the results of
312 hundreds of shear tests reported in the references provided in Table 1. We assigned the original shear
313 strengths to the geological units, instead of increasing them to render the cells statically stable, as Jibson
314 et al. (1998, 200) did. This would have changed the statically stable level of the entire study area,
315 especially the slopes in the state of limit equilibrium. In addition, we considered the size effect of the
316 potential slide surface, which could yield a lower F_S and, in turn, a higher displacement. However, the
317 inventory of landslides was used to calibrate the predicted displacements, and the confidence levels
318 indicated by the certainty factors fitted well with the spatial distribution of coseismic landslides, as shown
319 in the hazard map (Fig. 17).

We also ran a conventional Newmark analysis using the assigned strengths, such as friction angle (φ) and cohesion (c), as shown in Table 2. The predicted displacements calculated by the conventional Newmark analysis ranged from 0 cm to 121 cm, compared with 0 cm to 122 cm as obtained by the proposed method. Figure 19 shows the hazard map produced using conventional Newmark analysis. The CF s ranged from -1 to 0.94, indicating a very similar result to that of the proposed method above. However, there were large differences along the Shaba River and upstream of the Niulanjiang River between the methods. By comparing Fig. 17 with Fig. 19, we see that the confidence levels of the proposed method fitted the data better than those of the conventional method, especially near upstream of the Niulanjiang River. The area under the curve (AUC) was employed to compare the performance of the methods. To create an AUC plot, the cumulative area of CF s within each interval of the calculated values, from the maximum to the minimum, was determined as a proportion of the total study area (x-axis) and plotted against the proportion of cumulative landslides falling within those CF s (y-axis) (Miles and Keefer, 2009). A value of 0.5 of the AUC indicates that performance is not better than a random guess and that of 1 indicates perfect performance (Miles and Keefer, 2009). Figure 20 shows the results of the AUC analysis of both methods. The calculated value for the proposed method was 0.58 while that for the conventional Newmark's method was 0.53. That is to say, the method introduced here yielded better results, and is an improvement over the conventional Newmark analysis.

337

338 5 Conclusion

339 Newmark's method is a useful physical model to estimate the seismic stability of natural slopes. The
340 mapping procedure for data on the 2014 Ludian earthquake shows the feasibility of a Newmark analysis

341 combined with Barton's shear strength criterion. Such a method has practical applications in the
342 assessment of regional seismic hazard. We also considered here the size effect of parameters of shear
343 strength, such as the joint roughness coefficient (*JRC*) and the joint wall compressive strength (*JCS*), in
344 regional analysis. Moreover, linking the Newmark displacements to the certainty factor model improved
345 the utility of Newmark's method to predict the hazard posed by coseismic landslides. Finally, the results
346 of an AUC analysis indicate that the proposed method is more reliable than the conventional Newmark's
347 method.

348
349 Data availability. The digital geological map hosted by the China Geological Survey (CGS) can be made
350 available upon request. The pre-earthquake satellite images are publicly available from Google Earth (last
351 access: 30 January 2014). The 0.2-m high-resolution post-earthquake aerial images from the Digital
352 Mountain and Remote Sensing Applications Center, Institute of Mountain Hazards and Environment,
353 Chinese Academy of Sciences, and Beijing Anxiang Power Technology Co., LTD. are restricted and
354 cannot be accessed publicly but may be requested from the corresponding author. The 30 m × 30 m
355 ASTER Global Digital Elevation Model is distributed by NASA EOSDIS Land Processes DAAC
356 (<https://doi.org/10.5067/ASTER/ASTGTM.002>, last access: 16 July 2018). The dataset of the strong-
357 motion stations is provided by the China Earthquake Data Center (<http://data.earthquake.cn>, last access:
358 16 June 2016).

359
360 Author contributions. SQ initiated and led this research. MZ designed the analytical framework of this
361 study, produced maps and figures, performed the data analysis and interpretation, and wrote the paper.

362 YZ helped interpret landslides and collect the records of the strong-motion stations. SQ, ZS, and BSZ
363 reviewed and edited the paper.

364

365 Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

366

367 Acknowledgements. This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China
368 (Grant Nos. 41825018, 41672307, and 41807273), the Science and Technology Service Network
369 Initiative (Grant No. KFJ-EW-STS-094), and the China Scholarship Council (No. 201704910537).

