

# 1 Strategic Framework for Natural Disaster Risk Mitigation Using 2 Deep Learning and Cost-Benefit Analysis

3  
4  
5 Ji-Myong Kim<sup>1</sup>, Sang-Guk Yum<sup>2</sup>, Hyunsoung Park<sup>3</sup>, and Junseo Bae<sup>4</sup>

6  
7 <sup>1</sup>Department of Architectural Engineering, Mokpo National University, Mokpo 58554, South Korea; jimy6180@gmail.com  
8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, Gangneung-Wonju National University, Gangneung 25457, South Korea;  
9 skyeom0401@gwnu.ac.kr

10 <sup>3</sup>Department of Mechanical and Civil Engineering, University of Evansville, Evansville, Indiana 47722, United States;  
11 hp93@evansville.edu

12 <sup>4</sup>School of Computing, Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of the West of Scotland, Paisley PA1 2BE, United  
13 Kingdom; junseo.bae@uws.ac.uk

14 *Correspondence to:* Junseo Bae (junseo.bae@uws.ac.uk)

15

16 **Abstract.** Given trends in more frequent and severe natural disaster events, developing effective risk mitigation strategies is  
17 crucial to reduce negative economic impacts, due to the limited budget for rehabilitation. To address this need, this study aims  
18 to develop a strategic framework for natural disaster risk mitigation, highlighting two different strategic implementation  
19 processes (SIPs). SIP-1 is intended to improve the predictability of natural disaster-triggered financial losses using deep  
20 learning. To demonstrate SIP-1, SIP-1 explores deep neural networks (DNNs) that learn storm and flood insurance loss ratios  
21 associated with selected major indicators and then develops an optimal DNN model. SIP-2 underlines the risk mitigation  
22 strategy at the project level, by adopting a cost-benefit analysis method that quantifies the cost effectiveness of disaster  
23 prevention projects. In SIP-2, a case study of disaster risk reservoir projects in South Korea was adopted. The validated result  
24 of SIP-1 confirmed that the predictability of the developed DNN is more accurate and reliable than a traditional parametric  
25 model, while SIP-2 revealed that maintenance projects are economically more beneficial in the long-term as the loss amount  
26 becomes smaller after 8 years, coupled with the investment in the projects. The proposed framework is unique as it provides a  
27 combinational approach to mitigating economic damages caused by natural disasters at both financial loss and project levels.  
28 This study is its first kind and will help practitioners quantify the loss from natural disasters, while allowing them to evaluate  
29 the cost effectiveness of risk reduction projects through a holistic approach.

30

31 **Keywords.** Natural disaster; risk mitigation strategy; economic damage; deep learning; cost-benefit analysis

## 32 **1 Introduction**

33 Over the past decades, the frequency and severity of extreme weather events are rapidly increasing due to climate changes.  
34 These events represented by flooding, drought, heavy rain, tropical cyclone, heat waves or cold waves have often caused  
35 various damages in not only short term, but also various long-term effects such as sea level rises and disease spreads. The  
36 negative impact of these event has been warned by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (The Fifth Assessment  
37 Report, 2014). Nevertheless, across the world, severe weather events such as typhoons, heavy rains and changing patterns of  
38 meteorological disasters have already increased the loss of many lives and built assets. These damages are still expected to be  
39 accelerated in coming future (Kim et al., 2020).

40

41 Given the continuous trend, it is well known that natural disaster-triggered losses have been very closely tied with many  
42 economic losses worldwide. For example, Western European countries such as France, Germany, and Switzerland were hit by  
43 three consecutive tropical cyclones (e.g., Anatol, Lothar, and Martin) in 1999, resulting in a loss of 13 billion euros (Ulbrich  
44 et al., 1999). Typhoon Haiyan, which hit the Philippines and China of South Asia in 2013, was one of Category 5 Super  
45 Typhoons, was the most extreme tropical cyclone recorded on land. The typhoon's life-threatening wind and rain were enough  
46 to smash properties. South Asian countries adjacent to the typhoon track inflicted about \$300 billion in damage (Kim et al.,  
47 2019). Hurricane Katrina that hit the South Eastern areas in United States in 2005 caused the most severe damage in the  
48 national historic record as a Category 5 tropical cyclone. In detail, it caused the US Gulf Coast city to have \$180 billion in  
49 direct and indirect damages due to substantial rain and robust winds (Blake et al., 2007). Later, in 2017 solely, three different  
50 strong hurricanes named by Harvey, Maria, and Irma caused together a total damage amount of about \$293 billion, based on  
51 the individual damage amounts of \$125 billion by Harvey, \$90 billion by Maria, and \$77.6 billion by Irma (USNHC, 2018).

52

53 In this sense, the quality of living in the built environment has been threatened by natural disasters in the globe. To reduce  
54 these threats, many of non-governmental organizations and countries have investigated in prevention or post-disaster recovery  
55 strategies, on aspects of time, budget, and manpower to mitigate natural disaster risks. Mitigation of risks can reduce the loss  
56 by decreasing vulnerability or by decreasing the frequency and severity of causal factors (Rose et al., 2007). For risk mitigation,  
57 the execution and allocation of financial resources should be carried out promptly and extensively, against the limited resources  
58 available. Hence, it is important to estimate strategically the cost impact of natural disaster risks and the effect of risk reduction  
59 at the same time, specifically aiming at achieving the ultimate reduction and mitigation of risks through an efficient use of the  
60 limited resources.

## 61 **2 Point of Departure: The need of more effective strategic framework for natural disaster risk mitigation**

### 62 **2.1 Decision-support for natural disaster risk mitigation strategies**

63 Given the increasing frequency and severity of natural disasters, the demand for sophisticated natural disaster loss forecasting  
64 also increases. In response to such demand, various companies and national organizations have developed models to predict  
65 natural disaster losses. The New Multi-Hazards and Multi-Risk Assessment Method for Europe (MATRIX) in Europe, the  
66 HAZUS-Multi Hazard (HAZUS-MH) by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in the United States, the  
67 RiskScape in New Zealand, and the Probabilistic Risk Assessment initiative in Central America are representative models  
68 (Kim et al., 2017). Florida, USA, has developed a Florida Public Hurricane Loss Model (FPHLM) to predict losses due to  
69 hurricanes as it is located on the main north-facing road of hurricanes (Kim et al., 2020). These models are being used in  
70 different regions to assess the loss of life and potential economic losses for buildings and infrastructure owing to natural  
71 disasters. Nevertheless, since these models were developed based on the vulnerability of natural disasters and the severity and  
72 frequency of natural disasters in specific areas, they could not be applied to other areas.

