



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/96016/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Liu, B, Siu, YL, Mitchell, G et al. (2016) The danger of mapping risk from multiple natural hazards. *Natural Hazards*, 82 (1). pp. 139-153. ISSN: 0921-030X

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-016-2184-5>

---

**Reuse**

See Attached

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# The danger of mapping risk from multiple natural hazards

Baoyin Liu · Yim Ling Siu · Gordon Mitchell · Wei Xu

Baoyin Liu

School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

Yim Ling Siu (Corresponding author)

School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

Telephone number: +44(0) 113 34 36717

Email: [Y.L.Siu@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:Y.L.Siu@leeds.ac.uk)

Gordon Mitchell

School of Geography, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

Wei Xu

State Key Laboratory of Earth Surface Processes and Resource Ecology, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China

**Abstract** In recent decades, society has been greatly affected by natural disasters (e.g. floods, droughts, earthquakes), losses and effects caused by these disasters have been increasing. Conventionally, risk assessment focuses on individual hazards, but the importance of addressing multiple hazards is now recognised. Two approaches exist to assess risk from multiple-hazards; the risk index (addressing hazards, and the exposure and vulnerability of people or property at risk) and the mathematical statistics method (which integrates observations of past losses attributed to each hazard type). These approaches have not previously been compared. Our application of both to China clearly illustrates their inconsistency. For example, from 31 Chinese provinces assessed for multi-hazard risk, Gansu and Sichuan provinces are at low risk of life loss with the risk index approach, but high risk using the mathematical statistics approach. Similarly, Tibet is identified as being at almost the highest risk of economic loss using the risk index, but lowest risk under the mathematical statistics approach. Such inconsistency should be recognised if risk is to be managed effectively, whilst the practice of multi-hazard risk assessment needs to incorporate the relative advantages of both approaches.

**Keywords** Multi-hazard risk assessment · Risk index · Mathematical statistics · Economic loss · Human life loss

# The danger of mapping risk from multiple natural hazards

## 1. Introduction

The impacts of one hazardous event are often exacerbated by interaction with another (Marzocchi et al. 2009). The mechanism by which these interactions occur varies, and may be a product of one event triggering another, or ‘crowding’, where events occur independently without evident common cause, but in close proximity, spatially, temporally, or both (Tarvainen et al. 2006; Carpignano et al. 2009; Marzocchi et al. 2012). The 2011 Tohoku earthquake which led to a tsunami and subsequently the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster (Norio et al. 2011) is an event cascade and an example of triggering, whilst flooding in China’s Yangtze River Delta arising from a typhoon occurring at the same time as annual monsoonal rainfall is an example of event crowding (Liu et al. 2013). Close proximity between events may lower resilience to disaster and make recovery more difficult, and illustrates how risk from multiple natural hazards is often greater than that suggested by risk assessment that considers hazards as independent events.

Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment (MHRA) has been developed to combat the limitations of single hazard appraisal (Armonia Project 2006; Marzocchi et al. 2009; Di Mauro et al. 2006), with MHRA approaches building on the methods developed for single-hazard risk assessment, but additionally considering hazard interaction. The aim is to develop a more complete understanding of risk by assessing, and usually mapping, either the relative danger or expected losses (social, economic, environmental) due to the occurrence of multiple natural hazards in an area (Armonia Project 2006; Dilley et al. 2005). Two MHRA approaches exist, one developing a risk index, and the other using a mathematical statistics approach. There are no MHRA studies that compare analysis of risk using these two approaches for the same area. Therefore, this paper compares the risk index and mathematical statistics methods (definition and methodology), and then applies them to China’s provinces to analyze differences, including data needs and results. After discussing possible reasons for differences in results, the relative merits of these two methods are summarized.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 The risk index approach