370

371 Review statement. This paper was edited by Mario Parise and reviewed by two anonymous referees.

372

373 **References**

- 374 Alejano, L. R., González, J. and Muralha, J.: Comparison of different techniques of tilt testing and basic
375 friction angle variability assessment. *Rock mechanics and rock engineering* 45(6), 1023-1035, 2012.
- 376 Alejano, L. R., Perucho, Á., Olalla, C. and Jiménez, R.: *Rock engineering and rock mechanics: structures*
377 *in and on rock masses*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 615-1148, 2014.
- 378 Ambraseys, N. N. and Menu, J. M.: Earthquake-induced ground displacements. *Earthquake engineering*
379 *and structural dynamics* 16(7), 985-1006, 1988.
- 380 Bandis, S., Lumsden, A. C. and Barton, N. R.: Experimental studies of scale effects on the shear behaviour
381 of rock joints. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences & Geomechanics*
382 *Abstracts* 18(1), 1-21, 1981.
- 383 Bandis, S. C., Lumsden, A. C. and Barton, N. R.: Fundamentals of rock joint deformation. *International*
384 *Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences & Geomechanics Abstracts* 20(6), 249-268, 1983.
- 385 Barton, N.: Review of a new shear-strength criterion for rock joints. *Engineering geology* 7(4), 287-332,
386 1973.
- 387 Barton, N. and Bandis, S.: Effects of block size on the shear behavior of jointed rock. Keynote Lecture in
388 the 23rd US Symposium on Rock Mechanics (USRMS). American Rock Mechanics Association,
389 Berkeley, California, 739-760, 1982.
- 390 Barton, N. and Choubey, V.: The shear strength of rock joints in theory and practice. *Rock mechanics*
391 10(1-2), 1-54, 1977.
- 392 Bilgin, H. A. and Pasamehmetoglu, A. G.: Shear behaviour of shale joints under heat in direct shear. In
393 Barton N. and Stephansson O. (Eds.), *Rock joints*. CRC Press, Rotterdam, 179-183, 1990.

394 Bray, J. D. and Travarasrou, T.: Simplified procedure for estimating earthquake-induced deviatoric slope
395 displacements. *Journal of geotechnical and geoenvironmental engineering* 133(4), 381-92, 2007.

396 Burrough, P. A. and McDonnell, R. A.: *Principles of geographical information systems* (2nd Edition).
397 Oxford University Press, New York, 190, 1998.

398 Chang, Z. F., Chang, H., Yang, S. Y., Chen, G. and Li, J. L.: Characteristics and formation mechanism of
399 large rock avalanches triggered by the Ludian Ms6.5 earthquake at Hongshiyan and Ganjiazhai.
400 *Seismology and Geology* 39(5), 1030-1047, 2017 (in Chinese with English abstract).

401 Chen, X. L., Ran, H. L. and Yang, W. T.: Evaluation of factors controlling large earthquake-induced
402 landslides by the Wenchuan earthquake. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 12(12), 3645-
403 3657, 2012.

404 Chen, X. L., Zhou, Q. and Liu, C. G.: Distribution pattern of coseismic landslides triggered by the 2014
405 Ludian, Yunnan, China Mw6.1 earthquake: special controlling conditions of local topography.
406 *Landslides* 12(6), 1159-1168, 2015.

407 Chen, X. L., Liu, C. G., Wang, M. M. and Zhou, Q.: Causes of unusual distribution of coseismic landslides
408 triggered by the Mw 6.1 2014 Ludian, Yunnan, China earthquake. *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences* 159,
409 17-23, 2018.

410 Chen, X. L., Liu, C. G. and Wang, M. M.: A method for quick assessment of earthquake-triggered
411 landslide hazards: a case study of the Mw6. 1 2014 Ludian, China earthquake. *Bulletin of Engineering*
412 *Geology and the Environment* 78(4), 2449-2458, 2019.

413 Clough, R. W. and Chopra, A. K.: Earthquake stress analysis in earth dams. *ASCE Journal of the*
414 *Engineering Mechanics Division* 92, 197-211, 1966.