73

74 Companies specializing in natural disaster risk modeling have also developed different models, including EQECAT, Applied  
75 Insurance Research (AIR), and RMS (Risk Management Solution) (Kunreuther et al., 2004; Sanders, 2002). These models are  
76 widely used by insurers and reinsurers around the world to assess the risk of economic loss from natural disasters (e.g.,  
77 windstorms, earthquakes, floods, winter storms, and tornadoes). Nonetheless, these models have annual fees that are expensive  
78 to small and medium-sized users. In addition, these models are available only for the limited number of major countries (Europe,  
79 USA, Japan, China, etc.). Furthermore, it is difficult to optimize them for users since they have difficulties to reflect a user's  
80 portfolio, capital, business preference, and so on (Kim et al., 2019).

81

82 To reflect characteristics and vulnerabilities of each country associated with various situations of users, it is crucial to evaluate  
83 the loss through its own model. In order to develop a loss evaluation model, the development of an in-house model using a  
84 deep learning algorithm can be a solution. Recently, the 4th revolution technology (e.g., unmanned transportation, big data,  
85 artificial intelligence, IoT, robots, etc.) has been applied to various fields and its effectiveness has been recognized (Gledson  
86 and Greenwood, 2017; IPA, 2017). To effectively and efficiently analyze the complexity of various sensors-driven big data,  
87 the demand for deep learning applications has been increased dramatically. Given the increasing demand, many research efforts  
88 on applying deep learning techniques for risk assessment were made recently (Al Najjar et al. 2021; Khosravi et al. 2020; Kim  
89 et al. 2021; Moishin et al. 2021; Shane Crawford et al. 2020; Sugiyarto and Rasjava 2020; Yi et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2022).  
90 Especially, for improved natural disaster risk assessment and mitigation, neural networks have been widely used for deep  
91 learning in various ways (Khosravi et al. 2020; Moishin et al. 2021; Shane Crawford et al. 2020; Yi et al. 2020). Some  
92 researchers developed deep learning models to predict flood events (Khosravi et al. 2020; Moishin et al. 2021). Khosravi et al.  
93 (2020) developed a flood susceptibility map using convolutional neural networks (CNN). More specifically, 769 historical

94 flood locations in Iran were trained and tested based on amounts of soil moisture, slopes, curvatures, altitudes, rainfalls,  
95 geology, land use and vegetation, distances from roads and rivers. In addition, a hybrid deep learning algorithm integrating the  
96 merits of CNN and long short-term memory (LSTM) networks was built to manage flood risks by predicting future flood  
97 events, by training and testing daily rainfall data obtained from 11 sites in Fiji between 1990 and 2019 (Moishin et al. 2021).  
98

99 Other previous studies focused on post-disaster detection caused by landslides or tornados, which uses remote sensed data  
100 collected from satellites for deep learning (Al Najar et al. 2021; Shane Crawford et al. 2020; Yi et al. 2020). Shane Crawford  
101 et al. (2020) adopted CNN to classify damages of 15,945 buildings affected by the 2011 Tuscaloosa tornado in Alabama. To  
102 this end, the authors used satellited-driven images of trees as the damage classification indicator to estimate wind speeds. In  
103 addition, satellite images were embraced into the CNN-driven deep learning process to detect earthquake-induced landslides  
104 in China (Yi et al. 2020). More recently, Al Najar et al. (2021) estimated accurately ocean depths simulating remote sensed  
105 images using a deep learning technique, which overcomes drawbacks of traditional bathymetry measurement activities to track  
106 the physical evolution of coastal areas against any potential natural disasters or extreme storm events. Previous studies  
107 reviewed reveal consistently that deep learning techniques can overcome shortcomings of existing methods and thus to provide  
108 more accurate and reliable decision-support models for risk assessment and risk-informed mitigation strategies.  
109

110 In addition to applications of deep learning for location detection or event prediction-focused, as stated earlier, it is important  
111 to quantify negative economic impacts caused by natural disasters. Given the importance of economic damage aspects, Kim  
112 et al. (2021) applied a deep learning technique as a cost-effective and risk-informed facilities management solution. In detail,  
113 the authors generalized maintenance and repair costs of educational facilities in Canada, using deep neural networks that learn  
114 sets of maintenance and repair records, asset values, natural hazards such as tornados, lightening, hails, floods, and storms. In  
115 this sense, this study proposed a deep learning modeling framework to predict financial losses caused by natural disasters.  
116

## 117 **2.2 Investment strategies for natural disaster risk mitigation**

118 Mitigating the risk with efficient investment and operation of resources is a challenging task because risk reduction should be  
119 made in a timely manner, with the limited financial resources. To address these issues, cost-benefit analysis has been widely  
120 adopted (FEMA, 2005; Rose et al., 2007). For instance, efficient use of public resources is indicated when total estimated  
121 profits of a risk mitigation activity surpass the entire cost or are parallel to earnings on investment of both private and public.  
122

123 Disaster risk mitigation represents mitigating social, environmental, and economic damage caused by natural disasters. Since  
124 economic losses due to natural disasters are hard to minimize or avoid separately, there is an increasing public demand for risk  
125 reduction investments to reduce these economic losses (Bouwer et al., 2007; Shreve and Kelman, 2014). Since resources for  
126 risk mitigation investment are restricted, it is critical to estimate economic costs and benefits in order to determine the

127 effectiveness and appropriateness of the investment. For instance, the Federal Emergency Management Agency of the United  
128 States has reported that the average cost-benefit ratio is 4 for risk mitigation investment (e.g., structural defence measures  
129 against floods and typhoons, building renovations in preparation for earthquakes, etc.) after reviewing 4,000 natural disaster  
130 risk reduction programs in the United States (Kunreuther et al., 2012; Rose et al., 2007). In addition, studies in developing  
131 countries have shown a high cost-benefit ratio in a study of 21 investment activities such as re-establishment of schools and  
132 forestry in preparation for tsunami (Bouwer et al., 2014).