The risk index approach addresses the factors that lead to a disaster (disaster formation). Risk is defined as the probability of loss caused by the interactions between the vulnerability, exposure and the hazard. Risk is most commonly expressed as in equation (1) (ISDR 2004):

$$Risk = Hazard \times Vulnerability \times Exposure \quad (1)$$

69 Where hazard is the presence of potentially damaging physical events in an area, exposure is the number,  
 70 types and monetary value of elements that are exposed to that hazard, and vulnerability refers to intrinsic  
 71 characteristics of those elements that make them more or less susceptible to adverse impact. Selection of  
 72 component indicators for hazard, vulnerability and exposure, and calculation of associated weights are key  
 73 steps. The process is an extension of that used for an individual hazard, with risks from individual hazards  
 74 aggregated in a unified MHRA index. Aggregation may proceed in two ways. The first is to address hazard,  
 75 vulnerability and exposure for individual hazards, and then sum for the multi-hazard risk index (Granger  
 76 and Trevor 2000; Munich Reinsurance Company 2003; Khatsu and van Westen 2005; Schmidt-Thomé  
 77 2006; Thierry et al. 2008; Kunz and Hurni 2008; SCEMDOAG 2009):

78

$$79 \quad R = f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n H_i, \sum_{i=1}^n V_i, \sum_{i=1}^n E_i\right) \quad (2)$$

80

81 An alternative aggregation approach is used in which each hazard risk index is first assessed individually  
 82 for a given area. Weights (see below) are then assigned to each individual hazard risk and summation used  
 83 to derive the multi-hazard risk index (Bell and Glade 2004; UNDP 2004; Lavalley et al. 2005; Dilley et al.  
 84 2005; Wipulanusat et al. 2009; Shi 2011):

85

$$86 \quad R = \sum_{i=1}^n f(H_i, V_i, E_i) \quad (3)$$

87

88 In both cases,  $R$  is Multi-hazard risk,  $H_i$  is Hazard;  $V_i$  is Vulnerability,  $E_i$  is Exposure and  $i$  represents each  
 89 individual hazard.

90 However, most methods in both aggregation approaches (equations (2) and (3)) suffer the drawback that  
 91 the multi-hazard risk index is calculated by aggregating all single hazard risks with equal weight (Table 1),  
 92 which does not adequately reflect the varied impacts of different hazards present in the same area. Whilst  
 93 both aggregation methods have advanced MHRA and can be used to better compare the relative degree of  
 94 danger between different areas, these applications utilise hazard, vulnerability and exposure to assess the  
 95 final multi-hazard risk without a consideration of probabilities and exceedance probabilities (the probability  
 96 that a specified level of loss, or a greater loss, will occur), and thus these approaches cannot reflect the real  
 97 risk in the study areas. Thus the risk index is useful in a relative sense, but is less helpful in an absolute  
 98 sense for determining total losses.

99 **2.2 The mathematical statistics approach**

100 The mathematical statistics approach is based upon the analysis of observed natural disasters. Risk is  
 101 defined as a product of the probability of occurrence of a hazardous event and the consequences of such an

102 event for exposures (the magnitude of impact resulting from realization of the hazard). Risk is expressed as  
103 (IUGS 1997):

104  
105 
$$Risk = Probability \times Consequence \quad (4)$$
  
106

107 This is the basic model for the mathematical statistics method and its associated loss curve is shown in  
108 Fig.1. Loss (L) is the loss (damage) associated with the disaster, and EP(L) is the exceedance probability  
109 for the corresponding loss. Through application of this approach, an exceedance probability-loss curve can  
110 be built, which shows the likelihood of losses of different magnitudes, and which is used to estimate and  
111 evaluate risk of future disasters. Both parametric and nonparametric methods are used to estimate the  
112 required probabilities (FEMA 2004; Grünthal et al. 2006; Van Westen 2008; Schmidt et al. 2011;  
113 Linares-Rivas 2012; Frolova et al. 2012; Liu et al. 2013) (Table 1).