415 Coulson, J.H.: Shear strength of flat surfaces in rock. In Cording, E. J. (Ed.), Stability of Rock Slopes.
 416 13th Symposium on Rock Mechanics, Urbana, Illinois, 77-105, 1972.

417 Dai, F. C., Xu, C., Yao, X., Xu, L., Tu, X. B. and Gong, Q. M.: Spatial distribution of landslides triggered
 418 by the 2008 Ms 8.0 Wenchuan earthquake, China. Journal of Asian Earth Sciences 40(4), 883-895,
 419 2011.

420 Geological Engineering Handbook Editorial Committee: Geological Engineering Handbook. China
 421 Architecture & Building Press, Beijing, 2018 (in Chinese).

422 Giusepone, F. and da Silva, L. A. A.: Hoek & Brown and Barton & Bandis Criteria Applied to a Planar
 423 Sliding at a Dolomite Mine in Gandarela Synclinal. In ISRM Conference on Rock Mechanics for
 424 Natural Resources and Infrastructure-SBMR 2014. International Society for Rock Mechanics and
 425 Rock Engineering, 2014.

426 Gu, D. Z.: Engineering geomechanics of rock mass. Science Press, Beijing, China, 1979 (in Chinese).

427 Harp, E. L. and Jibson, R. W.: Landslides triggered by the 1994 Northridge, California, earthquake.
 428 Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America 86(1B), S319-S332, 1996.

429 Heckerman, D.: Probabilistic interpretations for MYCIN's certainty factors. In Kanal, L. N. and Lemmer,
 430 J. F. (Eds), Machine Intelligence and Pattern Recognition 4, North-Holland, 167-196, 1986.

431 Hsieh, S. Y. and Lee, C. T.: Empirical estimation of the Newmark displacement from the Arias intensity
 432 and critical acceleration. Engineering Geology 122(1-2), 34-42, 2011.

433 Hoek, E. and Bray, J. D.: Rock slope engineering. CRC Press, 1981.

434 ISRM (International Society for Rock Mechanics): Suggested Methods for the Quantitative Description
 435 of Discontinuities in Rock Masses. International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences &
 436 Geomechanics Abstracts 15, 319-368, 1978.

437 Jaeger, J. C., Cook, N. G. W.: Fundamentals of Rock Mechanics. Methuen and Company, London. 513
 438 pp., 1969.

439 Jibson, R. W.: Predicting earthquake-induced landslide displacements using Newmark's sliding block
 440 analysis. Transportation research record 1411, 9-17, 1993.

441 Jibson, R. W.: Methods for assessing the stability of slopes during earthquakes-A retrospective.
 442 Engineering Geology, 122(1-2), 43-50, 2011.

443 Jibson, R. W.: Regression models for estimating coseismic landslide displacement. Engineering Geology
 444 91(2), 209-218, 2007.

445 Jibson, R. W., Harp, E. L. and Michael, J. A.: A method for producing digital probabilistic seismic
 446 landslide hazard maps: an example from the Los Angeles, California, area. US Geological Survey.
 447 Open-File Rep. 98-113. 17 pp., 1998.

448 Jibson, R. W., Harp, E. L. and Michael, J. A.: A method for producing digital probabilistic seismic
 449 landslide hazard maps. Engineering Geology 58(3-4), 271-289, 2000.

450 Keefer, D. K.: Landslides caused by earthquakes. Geological Society of America Bulletin 95(4), 406-421,
 451 1984.

452 Khazai, B. and Sitar, N.: Evaluation of factors controlling earthquake-induced landslides caused by Chi-
 453 Chi earthquake and comparison with the Northridge and Loma Prieta events. Engineering geology
 454 71(1-2), 79-95, 2004.

455 Miles, S. B. and Keefer, D. K.: Evaluation of CAMEL-comprehensive areal model of earthquake-induced
 456 landslides. *Engineering Geology* 104(1-2), 1-15, 2009.

457 NASA/METI/AIST/Japan Spacesystems and U.S./Japan ASTER Science Team: ASTER Global Digital
 458 Elevation Model version 2. NASA EOSDIS Land Processes DAAC, [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.5067/ASTER/ASTGTM.002)
 459 10.5067/ASTER/ASTGTM.002 (last accessed July 16, 2018), 2009.