133

134 Despite these high potential benefits, investment in risk reduction for residents living in areas at risk of natural disasters is  
135 restricted (Bouwer et al., 2014). According to Hochrainer-Stigler et al. (2010), since natural disaster risk reduction measures  
136 are focused on short-term outcomes, only about 10% of residents in areas vulnerable to natural disasters receive natural disaster  
137 risk reduction measures in the United States. In the case of a natural disaster risk reduction project, a large initial investment  
138 is required, which reduces the expected profit if performance indicators need to be met in a short period of time. As a result,  
139 policy makers and politicians are reluctant to make bold investments in natural disaster risk reduction. They prefer to provide  
140 economic support after disasters (Cavallo et al., 2013). This phenomenon is also reflected in the budget distribution of disaster  
141 management funds of donations and development agencies. Most (98%) of the budget is allocated to reconstruction or relief.  
142 Only the remaining budget (2%) is allocated to risk reduction (Mechler, 2005). As such, while the need for pre-disaster risk  
143 reduction through proactive disaster investment is widely recognized, the economic impact of natural disaster risk reduction  
144 is often not fully considered in decision-making. Moreover, although cost-benefit analysis is the main decision-making tool  
145 commonly used in investment and financial evaluations by public sectors, natural disaster risk is not sufficiently applied in the  
146 cost-benefit analysis (Hochrainer-Stigler et al., 2010). Natural disasters in public sectors' investment projects were often  
147 overlooked or not evaluated based on the cost-to-benefit comparison (Kreimer et al., 2003). In turn, this study explored natural  
148 disaster risk reduction projects and analyzed the cost effectiveness of the projects adopting a cost-benefit analysis method.

### 149 **3 Research objectives and methods**

150 Given trends in more frequent and severe natural disaster events, developing effective natural disaster risk mitigation strategies  
151 is crucial to reduce negative economic impacts on built assets, due to the limited budget for rehabilitation. To address this need,  
152 this study aims to develop a strategic framework for natural disaster risk mitigation, highlighting two different strategic  
153 implementation processes (SIPs), as depicted in Figure 1.

154




Figure 1. Research framework

More specifically, SIP-1 is intended to improve the predictability of natural disaster-triggered financial loss model. To this end, SIP-1 develops a deep neural network (DNN) model that learns insurance loss amounts to generalize loss ratios, associated with major indicators including rainfall, wind, and ground acceleration. To demonstrate SIP-1, this study collected reliable storm and flood damage insurance data and natural disaster risk indicators, created a predictive model using deep learning, and validate the improved predictability of the model, through the following steps:

- 1) To collect data on loss caused by natural disasters, this study collected data on claim payout for storm and flood damage insurance from the Korea Insurance Development Institute (KIDI) over the past 11 years between 2009 and 2019.
- 2) This study obtained natural disaster risk indicators based on the collected data.
- 3) A model of deep learning algorithm was developed using Python 3.7, Keras, and Scikit-Learn libraries. The model was trained, tested, and validated using the collected data.
- 4) A multiple regression model was independently developed using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23 for model validation.
- 5) The root mean squared error and mean absolute error values of the deep learning algorithm model and the multiple regression analysis model were estimated and paralleled, respectively.

Compared to SIP-1, SIP-2 underlines the risk mitigation strategy at the project level, by proposing a methodological implementation process for quantifying the cost effectiveness of natural disaster risk reduction by adopting a cost-benefit analysis method that quantifies the cost effectiveness of disaster prevention project. To demonstrate SIP-2, a case study of disaster risk reservoir maintenance projects completed in South Korea was adopted, through the following steps:

- 1) Among natural disaster risk reduction projects carried out by the South Korean government, information on disaster risk reservoir maintenance projects completed in 2009-2019 was collected.

- 180 2) The loss rate of storm and flood insurance in the region where the flood damage occurred after the completion of the  
181 maintenance project was investigated through KIDI.
- 182 3) The amount of precipitation before and after the disaster risk reservoir maintenance project was investigated.
- 183 4) Cost-benefit analysis was conducted to determine the economic feasibility of the maintenance project.

#### 184 **4 SIP-1: Improving the predictability of natural disaster-induced financial loss values using deep learning**

185 SIP-1 aims to explore deep learning-driven modelling processes and develop an optimal learning model that can improve the  
186 predictability of natural disaster-triggered financial losses. To demonstrate SIP-1, the loss amounts of storm and flood  
187 insurance were learned, and the corresponding loss ratios were generalized associated with the selected risk indicators by the  
188 property type. To scientifically validate the robustness of the learning model, the prediction results were compared with a  
189 conventional parametric model underpinned by multiple regression analysis.


#### 190 **4.1 Data collection**

191 A total of 458 storm and flood damage insurance claims for 11 years from 2009 to 2019 was collected from KIDI's data sets.  
192 KIDI was established in 1983. It is an insurance professional service organization that develops insurance products, calculates  
193 insurance rates, and protects the rights of policyholders. It also collects and manages various statistical data such as insurance  
194 information and losses of each insurance company (Choi and Han, 2015). Storm and flood damage insurance, which reflects  
195 the loss amount, is an insurance that compensates for property damage caused by natural disasters (e.g., typhoons, floods,  
196 heavy rains, tsunamis, strong winds, storms, heavy snow, earthquakes, and so on). It has been implemented since 2006 under  
197 the initiative of state and local governments (Kwon and Oh, 2018). The insurance payout amount is determined by objective  
198 analysis of certified loss assessment service according to standardized procedures for each insurance company. Its reliability  
199 is high (Kim et al., 2020). The collected data information includes the total loss amounts, the total net premiums, building  
200 types, and location profiles, which is publicly available. The prediction model was trained, tested, and validated using losses  
201 and natural disaster risk indicators.

202


203 The cost of loss due to natural disasters was divided by the total net premiums to calculate the ratio and then log-transformed,  
204 which distribution of the data is shown in Figure 2. In addition, natural disaster risk indicators affecting insurance loss due to  
205 natural disasters were collected. For natural disaster risk indicators, building type, wind speed, total rainfall, and peak ground  
206 acceleration were selected as variables through past literature studies (Kim et al., 2017, 2019; Kim et al., 2020; Kim et al.,  
207 2021). Figure 3 shows the distributions of the selected indicators. A description of variables is presented in Table 1. Building  
208 types were set as dummy variables that consist of residential buildings and greenhouses. Wind speed and the maximum value  
209 of rainfalls were collected from the Korea Meteorological Administration (KMA). Peak ground accelerations were collected

210 from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Accordingly, Table 2 summarises the descriptive  
211 statistics of variables.  
212




213  
214  
215

Figure 2. Distribution of the insurance loss ratio record




(a) Wind speed (m/s)




(b) Rainfall (mm/day)





(c) Peak ground acceleration (g)



(d) Building type (1: residential; 2: greenhouse)