114

115 **Fig.1** Exceedance probability-loss curve

116

117 The mathematical theory in the parametric method assumes that disaster losses follow a known distribution  
118 function (curve). Historical loss data sets are often used to estimate the distribution function parameters that  
119 are then used to calculate the probability distribution. This methodology has been widely used in risk  
120 assessment. For instance, Grünthal et al. (2006) calculated exceedance probability–mean wind speed curves  
121 for windstorm risk assessment using Schmidt and Gumbel distributions (Gumbel 1958). Stedinger et al.  
122 (1992) estimated distribution function parameters by the method of moments for Gumbel type, Pearson  
123 type III, Weibull and lognormal curves; instead of, and Grünthal et al. (2006) used these distributions to  
124 build exceedance probability–discharge curves for flood risk assessment.

125 There is sometimes a lack of historical observations, so it can be difficult to develop a probability  
126 distribution function that reflects the real situation for parameter estimation. In these circumstances, a  
127 nonparametric method is used, which may employ histogram density estimation, kernel density estimation  
128 or information diffusion to derive probability estimates. Histogram density estimation is easy to use, but the  
129 results obtained are crude and are greatly influenced by the interval choice. Kernel density estimation  
130 (Rosenblatt 1956; Parzen 1962) are closely related to histograms, but can be endowed with properties such  
131 as smoothness or continuity by using a suitable kernel. However, the key problem of how to choose an  
132 appropriate smoothing parameter still remains. The information diffusion method was introduced by Huang  
133 (1997) to overcome this problem, and improves the accuracy of natural disaster risk assessment. The  
134 information diffusion method can use sample data to assess natural disaster risk, and Huang (2000) showed  
135 it to be about 28% more efficient than histogram density estimation.

136

137 **Table 1** Multi-hazard risk assessment approaches and applications

138

139 These two risk assessment approaches are distinct, in that the risk index method primarily serves to aid  
140 understanding of the disaster formation mechanism, as it strives for an appreciation of the relative  
141 importance of hazard, vulnerability and exposure (of human and physical systems) and the interaction  
142 between these elements, in the overall determination of risk (Shi 1996; Wisner et al. 2004). Conversely the  
143 statistics method expresses risk as probabilistic loss, and is useful in estimating and evaluating losses from  
144 potential future disaster. It gives more consideration to the probability of occurrence but relative to the risk  
145 index approach, exposure and vulnerability are neglected.

### 146 **3. Application to China**

#### 147 **3.1 Data**

148 These approaches have not previously been compared, whilst researchers rarely explicitly justify their  
149 chosen approach. Their comparison is important to developing more transparent MHRA that would better  
150 inform management of risk from multiple hazards. We therefore compared the two MHRA approaches via  
151 their application to a common area that experiences significant natural hazards. A history of natural  
152 disasters driven by different natural hazards, plus a growing population and economy at risk, makes China  
153 a suitable region to conduct this comparison (Wang et al. 2008). For both approaches, nine natural hazards  
154 including flood, drought, heat wave, cold wave, earthquake, landslide, storm (typhoon and local storm),  
155 wildfire and avalanche were addressed to calculate the risk to human life and economic production.

156 Historical data on natural disasters in China was drawn from the EM-DAT International Disaster Database  
157 for 1981-2012, and used in application of both approaches. The approaches differ in their requirements for  
158 socio-economic data, in terms of both data type and time series, which reflects differences in the  
159 complexity of the approaches. The risk index requires socio-economic data for multiple variables, but only  
160 one year of data is required (Table 2). The mathematical statistics approach is less demanding in terms of  
161 the variety of socio-economic data required, but a longer time series is needed (Table 2).