460 Newmark, N. M.: Effects of earthquakes on dams and embankments. *Geotechnique* 15(2), 139-160, 1965.

461 Pradel, D., Smith, P. M., Stewart, J. P. and Raad, G.: Case history of landslide movement during the
 462 Northridge earthquake. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* 131(11), 1360-
 463 1369, 2005.

464 **Priest, S. D.: Discontinuity analysis for rock engineering. Chapman & Hall, London, 1993.**

465 Qi, S. W., Xu, Q., Lan, H. X., Zhang, B. and Liu, J. Y.: Spatial distribution analysis of landslides triggered
 466 by 2008.5.12 Wenchuan Earthquake, China, *Engineering Geology* 116 (1-2), 95~108, 2010.

467 Qi, S. W., Xu, Q., Zhang, B., Zhou, Y. D., Lan, H. X. and Li, L. H.: Source characteristics of long runout
 468 rock avalanches triggered by the 2008 Wenchuan earthquake, China, *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences*
 469 40 (4), 896~906, 2011.

470 Qi, S. W., Yan, C. G. and Liu, C. L.: Two typical types of earthquake triggered landslides and their
 471 mechanisms. In *Landslides and Engineered Slopes: Protecting Society through Improved*
 472 *Understanding*, ISBN 978-0-415-63303-1, 2012.

473 Rathje, E. M. and Antonakos, G.: A unified model for predicting earthquake-induced sliding
 474 displacements of rigid and flexible slopes. *Engineering Geology* 122(1-2), 51-60, 2011.

475 Rathje, E. M. and Saygili, G.: Probabilistic assessment of earthquake-induced sliding displacements of
 476 natural slopes. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering* 42(1), 18-27, 2009.

477 Saygili, G. and Rathje, E. M.: Empirical predictive models for earthquake-induced sliding displacements
 478 of slopes. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* 134(6), 790-803, 2008.

479 Shortliffe, E. H. and Buchanan, B. G.: A model of inexact reasoning in medicine. *Mathematical*
 480 *Biosciences* 23, 351-379, 1975.

481 Singh, T. N., Kainthola, A. and Venkatesh, A.: Correlation between point load index and uniaxial
 482 compressive strength for different rock types. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering* 45(2), 259-264,
 483 2012.

484 Tang, C., Ma, G., Chang, M., Li, W., Zhang, D., Jia, T. and Zhou, Z.: Landslides triggered by the 20 April
 485 2013 Lushan earthquake, Sichuan Province, China. *Engineering Geology* 187, 45-55, 2015.

486 Terzaghi, K.: Mechanism of landslides. In Paige, S. (Ed.), *Application of Geology to Engineering Practice*
 487 (Berkey Volume). Geological Society of America, New York, NY, 83-123, 1950.

488 Watson, D. F. and Philip, G. M.: A Refinement of Inverse Distance Weighted Interpolation. *Geoprocessing*
 489 2, 315–327, 1985.

490 Weibull, W.: In: *A Statistical Theory of the Strength of Materials*. Ingenioersvetenskaps-akademien,
 491 Handlingar, Stockholm, p., 151, 1939.

492 Wieczorek, G. F., Wilson, R. C. and Harp, E. L.: Map showing slope stability during earthquakes in San
 493 Mateo County, California. U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Investigations Map I-1257-E, scale
 494 1:62,500, 1985.

495 Wilson, R. C. and Keefer, D. K.: Dynamic analysis of a slope failure from the 6 August 1979 Coyote
 496 Lake, California, earthquake. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America* 73(3), 863-877, 1983.
 497 Xu, C., Xu, X., Zhou, B., and Yu, G.: Revisions of the M 8.0 Wenchuan earthquake seismic intensity
 498 map based on co-seismic landslide abundance. *Natural Hazards*, 69(3), 1459-1476, 2013.
 499 Yong, R., Ye, J., Liang, Q. F., Huang, M. and Du, S. G.: Estimation of the joint roughness coefficient
 500 (JRC) of rock joints by vector similarity measures. *Bulletin of Engineering Geology and the*
 501 *Environment* 77, 735-749, 2018.
 502 Yuan, R. M., Tang, C. L., Hu, J. C., and Xu, X. W.: Mechanism of the Donghekou landslide triggered by
 503 the 2008 Wenchuan earthquake revealed by discrete element modeling. *Natural Hazards and Earth*
 504 *System Sciences*, 14(5), 1195-1205, 2014.
 505 Zhou, S. H., Chen, G. Q. and Fang, L. G.: Distribution pattern of landslides triggered by the 2014 Ludian
 506 earthquake of China: Implications for regional threshold topography and the seismogenic fault
 507 identification. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* 5(4), 46, 2016.
 508

509 **Figure Captions**

510 **Fig. 1.** Map of the study area showing the inventoried landslides.