Figure 3. Distributions of the indicators to learn the loss ratios

216

217

218

Table 1. Description of variables

Variable	Explanation
Loss ratio	Total loss divided by the total net premium (Amount unit: KRW)
Building type	Buildings covered by storm and flood insurance (Categorical variable - Residential building: 1; Greenhouse: 2)
Wind speed	10-minute average maximum wind speed (m/s)
Rainfall	Maximum precipitation per day (mm/day)
Peak ground acceleration	Value of peak ground acceleration (PGA) (g)

219

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of variables by the building type (i.e., residential building and greenhouse)

Variable (Unit)	Sample size	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Loss ratio (Log-transformed value)	458	-5.12	3.17	-0.66	1.01
Wind speed (m/s)	458	20.80	39.20	29.21	3.17
Rainfall (mm/day)	458	172.00	801.20	319.02	68.57
Peak ground acceleration (g)	458	0.10	1.60	1.10	0.25

221

## 222 4.2 Modeling deep neural networks

223 A deep learning algorithm is a neural network with many layers and various structures in general. Its use in research and  
224 industry for prediction and recognition has spread rapidly, proving its effectiveness (Kim et al., 2021). Deep learning  
225 algorithms are also widely used for regression analysis and type classification as a machine learning technique (Ajayi et al.,  
226 2019). Deep learning models have the same training framework as other types of neural networks. However, they can train  
227 large data sets more effectively with multiple hidden layers (Bae et al., 2021). Deep learning algorithms can be divided into  
228 deep neural network (DNN), generative adversarial network (GAN), recurrent neural network (RNN), convolutional neural  
229 network (CNN), and auto encoder (AE) according to their structure and processing method (Kim et al., 2021). Especially,  
230 DNN is used for cataloguing and prediction in various engineering and academic fields (Krizhevsky et al., 2012; Toya and  
231 Skidmore, 2007). Moreover, DNNs can be applied to train and model complex nonlinear relationships due to their multi-  
232 layered structures. Thus, in this study, a DNN model was accepted considering nonlinearity of collected loss data.

233

234 The learning performance of the model was appraised by measuring the values of root mean squared error (RMSE) and mean  
235 absolute error (MAE). RMSE and MAE are representative indicators of the size of the error by comparing the predicted result  
236 of an artificial neural network with the actual value (Daniell et al., 2011). RMSE is a value that measures the average error  
237 magnitude. MAE is a value obtained by converting the difference between the actual value and the predicted value into an  
238 absolute value and averaging it. Both indicators can be used to indicate that the prediction error decreases as the error value  
239 gets smaller (e.g., closer to zero).

240

241 The collected loss data were pre-processed using a *z*-score normalization method to adjust the unit and quantity of the data.  
242 The pre-processed completed input data were divided into a training set, a verification set, and a test set of data. The training  
243 set of data were used for learning of the DNN algorithm. The verification set of data were used to judge whether training was  
244 optimal and the test set of data were used to verify whether the developed model was finally trained for the purpose. In this  
245 study, considering the amount of data, 70% of the total data were set as training set of data and 30% of them were used as test  
246 set of data. Then 30% of training data were utilized as verification data.

247

248 The DNN model selected the optimal combination through a trial-and-error method since the DNN model could update the  
249 weights of neural network nodes with a backpropagation algorithm. Since various combinations were possible depending on  
250 the input variable and the output variable, it was necessary to find the optimal combination through the trial-and-error method.  
251 For such an optimal combination, it is necessary to define the network structure scenario for setting the number of layers and  
252 nodes and defining hyper parameters such as optimizers, activation functions, and dropouts (Cavallo et al., 2013). This study  
253 adopted a network structure scenario with three hidden layers considering data characteristics. Dropout is a regularization  
254 penalty to avoid overfitting. It was set to reduce prediction errors caused by overfitting. In this study, making an allowance for

255 the amount of training data, dropout was set to 0 and 0.2 and simulated. The ReLu (Rectified Linear Unit) function was utilized  
 256 as the activation function, a method of adjusting the weight of each node for optimal learning. The ReLu function allows the  
 257 input value to change when the input value is greater than 0 or less than 0. It was established to resolve the problem of gradient  
 258 loss of the existing Sigmoid function (Krizhevsky et al., 2012). The Adaptive Moment Estimation (Adam) method as accepted  
 259 as the optimizer (Krizhevsky et al., 2012). Optimizer is used for speed and stability of learning. The Adam Method is a widely  
 260 assumed algorithm since its development in 2015 (Kingma and Ba, 2015). The batch was defined as 5 as a data group  
 261 designation for efficient learning and the number of epochs was designated as 1,000 for the number of learning (Bae and Yoo,  
 262 2018; Ryu et al., 2018).  
 263

#### 264 4.3 Exploring DNNs and developing the DNN model

265 Table 3 shows MAE and RMSE values according to the network structure and dropout. Amongst outcomes, the model with  
 266 the minimum MAE and RMSE was adopted as the final structure. As the number of hidden layer nodes increased, the MAE  
 267 and RMSE values fluctuated slightly. However, the number of hidden layer nodes was minimized at 25-25-25. When the  
 268 dropout was 0, MAE and RMSE values were commonly lesser than when the dropout was 0.2. It could be realized that when  
 269 the number of hidden layer nodes was 25-25-25 and the dropout was 0.0, both MAE and RMSE had minimum values.  
 270 Consequently, in the final structure, the number of nodes was 25-25-25 and the dropout was 0. Table 4 and Figure 4  
 271 demonstrate the network structure and hyper parameter configuration of the optimization model.  
 272  
 273

Table 3. Training results

Network Structure Scenario	Dropout (0)		Dropout (0.2)	
	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE
5-5-5	0.521	0.484	0.521	0.484
10-10-10	0.498	0.468	0.524	0.484
15-15-15	0.521	0.484	0.523	0.487
20-20-20	0.522	0.484	0.521	0.484
25-25-25	0.476	0.461	0.521	0.484
30-30-30	0.521	0.484	0.521	0.484
35-35-35	0.521	0.484	0.522	0.484
40-40-40	0.521	0.484	0.521	0.484
50-50-50	0.521	0.484	0.522	0.484

274

Table 4. Network structure and hyper parameter formation of the final model

Category	Configuration	Feature
Network structure	Number of Hidden Layer	3
	Node	25-25-25
Hyper-parameter	Dropout	0.0
	Activation Function	ReLU (Rectified Linear Unit)
	Optimizer	Adam (Adaptive Moment Estimation)
	Epoch	1000
	Batch Size	5




Figure 4. Final model of deep neural networks

#### 279 4.4 The robustness validation of the final DNN model

280 An MRA (Multiple Regression Analysis) model was added for systematic validation of the final DNN model. MAE and RMSE  
 281 values of these two models were compared. The MRA method is widely adopted as an essential method for numerical  
 282 prediction models (Kim et al., 2021). Table 5 displays validation results of these models. Results of the DNN model showed  
 283 MAE of 0.531 and RMSE of 0.480 with the verification set of data. For the test set of data, results showed MAE of 0.452 and  
 284 RMSE of 0.435. There was no significant difference in MAE or RMSE between results with the test set of data and those with  
 285 the verification set of data since the overfitting problem of the final model could be overlooked. In addition, the MRA model

286 showed an MAE of 0.533 and a RMSE of 0.484. Equating outcomes of the DNN model and the MRA model, it was found  
 287 that the DNN model had meaningfully minor prediction error rates of 15.2% MAE and 10.12% RMSE than the MRA model.