162

163 **Table 2** Data for multi-hazard risk assessment in China

164

#### 165 **3.2 Application and results**

166 The risk index approach was applied such that the multi-hazard index was the sum of each hazard value  
167 multiplied by its weight, calculated according to the average historical death toll associated with this hazard

168 (Munich Reinsurance Company 2003). The normalised multi-hazard index to human life is shown in Fig.2a.  
169 Provinces with a high multi-hazard index value mainly located in south-eastern China. Population age  
170 structure, gender ratio, and quality of supporting infrastructure (transport routes, telecommunication  
171 facilities, and medical facilities) were used as indicators to calculate the vulnerability index (Cutter et al.  
172 2003; Villagran de Leon 2006; SCEMDOAG 2009) to human life using the entropy-weight method<sup>1</sup> (Zou  
173 et al. 2006; Miao and Ding 2015). As shown in Fig.2b, Provinces with a high vulnerability index value  
174 mainly located in western China. The exposure index to human life loss was represented by population  
175 density. As shown in Fig.2c, Shanghai has the highest exposure index. The multi-hazard risk index to  
176 human life was then calculated by aggregating the multi-hazard index, the vulnerability index and the  
177 exposure index with equal weight (Fig. 2d). This methodology was used in assessing economic loss, with  
178 GDP per km<sup>2</sup> as the exposure index. The hazard index, vulnerability index, exposure index and  
179 multi-hazard risk index to economic loss are shown in Fig.3.

180

181 **Fig. 2** Multi-hazard risk assessment to human life in China (2013) using the risk index approach (0  
182 represents the lowest value, and 1 represents the highest value)

183

184 **Fig. 3** Multi-hazard risk assessment to loss of economic production (GDP) in China (2013) using the risk  
185 index approach (0 represents the lowest value, and 1 represents the highest value)

186

187 The information diffusion method (Huang 1997) was adopted in the mathematical statistics approach. The  
188 exceedance probability (EP) distribution of multi-hazard loss was calculated based on observed disaster  
189 loss data (1981-2012), and an EP loss curve developed. Multi-hazard risk to life and GDP was mapped for  
190 10-, 20- and 50-year hazard return periods (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5). Estimated losses are expressed as deaths per  
191 million people and ratio of economic loss to production, so population size and GDP in 2013 were used to  
192 probabilistically estimate deaths and economic loss in 2013 attributed to multi-hazard with a 20-year return  
193 period (Fig.6).

194

195 **Fig. 4** Multi-hazard risk to human life for selected event return periods

196

---

<sup>1</sup> Entropy measures the amount of useful information in the indicator provided. When the difference in one indicator between different assessment units is small, the entropy is great, it illustrates that this indicator provides less useful information, and the weight of this indicator should be set correspondingly small. On the other hand, if the difference is large and the entropy is small, the weight would be big.

197 **Fig. 5** Multi-hazard risk to economic production for selected event return periods

198

199 **Fig. 6** Death and economic loss in 2013 to multi-hazard with a 20-year return period

200

#### 201 **4. Comparative performance**

202 Comparing these with the risk maps generated using the risk index approach and mathematical statistics  
203 approach shows that the results are inconsistent (Fig.2d and Fig.6a, Fig.3d and Fig.6b). For instance, Gansu  
204 and Sichuan provinces are at low risk of life loss with the risk index approach (Fig.2d), but high risk using  
205 the mathematical statistics approach (Fig.6a). Similarly, Tibet is identified as being at almost the highest  
206 risk of economic loss using the risk index (Fig.3d), but lowest risk under the mathematical statistics  
207 approach (Fig.6b).

208 The risk index expresses risk using a synthetic unitless indicator, whilst the mathematical statistics  
209 approach expresses risk as integrated losses (lives, GDP); hence, results cannot be compared directly.  
210 However, Spearman rank correlation (Spearman 1904) coefficients of 0.17 and 0.33 for multi-hazard risk to  
211 human life and loss of economic production clearly reveal the lack of consistency between the two  
212 approaches, which supposedly both assess the same multi-hazard risk. This is further illustrated by Table 3,  
213 the risk ranking for the two approaches.