511 **Fig. 2.** Geological map of the study area showing lithology and faults.

512 **Fig. 3.** Conceptual sliding-block model of Newmark analysis.

513 **Fig. 4.** A schematic diagram showing shadow unloading joints in the slope.

514 **Fig. 5.** Demonstration of the Newmark analysis algorithm (adapted from Wilson and Keefer, 1983; Jibson
515 et al., 1998, 2000)

516 **Fig. 6.** Slope map derived from the DEM of the study area.

517 **Fig. 7.** Schematic map showing an internal fracture angle (α) for slopes steeper than 60° .

518 **Fig. 8.** JRC_n component of shear strength assigned to rock types in the study area.

519 **Fig. 9.** JCS_n component of shear strength assigned to rock types in the study area.

520 **Fig. 10.** Basic-friction-angle (ϕ_b) component of shear strength assigned to rock types in the study area.

521 **Fig. 11.** Unit weight (γ) assigned to rock types in the study area.

522 **Fig. 12.** Static factor-of-safety map of the study area.

523 **Fig. 13.** Map showing critical accelerations in the study area.

524 **Fig. 14.** Locations of strong-motion stations.

525 **Fig. 15.** Contour map of peak ground acceleration (PGA) produced by the Ludian earthquake in the
526 study area. PGA values shown are in g .

527 **Fig. 16.** Map showing predicted displacements in the study area.

528 **Fig. 17.** Map showing confidence levels of coseismic landslides in the Ludian earthquake using the
529 proposed method. Confidence levels are portrayed in terms of values of CF .

530 **Fig. 18.** Proportion of the area of landslides in each CF value area. A dot shows the CF value of
531 Newmark displacement bin; the red line is the fitting curve of the data using a modified Weibull function.
532 **Fig. 19.** Map showing confidence levels of coseismic landslides in the Ludian earthquake using a
533 conventional Newmark analysis. Confidence levels are portrayed in terms of values of CF .
534 **Fig. 20.** Plots of area under the curve comparing the proposed method with the conventional Newmark's
535 method.
536




Fig. 1. Map of the study area showing the inventoried landslides.





Fig. 2. Geological map of the study area showing lithology and faults.



544

545 **Fig. 3.** Conceptual sliding-block model of **Newmark** analysis. The potential landslide is modeled as a
 546 **rigid plastic** block resting on an inclined plane at an angle (α) from the horizontal (Jibson et al., 1998,
 547 2000). The base of the block is subjected to an earthquake ground acceleration that is denoted by Ag .

548




Fig. 4. A schematic diagram showing shallow unloading joints in the slope.




Fig. 5. Demonstration of the Newmark analysis algorithm (adapted from Wilson and Keefer, 1983; Jibson et al., 1998, 2000): (a) Acceleration-time history with critical acceleration (horizontal dotted line) of 20%g superimposed. (b) Velocity of block versus time. (c) Displacement of block versus time.




Fig. 6. Slope map derived from the DEM of the study area.





Fig. 7. Schematic map showing an internal fracture angle (α) for slopes steeper than 60° .



563

564 **Fig. 8.** JRC_n component of shear strength assigned to rock types in the study area.




Fig. 9. JCS_n component of shear strength assigned to rock types in the study area.




Fig. 10. Basic-friction-angle (ϕ_b) component of shear strength assigned to rock types in the study area.




Fig. 11. Unit weight (γ) assigned to rock types in the study area.




Fig. 12. Static factor-of-safety map of the study area.




Fig. 13. Map showing critical accelerations in the study area.




Fig. 14. Locations of strong-motion stations.




Fig. 15. Contour map of peak ground acceleration (*PGA*) produced by the Ludian earthquake in the study area. *PGA* values shown are in *g*.