288

289 Table 5. Results with the validation set and test set of data

	Validation Set		Test Set	
	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE
DNN	0.531	0.480	0.452	0.435
MRA	-	-	0.533	0.484
DNN/MRA (%)			-15.20	-10.12

290 **5 SIP-2: Quantifying the cost effectiveness of natural disaster risk reduction projects using cost-benefit analysis**

291 Management of a disaster risk reservoir is a part of the disaster prevention project. According to the Special Act on the Disaster  
 292 Risk Reduction Project and Relocation Measures, the purpose of disaster prevention measures necessary for improving the  
 293 disaster risk area is for fundamental prevention and permanent recovery of disasters. The disaster prevention project was started  
 294 in 1998 when the Disaster Response Division of the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs discovered  
 295 disaster-prone facilities and areas with risk of human casualties and provided government funds for the maintenance of natural  
 296 disaster risk areas for systematic management and prompt resolution of disaster risk factors (Lee, 2017). Disaster prevention  
 297 projects include natural disaster risk improvement districts, disaster risk reservoirs, steep slope collapse risk areas, small rivers,  
 298 and rainwater storage facilities (Kim et al., 2019). Given the significance of disaster prevention projects, SIP-2 examines  
 299 economic effects through cost-benefit analysis of natural disaster risk reduction projects to reduce losses from natural disasters.  
 300 To demonstrate SIP-2, a cost-benefit analysis was conducted for the natural disaster reduction project by comparing losses  
 301 from storm and flood insurance before and after the disaster risk reservoir maintenance project.

302

303 **5.1 Data collection and investigation of historical record**

304 Among natural disaster risk reduction projects carried out by the South Korean government, the data set of disaster risk  
 305 reservoir maintenance projects completed in 2009-2019 was extracted from the Public Data Portal (data.go.kr) managed by  
 306 the South Korean government to collect and provide public data created or acquired by public institutions in one place. The  
 307 system was established in 2011 to provide public data in the form of file data, visualization, and open API (Application  
 308 Programming Interface) (Closs et al., 2014). During the study period of 2009-2019, 474 reservoirs were designated as disaster  
 309 risk reservoirs and 290 maintenance projects were initiated. Among them, a total of 12 areas were flooded before and after the  
 310 completion of the disaster risk reservoir maintenance project. Table 6 shows the loss rate and maximum precipitation at the  
 311 time of flooding before and after completion of the maintenance projects in these 12 areas. Data about the loss amounts from  
 312 storm and flood insurance were obtained from KIDI. Precipitation data were collected from KMA and the maximum daily

313 precipitation at the time of the flooding was used. Insured loss was expressed as a rate of the incurred loss divided by the  
 314 accrued premium. The loss rate before the maintenance project was 34.32% on average, while that after the maintenance  
 315 project was completed was 5.9% on average, showing a sharp decrease of 82.8% on average.

316

317 Table 6. Comparison of loss rate and precipitation before and after maintenance projects in flooded regions in South Korea

No	Region	Loss rate		Precipitation (mm/day)	
		Before (%)	After (%)	Before	After
1	Yongin City	47.40	20.60	425	188
2	Nonsan City	30.10	0.80	334	306
3	Wanju-gun	40.70	3.40	364	142
4	Gangjin-gun	76.30	0.40	235	166
5	Sejong City	7.30	4.90	257	223
6	Muan-gun	25.80	2.00	285	192
7	Hampyeong-gun	23.80	10.30	301	230
8	Gyeongju City	33.10	1.20	488	280
9	Changwon City	10.60	10.70	300	266
10	Namhae City	22.10	8.50	324	231
11	Naju City	53.90	5.10	330	106
12	Goheung-gun	40.70	3.00	325	249
Average (%)		34.32	5.9	331	215
After/Before (%)		82.8		35.0	

318

### 319 5.2 Cost-benefit analysis and results of natural disaster risk reduction projects

320 As seen in Table 6, when data of precipitation as the main cause of flooding accidents during flood damage were compared,  
 321 the average precipitation was 331 mm/day before the maintenance project and 215 mm/day after the maintenance project. It  
 322 could be seen that the amount of precipitation was decreased by 35% when flood damage occurred after the maintenance  
 323 project. The sharp decrease in the loss rate after the maintenance project could be due to not only the effect of maintenance  
 324 project, but also decreased rainfalls. In turn, it is difficult to conclude that the decreased loss rate is due to the effect of reducing  
 325 storm and flood damage caused by the maintenance project.

326

327 To analyze the cost effectiveness of the maintenance projects in flood regions, a cost-benefit analysis method using an equal-  
 328 payment-series present-worth factor was adopted. The present-worth factor, assuming an annual loss rate  $i$ , is a coefficient  
 329 used to find the present value corresponding to annual equivalent loss  $A$  for the next  $n$  years. Eq. (1) presents a widely used  
 330 concept in economic analysis (Park & Sharp, 2021):

331

332

$$P = \frac{A[(1+i)^n - 1]}{i(1+i)^n} \tag{1}$$

333

334 Where:

335 *P*: Present value

336 *A*: Annual loss amount

337 *i*: Loss rate

338 *n*: Year

339

340 The initial cost of each maintenance project was collected through The Public Data Portal and the average cost of the  
 341 maintenance project was calculated. For the loss rate, the average loss rate of the loss area was used. For the annual loss amount,  
 342 the average annual loss for the study period (2009-2019) was used as seen in Table 7. However, it was assumed that no  
 343 additional costs incurred due to the maintenance project. Figure 5 shows calculation results before and after the maintenance  
 344 projects, which reveals that the loss amount becomes smaller after 8 years due to investment through the maintenance projects.