214

215 **Table 3** Province ranking by the risk index and mathematical statistics approaches to human life and  
216 economic production

217

218 There are several possible explanations for this observation. Firstly, the risk index and mathematical  
219 statistics approaches adopt different assessing elements. The risk index approach assesses risk from  
220 component indicators for hazard, vulnerability and exposure, but mathematical statistics approach adopt  
221 probability and corresponding loss to measure the risk. Second, MHRA using the risk index approach  
222 draws on vulnerability and exposure data for a single year only (2013 in our analysis), whereas the  
223 mathematical statistics method makes a probabilistic assessment that must draw on a long run time-series  
224 of observed losses (32 years in our case). Thirdly, and related to this, is that the mathematical statistics  
225 approach does not explicitly address changes in vulnerability (of population and property) but these values  
226 change from year to year as a country develops. A region experiencing rapid population growth may see a  
227 major change in the population that is vulnerable to natural hazards, but the risk index reflects this  
228 vulnerability for one year only (most likely that for which the latest data is available), and hence is unlikely

229 to be representative of vulnerability over the long-run. The mathematical statistics approach does not  
230 address vulnerability directly, but does so indirectly, via observed losses, which in contrast are for the long  
231 run. Fourthly, the risk index is also similarly sensitive to changes in population (or property) exposure (e.g.  
232 the population density of Shanghai, at 3,809 people per km<sup>2</sup> is 1,494 times higher than that of Tibet).  
233 Finally, the mathematical statistics approach underestimates the influence of extreme events whose return  
234 periods are substantially longer than the time period of the observed loss data. This is evident in the case of  
235 Sichuan which is calculated as high risk (to human life) in the 20-year return period, because this region  
236 experienced an earthquake in 2008 whose magnitude (and death toll, a reported 87,587 deaths) (USGS  
237 2012) had a return period that was much longer than that of the observed loss record. If more extreme  
238 natural hazard events are included, the observed loss data would increase exceedance probabilities and the  
239 resulting multi-hazard risk estimation.

240 Despite the difference in results, it cannot be concluded that one approach is wrong or that neither is correct.  
241 These two approaches both provide a measure of risk, but they each have a different emphasis. Both  
242 approaches have certain advantages and drawbacks which reflect that one emphasizes the disaster  
243 formation mechanism (and is best used to assess relative risk), and the other emphasizes the expected losses  
244 (thus reflecting real world observations, but neglecting exposure and vulnerability) (Table 4). Our analysis  
245 for China has demonstrated that these two approaches can differ in the estimation of risk, so much so that a  
246 complete reversal of the risk picture gained is possible if switching from one approach to the other. This  
247 has significant implications for management of that risk.

248

249 **Table 4** Relative merits of multi-hazard risk assessment approaches

250

## 251 **5. Conclusion and discussion**

252 We conclude that in assessing risk from multiple natural hazards, there is a need to recognise that the  
253 results of a MHRA are heavily dependent upon the approach adopted, and that there is clearly danger to  
254 effective risk management, in unwittingly choosing one approach over another, with for example, choice of  
255 approach driven by practical considerations, such as data availability.

256 Comparative analysis of multi-hazard risk merits further work, for different territories and geographic  
257 scales, to verify our findings. However, the degree of inconsistency between the approaches revealed by  
258 our analysis implies that risk assessors must recognise the relative merits of their adopted approach, and  
259 clearly explain to those with natural hazard risk management responsibilities (including politicians, policy  
260 makers and planners) which approach has been used and why. As shown in Fig.7, the approach adopted  
261 will likely depend upon the objective of the MHRA. Loss assessors (e.g. the insurance industry) may

262 favour the mathematical statistics approach, but those seeking to pro-actively manage multi-hazard risk  
263 require a deeper understanding of the factors that underpin that risk and so will favour the risk index  
264 approach. The evident disparity between these two approaches means that effective management of  
265 multi-hazard risk, which better protects life and property, may be constrained.