Fig. 16. Map showing predicted displacements in the study area.



590

591 **Fig. 17.** Map showing confidence levels of coseismic landslides in the Ludian earthquake using the

592 proposed method. Confidence levels are portrayed in terms of values of CF .




Fig. 18. Proportion of the area of landslides in each CF value area. A dot shows the CF value of Newmark displacement bin; the red line is the fitting curve of the data using a modified Weibull function.




Fig. 19. Map showing confidence levels of coseismic landslides in the Ludian earthquake using a conventional Newmark analysis. Confidence levels are portrayed in terms of values of CF .




Fig. 20. Plots of area under the curve comparing the proposed method with the conventional Newmark's method.

605 **Table Captions**

606 **Table 1.** Shear strengths assigned to rock types in the study area.

607 **Table 2.** Station records of three components of peak ground acceleration.

608

609 **Table 1**

610 Shear strengths assigned to rock types in the study area.

Rock type	γ (kN/m ³)	ϕ_b	JCS_0 (MPa)	JRC_0	φ	c (kPa)	References
Dolomite	25.9	32°	140	9.5	43°	35	Singh et al., 2012 Giusepone, 2014 Alejano et al., 2014 Bandis et al., 1983
Limestone	21.5	37°	160	9	45°	30	Singh et al., 2012 Yong et al., 2018 Barton and Choubey, 1977
Shale	24.9	27°	75	8	27°	16	Bilgin and Pasamehmetoglu, 1990 Coulson, 1972
Sandstone	23.5	35°	100	6	42°	24	Bandis et al., 1983 Priest, 1993 Coulson, 1972
Basalt	27.9	38°	205	8.5	50°	40	Barton and Choubey, 1977 Alejano et al., 2014 Coulson, 1972 Barton and Choubey, 1977
Slate	26.5	30°	175	3	40°	11	Bandis et al., 1983 Alejano et al., 2012 Yong et al., 2018

611 Friction angle (φ), cohesion (c), and unit weight (γ) were derived from the Geological Engineering
612 Handbook (Geological Engineering Handbook Editorial Committee, 2018)

615 Station records of three components of peak ground acceleration.

No.	Station	Epicentral distance (km)	EW (g)	NS (g)	UD (g)	Average of horizontal components (g)
1	Longtoushan 1	8.114	0.5141	0.9679	0.7193	0.7410
2	Longtoushan 2	8.3	0.9685	0.7203	0.5147	0.8444
3	Qianchang	18.6	0.1490	0.1432	0.0539	0.1461
4	Ciyuan	32.6	0.0468	0.0457	0.0265	0.0463
5	Mashu	38.5	0.1380	0.1361	0.0663	0.1370
6	Qiaojia	43	0.0253	0.0210	0.0135	0.0232
7	Zhaotong 1	47.4	0.0096	0.0152	0.0065	0.0124
8	Zhaotong 2	47.671	0.0065	0.0096	0.0088	0.0081
9	Huidongxijie	63.3	0.0123	0.0128	0.0037	0.0126
10	Maolin	64.4	0.0251	0.0184	0.0111	0.0217
11	Yongshanmaolin	65.647	0.0111	0.0252	0.0184	0.0182
12	Jingan	66.2	0.0103	0.0122	0.0062	0.0113
13	Butuotuoju	66.8	0.0118	0.0173	0.0079	0.0146
14	Zhaotongjingan	67.392	0.0062	0.0103	0.0122	0.0083
15	Huidongqianxin	67.4	0.0224	0.0223	0.0067	0.0224
16	Ningnansongxin	69.2	0.0062	0.0081	0.0032	0.0071
17	Pugebaishui	76	0.0152	0.0149	0.0066	0.0151
18	Huize	76.5	0.0164	0.0182	0.0090	0.0173
19	Pugediban	81.2	0.0186	0.0127	0.0046	0.0156
20	Butuodiban	83.7	0.0024	0.0021	0.0024	0.0023
21	Tuobuka	85.2	0.0168	0.0168	0.0136	0.0168

616

22	Pugeyangwo	91.4	0.0066	0.0069	0.0022	0.0068
23	Daguan	91.8	0.0043	0.0035	0.0027	0.0039

617



618