345


346

Table 7. Summary of inputs

Input	Before	After
Initial cost	-	22.088*
Loss rate	0.343	0.059
Annual loss amount	0.371*	0.006*

347 \* Billion KRW

348



349

350

Figure 5. Comparison of losses before and after the maintenance projects

## 351 **6 Discussion**

352 Within the proposed strategic framework, SIP-1 developed an improved model for predicting economic losses due to natural  
353 disasters using the DNN algorithm. For model development, insurance company's storm and flood damage insurance loss  
354 records were used to collect economic losses caused by actual natural disasters. After developing a DNN model and training  
355 it with collected data, the final network model was selected by comparing with other DNN alternatives. To scientifically  
356 validate the improved predictability, the performance (i.e., actual-to-predicted comparison using MAE and RMSE methods)  
357 of the developed DNN model was compared with a parametric model underpinned by MRA. The results revealed that the  
358 DNN model was 15.2% less in the MAE and 10.12% less in the RMSE, compared to the MRA model. These results confirm  
359 that deep learning can produce more accurate and reliable prediction results of natural disaster-induced economic loss values  
360 associated with non-linear characteristics of risk indicators. It is noteworthy that the proposed implementation process is  
361 applicable to various natural disaster-triggered loss predictions, as the amount and its fluctuation of losses are diverse  
362 dependant on various types and strengths of natural disasters. In this sense, the proposed SIP-1 will help natural disaster risk  
363 managers predict the financial loss cost of natural disasters or develop an optimally customized prediction model by adopting  
364 deep learning. It can also be used as a reference when developing risk reduction investment plans or financial guideline in  
365 public and private sectors. For example, by applying this implementation process, it would be possible to estimate reliably the  
366 negative impact of natural disaster events on existing financial management practices and thus make decisions proactively on  
367 the most feasible risk reduction investment plan that can strengthen natural disaster risk management and reduce the amount  
368 of risk, ultimately reducing the economic loss caused by natural disasters. Based on the well-developed financial guideline, it  
369 would be possible to avoid any transfers of unexpected financial losses from insurance coverages or special purchases suitable  
370 for expected losses. Despite the merit of SIP-1, there still remain some limitations. First, owing to the limited data set, it was  
371 problematic to accumulate different data sets. Additional research in the future is needed to parallel and prove loss records in  
372 other countries or regions. In addition, further research is required to increase the amount of available data and upgrade the  
373 model through the introduction of additional variables to more precisely predict losses from natural disasters using deep  
374 learning algorithms.

375

376 Compared to SIP-1, SIP-2 proposed a new methodology that can quantify the cost effectiveness of natural disaster risk  
377 reduction projects through the cost-benefit analysis. To demonstrate SIP-2, among natural disaster risk reduction projects were  
378 implemented in South Korea, specific information of the disaster risk reservoir maintenance projects where flood damage  
379 occurred before and after completion was collected. Then, to identify benefits and costs, corresponding loss rates and daily  
380 precipitation amounts were investigated and compared at the project level. Lastly, the cost effectiveness of the projects was  
381 analyzed using a cost-benefit analysis method. As the result of cost-benefit analysis, in the short term, the loss after the  
382 maintenance project was greater than that before the maintenance project. However, this was reversed from 8 years after the  
383 maintenance project and the loss amount before the maintenance project was larger than that after the maintenance project.



384 Although it is difficult to expect profits from the maintenance project in the short term, it can be seen that the maintenance  
385 project is economically beneficial in the long term (8 years or more). SIP-2 would be useful for making sounder decisions on  
386 natural disaster management policy and natural disaster risk reduction project investment plans. Evaluating the effectiveness  
387 of risk reduction through SIP-2 will lead to drastic investment, which will ultimately reduce the amount of natural disaster  
388 risks. However, it should be noted that the study period shown in the SIP-2 case study was relatively short, while the location  
389 of project samples was limited to South Korea. In addition, it was assumed that the inflation rate is identical during the study  
390 period. In turn, it is necessary to conduct additional analyses considering various locations vulnerable to natural disasters in  
391 other countries and more realistic financial loss values using a net present value concept.

## 392 **7 Conclusion**

393 Due to increasing threats to the life of general public and built assets from natural disasters, a variety of risk mitigation activities  
394 are being carried out extensively. Given the continuous trend toward natural disaster risk mitigation, the significance of relevant  
395 economic analyses has been underlined, against the limited public budget and its economic feasibility. To overcome this  
396 difficulty, this study proposed a strategic framework for natural disaster risk mitigation, highlighting two different SIPs. SIP-  
397 1 introduced more powerful method that can improve the predictability of natural disaster-triggered financial loss values using  
398 deep learning, while SIP-2 highlighted the risk mitigation strategy at the project level, adopting a cost-benefit analysis method.  
399 In SIP-1, a DNN model for natural disaster loss prediction was developed, and the improved predictability was validated by  
400 comparing with MRA. The developed model learned and generalized the loss amount of natural disaster risk indicator facilities  
401 (building type, wind speed, total rainfall, and peak ground acceleration) and wind and flood insurance. By evaluating learning  
402 performances of 18 different DNN alternatives using RMSE and MAE values as representative evaluation indicators of deep  
403 learning algorithms, 25-25-25 hidden layers with dropouts of 0.0 structure was selected as the optimal learning model. The  
404 robustness of the developed model was technically validated by comparing RMSE and MAE values of a conventional  
405 parametric model using a multiple regression analysis. Validation results confirmed that the non-parametric DNN model was  
406 powerful for predicting non-linear characteristics of losses caused by natural disasters. In SIP-2, The cost-benefit analysis was  
407 conducted on the disaster risk reservoir maintenance project that occurred before and after the completion of the flood damage.  
408 As the result, it was difficult to expect profits from the maintenance business in the short term. However, in the long term  
409 (more than 8 years), it was found that the maintenance business was economically profitable. The proposed framework is  
410 unique as it provides a combinational approach to mitigating cost risk impacts of natural disasters at both financial loss and  
411 project levels. Main findings of this study could be used as a guideline for decision-making of natural disaster management  
412 policies and investment in natural disaster risk reduction projects. This study is its first kind and supporting the current  
413 knowledge framework. This study will help practitioners quantify the loss from various natural disasters, while allowing them  
414 to evaluate the cost effectiveness of risk reduction projects through a holistic approach.