266

267 **Fig. 7** Multi-hazard risk assessment (economic loss) for relevant stakeholders (a) policy makers and  
268 planners, and (b) insurance industries

269

270 A hybrid MHRA approach that integrates the best of the index and statistical approaches is clearly worth  
271 pursuing. This could be achieved by analysing risk considering the disaster formation mechanism  
272 considering hazard, vulnerability and exposure, and calculating possible loss and corresponding probability  
273 of loss under different natural hazard scenarios. A key element here would be consideration of the  
274 interaction between hazards, the interaction of hazards and vulnerability, and the frequency of hazard  
275 occurrence.

276

## 277 **References**

- 278 Armonia Project–Applied Multi-Risk Mapping of Natural Hazards for Impact Assessment (2006) Applied  
279 multi-risk mapping of natural hazards for impact assessment, report on new methodology for  
280 multi-risk assessment and the harmonisation of different natural risk maps. Armonia, European  
281 Community, Genova, Italy
- 282 Bell R, Glade T (2004) Multi-hazard analysis in natural risk assessments. In: Brebbia CA (ed) Proceedings  
283 of the 4th international conference on computer simulation in risk analysis and hazard mitigation. WIT  
284 Press, 26–29 September, 2004, Rhodes, pp197–206
- 285 Carpignano A, Golia E, Di Mauro C, Bouchon S, Nordvik, JP (2009) A methodological approach for the  
286 definition of multi-risk maps at regional level: first application. *Journal of Risk Research* 12(3-4):  
287 513–534
- 288 Cutter SL, Boruff BJ, Shirley WL (2003) Social vulnerability to environmental hazards\*. *Social science*  
289 *quarterly* 84(2): 242-261
- 290 Dilley M et al. (2005) *Natural disaster hotspots, a global risk analysis*. World Bank, Washington, D.C
- 291 Di Mauro C, Bouchon S, Carpignana A, Golia E, Peressin S (2006) Definition of multi-risk maps at  
292 regional level as management tool: experience gained by civil protection authorities of Piemonte  
293 region. In: 5th conference on risk assessment and management in the civil and industrial settlements.  
294 University of Pisa, Italy, 17-19 October, 2006
- 295 FEMA (2004) Using HAZUS-MH for risk assessment. <http://www.fema.gov>. Accessed October 2010
- 296 Frolova NI, Larionov VI, Sushchev SP, Bonnin J (2012) Seismic and integrated risk assessment and  
297 management with information technology application. In: 15th world conference on earthquake  
298 engineering. Lisbon
- 299 Granger K, Trevor J (2000) A multi-hazard risk assessment. In: Middelman M and Granger K (eds)  
300 *Community risk in MacKay, A multi-hazard risk assessment*. Australian geological survey  
301 organization