415

416 **Code and data availability.**

417 The data presented in this research are available from the first or corresponding author upon reasonable request.

418 **Author contributions.**

419 **J.-M.:** contributed to the conceptualization and supervision; methodology development; data curation; investigation; project  
420 administration; resources and visualization; and writing the original manuscript and reviewing the revised manuscript. **S.-G.:**  
421 contributed to data curation; investigation and validation; and reviewing the manuscript. **H.:** contributed to investigation;  
422 improving the literature review; and reviewing the manuscript. **J.:** contributed to strengthening research methodology and  
423 strategic framework design; visualization and validation; and reviewing and editing the manuscript as the corresponding author.

424 **Competing interests.**

425 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

426 **Acknowledgement**

427 This research was supported by Research Funds of Mokpo National University in 2021.

428 **References**

- 429 Ajayi, A., Oyedele, L., Owolabi, H., Akinade, O., Bilal, M., Delgado, J.M.D., and Akanbi, L.: Deep learning models for health  
430 and safety risk prediction in power infrastructure projects, *Risk Anal.*, 40, 2019–2039, 2019.
- 431 Al Najar, M., Thoumyre, G., Bergsma, E. W., Almar, R., Benschila, R., and Wilson, D. G.: Satellite derived bathymetry using  
432 deep learning. *Machine Learning*, 1-24, 2021.
- 433 Bae, S. W. and Yoo, J. S.: Apartment price estimation using machine learning: Gangnam-gu, Seoul as an example. *Real Estate*  
434 *Stud.*, 24, 69–85, 2018.
- 435 Bae, J., Yum, S. G., and Kim, J. M.: Harnessing machine learning for classifying economic damage trends in transportation  
436 infrastructure projects, *Sustainability*, 13, 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116376>, 2021.
- 437 Blake, E. S., Rappaport, E. N., and Landsea, C. W.: The Deadliest, Costliest, and most Intense United States Tropical Cyclones  
438 from 1851 to 2006, NOAA Technical Memorandum NWS NHC: Washington, DC, USA, 2011.
- 439 Bouwer, L. M., Crompton, R. P., Faust, E., Höpfe, P., and Pielke, R. A.: Confronting disaster losses, *Science*, 318, 753.  
440 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1149628>, 2007.
- 441 Bouwer, L. M., Papyrakis, E., Poussin, J., Pfuerscheller, C., and Thieken, A. H.: The costing of measures for natural hazard  
442 mitigation in Europe, *Natural Hazards Review*, 15, 04014010, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)nh.1527-6996.0000133](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)nh.1527-6996.0000133),  
443 2014.
- 444 Choi, C.H. and Han, S. W.: Current status and implications of earthquake insurance in major countries, *Insurance Research*  
445 *Institute Research Report*, 20, 1-118, 2017.
- 446 Cavallo, E., Galiani, S., Noy, I., and Pantano, J.: Catastrophic natural disasters and economic growth, *Review of Economics*  
447 *and Statistics*, 95, 1549–1561, [https://doi.org/10.1162/REST\\_a\\_00413](https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00413), 2013.

448 Closs, S., Studer, R., Garoufallou, E., and Sicilia, M. A.: Metadata and semantics research: 8th Research Conference, MTSR  
449 2014 Karlsruhe, Germany, November 27-29, 2014 Proceedings 13, Communications in Computer and Information  
450 Science, 478(Smiraglia 2014), 88–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13674-5>, 2014.

451 Daniell, J. E., Khazai, B., Wenzel, F., and Vervaeck, A.: The CATDAT damaging earthquakes database, *Natural Hazards and*  
452 *Earth System Science*, 11, 2235–2251, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-11-2235-2011>, 2011.

453 Federal Emergency Management Agency.: Detailed expenditure data, 1993–2003, Computer file, Washington, D.C., 2005.

454 Gledson, B.J.; Greenwood, D.: The adoption of 4d bim in the UK construction industry: An innovation diffusion approach,  
455 *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.*, 24, 950–967, 2017.

456 Hochrainer-Stigler, S., Kunreuther, H., Linnerooth-Bayer, J., Mechler, R., Michel-Kerjan, E., Muir-Wood, R., Ranger, N.,  
457 Vaziri, P., and Young, M.: The Costs and Benefits of Reducing Risk from Natural Hazards to Residential Structures in  
458 Developing Countries. 32. [http://personal.lse.ac.uk/RANGERN/WP2010-12-](http://personal.lse.ac.uk/RANGERN/WP2010-12-01_IIASA,RMS,Wharton_DevelopingCountries.pdf)  
459 [01\\_IIASA,RMS,Wharton\\_DevelopingCountries.pdf](http://personal.lse.ac.uk/RANGERN/WP2010-12-01_IIASA,RMS,Wharton_DevelopingCountries.pdf), 2010.

460 IPA.: Transforming infrastructure performance; Infrastructure and projects authority: London, UK, 2017.

461 Kim, J. M., Bae, J., Son, S., Son, K., and Yum, S. G.: Development of model to predict natural disaster-induced financial  
462 losses for construction projects using deep learning techniques. *Sustainability*, 13, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13095304>,  
463 2021.

464 Kim, J. M., Ha, K. C., Ahn, S., Son, S., and Son, K.: Quantifying the third-party loss in building construction sites utilizing  
465 claims payouts: A case study in south korea, *Sustainability*, 12, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su122310153>, 2020.

466 Kim, D. H., Kim, J. D., Choi, C. H., Wang, W. J., Yoo, Y. H., and Kim, H. S.: Estimation of disaster risk rainfall and collapse  
467 runoff of old reservoirs, *Proceedings of the Korean Society for Disaster Prevention*, 19, 421-432, 2019.

468 Kim, J. M., Kim, T., and Son, K.: Revealing building vulnerability to windstorms through an insurance claim payout prediction  
469 model: a case study in South Korea, *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, 8, 1333–1341,  
470 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2017.1337651>, 2017.

471 Kim, J. M., Kim, T., Son, K., Yum, S. G., and Ahn, S.: Measuring vulnerability of Typhoon in residential facilities: Focusing  
472 on Typhoon Maemi in South Korea. *Sustainability*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11102768>, 2019.

473 Kim, J. M., Son, K., Yum, S. G., and Ahn, S.: Typhoon vulnerability analysis in South Korea utilizing damage record of  
474 typhoon Maemi, *Advances in Civil Engineering*, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8885916>, 2020.

475 Kim, J. M., Son, S., Lee, S., and Son, K.: Cost of climate change: Risk of building loss from typhoon in South Korea,  
476 *Sustainability*, 12, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12177107>, 2020.

477 Kim, J., Yum, S., Son, S., Son, K., and Bae, J.: Modeling deep neural networks to learn maintenance and repair costs of  
478 educational facilities, *Buildings*, 11, 165. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11040165>, 2021.

479 Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. L.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. 3rd International Conference on Learning  
480 Representations, ICLR 2015 - Conference Track Proceedings, 1–15, 2015.

481 Khosravi, K., Panahi, M., Golkarian, A., Keesstra, S. D., Saco, P. M., Bui, D. T., and Lee, S.: Convolutional neural network  
482 approach for spatial prediction of flood hazard at national scale of Iran. *Journal of Hydrology*, 591, 125552, 2020.

483 Krizhevsky, B. A., Sutskever, I., and Hinton, G. E.: ImageNet classification with deep convolutional natural networks, *Adv.*  
484 *Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 60, 84–90, 2012.

485 Kunreuther H. and Michel-Kerjan E.: Challenge Paper: Natural Disasters, Policy options for reducing losses from natural  
486 disasters: Allocating \$75billion, Revised version for Copenhagen Consensus, Center for Risk Management and Decision  
487 Processes, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U.S.A., 2012.

488 Kunreuther, H., Meyer, R., and Van De Bulte, C.: Risk analysis for extreme events : Economic Incentives for reducing future  
489 losses, *Technology*, 93. <http://www.bfrl.nist.gov/oae/publications/gcrs/04871.pdf>, 2004.

490 Kwon, T. Y. and Oh, G. Y.: Development of integrated management system for wind and flood damage insurance management  
491 map equipped with insurance rate analysis algorithm module, *Proceedings of the Korean Society for Disaster Prevention*,  
492 18, 105-114, 2018.

493 Mechler, R.: Cost-benefit analysis of natural disaster risk management in developing countries, Eschborn: Deutsche  
494 Gesellschaft Fur Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Sector Project: Disaster Risk Management in Development  
495 Cooperation, 5–67. [http://maail.mekonginfo.org/assets/midocs/0003131-environment-cost-benefit-analysis-of-natural-](http://maail.mekonginfo.org/assets/midocs/0003131-environment-cost-benefit-analysis-of-natural-disaster-risk-management-in-developing-countries-manual.pdf)  
496 [disaster-risk-management-in-developing-countries-manual.pdf](http://maail.mekonginfo.org/assets/midocs/0003131-environment-cost-benefit-analysis-of-natural-disaster-risk-management-in-developing-countries-manual.pdf), 2005.

497 Moishin, M., Deo, R. C., Prasad, R., Raj, N., and Abdulla, S.: Designing deep-based learning flood forecast model with  
498 ConvLSTM hybrid algorithm. *IEEE Access*, 9, 50982-50993, 2021.

499 Multihazard Mitigation Council.: Natural hazard mitigation saves: Independent study to assess the future benefits of hazard  
500 mitigation activities, Study documentation, Vol. 2, Federal Emergency Management Agency of the U.S. Department of  
501 Homeland Security by the Applied Technology Council under contract to the Multihazard Mitigation Council of the  
502 National Institute of Building Sciences, Washington, D.C., 2005.

503 Kreimer, A., Arnold, M., and Carlin, A.: Building safer cities: the future of disaster risk (No. 3), World Bank Publications,  
504 2003.

505 Lee, S. W.: Exploring the limitations of disaster prevention projects and improvement measures, *Disaster Prevention Review*,  
506 19, 15-20, 2017.

507 Park, C. S. and Sharp, G. P.: *Advanced engineering economics*, John Wiley & Sons, 2021.

508 Rasjava, A. R. I., Sugiyarto, A. W., Kurniasari, Y., and Ramadhan, S. Y.: Detection of Rice Plants Diseases Using  
509 Convolutional Neural Network (CNN). In *Proceeding International Conference on Science and Engineering*, 3, 393-396,  
510 2020.

511 Rose, A., Porter, K., Dash, N., Bouabid, J., Huyck, C., Whitehead, J., Shaw, D., Eguchi, R., Taylor, C., McLane, T., Tobin, L.  
512 T., Ganderton, P. T., Godschalk, D., Kiremidjian, A. S., Tierney, K., and West, C. T.: Benefit-cost analysis of FEMA  
513 hazard mitigation grants, *Natural Hazards Review*, 8, 97–111, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)1527-6988\(2007\)8:4\(97\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)1527-6988(2007)8:4(97)),  
514 2007.

515 Ryu, J. D., Park, S. M., Park, S. H., Kwon, C. W., and Yoon, I. S.: A study on the development of a model for predicting the  
516 number of highway traffic accidents using deep learning, *J. Korean Soc.*, 17, 14–25, 2018.

517 Sanders, D. E. A.: The management of losses arising from extreme events, *Giro* 2002, 261.  
518 [papers2://publication/uuid/61B316B3-6F10-4364-BFA2-9C9174665E44](https://publication/uuid/61B316B3-6F10-4364-BFA2-9C9174665E44), 2002.

519 Shane Crawford, P., Hainen, A. M., Graettinger, A. J., van de Lindt, J. W., and Powell, L.: Discrete-outcome analysis of  
520 tornado damage following the 2011 Tuscaloosa, Alabama, tornado. *Natural Hazards Review*, 21(4), 04020040, 2020.

521 Shreve, C. M. and Kelman, I.: Does mitigation save? Reviewing cost-benefit analyses of disaster risk reduction, *International*  
522 *Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 10(PA), 213–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2014.08.004>, 2014.

523 Toya, H. and Skidmore, M.: Economic development and the impacts of natural disasters, *Economics Letters*, 94, 20–25.  
524 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2006.06.020>, 2007.

525 United States National Hurricane Center.: Costliest, U.S. tropical cyclones tables update, Retrieved from  
526 <https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/news/UpdatedCostliest.pdf>. Accessed May 31, 2021, 2018.

527 Ulbrich, U., Fink, A. H., Klawa, M., and Pinto, G.: *Archives of Ophthalmology*, 117, 1661.  
528 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archopht.117.12.1661>, 1999.

529 Yi, Y. and Zhang, W.: A new deep-learning-based approach for earthquake-triggered landslide detection from single-temporal  
530 RapidEye satellite imagery. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 13,  
531 6166-6176, 2020.

532 Zhang, Y., Shi, X., Zhang, H., Cao, Y., and Terzija, V.: Review on deep learning applications in frequency analysis and control  
533 of modern power system. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 136, 107744, 2022.

534