- 302 Grünthal G, Thieken AH, Schwarz J, Radtke KS, Smolka A, Merz B (2006) Comparative risk assessment  
303 for the city of Cologne—storms, floods, earthquake. *Natural Hazards* 38(1-2): 21-44
- 304 Gumbel EJ (1958) *Statistics of extremes*. Columbia University Press, New York
- 305 Huang C (1997) Principle of information diffusion. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 91(1): 69–90
- 306 Huang C (2000). Demonstration of benefit of information distribution for probability estimation. *Signal*  
307 *Process* 80(6): 1037-1048
- 308 ISDR (International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) (2004) *Living with risk. A global review of disaster*  
309 *reduction initiatives*. United Nations publication, New York and Geneva
- 310 IUGS (1997) Quantitative risk assessment for slopes and landslides—the state of the art. In: Cruden DM  
311 and Fell R (eds) *Landslide risk assessment*. Balkema, Rotterdam
- 312 Khatsu P, van Westen CJ (2005) Urban multi-hazard risk analysis using GIS and remote sensing: a case  
313 study from Kohima Town, Nagaland, India. In: *proceedings of the 26th Asian Conference on remote*  
314 *sensing, 7–11 November, 2005, Hanoi, Vietnam*
- 315 Kunz M, Hurni L (2008) Hazard maps in Switzerland. In: *Proceedings of the 6th ICA Mountain*  
316 *Cartography Workshop*, 125–130
- 317 Lavallo C, Barredo JI, Roo AD, Niemeyer S, Miguel-Ayanz JS, Hiederer R., Genovese E, Camia A (2005)  
318 *Towards an European integrated map of risk from weather driven events. A contribution to the*  
319 *evaluation of territorial cohesion in Europe*. Joint Research Centre, European Commission
- 320 Linares-Rivas A (2012) CAPRA initiative: integrating disaster risk into development policies in Latin  
321 America and the Caribbean.  
322 <http://www.ecapra.org/capra-initiative-integrating-disaster-risk-development-policies-latam>. Accessed  
323 October 2013
- 324 Liu B, Siu YL, Mitchell G, Xu W (2013) Exceedance probability of multiple natural hazards: risk  
325 assessment in China's Yangtze River Delta. *Natural Hazards*: 69(3): 2039-2055
- 326 Marzocchi W, Garcia-Aristizabal A, Gasparini P, Mastellone M, Di Ruocco A (2012) Basic principles of  
327 multi-risk assessment: a case study in Italy. *Natural Hazards* 62(2): 551–573
- 328 Marzocchi W, Mastellone M L, Di Ruocco A, Novelli P, Romeo E, Gasparini P (2009) Principles of  
329 multi-risk assessment. Interaction amongst natural and man-induced risks. European Communities,  
330 Brussels
- 331 Miao C, Ding M (2015) Social vulnerability assessment of geological hazards based on entropy method in  
332 Lushan earthquake-stricken area. *Arabian Journal of Geosciences*, 1-13
- 333 Munich Reinsurance Company (2003) *Topics—annual review: natural catastrophes 2002*. Munich Re  
334 Group, Munich
- 335 Norio O, Ye T, Kajitani Y, Shi P, Tatano H. (2011) The 2011 eastern Japan great earthquake disaster:  
336 overview and comments. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science* 2(1): 34-42
- 337 Parzen E (1962) On estimation of a probability density function and mode. *The Annals of Mathematical*  
338 *Statistics* 33: 1065-1076
- 339 Rosenblatt M (1956) Remarks on some nonparametric estimates of a density function. *The Annals of*  
340 *Mathematical Statistics* 27(3): 832-837
- 341 SCEMDOAG (South Carolina Emergency Management Division Office of the Adjutant General) (2009)  
342 *State of South Carolina hazards assessment 2008*. University of South Carolina, South Carolina  
343 Emergency Management Division Office of the Adjutant General, Hazards Research Lab, Department  
344 of Geography, South Carolina
- 345 Schmidt J, Matcham I, Reese S, King A, Bell R, Henderson R, Smart G, Cousins J, Smith W, Heron D  
346 (2011) Quantitative multi-risk analysis for natural hazards: a framework for multi-risk modeling.  
347 *Natural Hazards* 58(3): 1169–1192

- 348 Schmidt-Thomé P (2006) The spatial effects and management of natural and technological hazards in  
349 Europe. European Spatial Planning and Observation Network (ESPON) project 1.3.1, Geological  
350 Survey of Finland, Luxembourg
- 351 Shi PJ (1996) Theory and practice of disaster study. *Journal of natural disaster* 5(4): 6–17
- 352 Shi PJ (2011) Atlas of natural disaster risk of China. Science press, Beijing
- 353 Spearman C (1904) The proof and measurement of association between two things. *American Journal of*  
354 *Psychology* 15(1): 72–101
- 355 Stedinger JR, Vogel RM, Foufoula-Georgiou E (1992) Frequency analysis of extreme events. In: Maidment  
356 DR (ed), *Handbook of hydrology*. McGraw-Hill Inc, New York
- 357 Tarvainen T, Jarva J, Greiving S (2006) Spatial pattern of hazards and hazard interactions in Europe. In:  
358 Schmidt-Thomé P (ed) *Natural and technological hazards and risks affecting the spatial development*  
359 *of European regions*. Geological Survey of Finland, Special Paper 42. Espoo 2006, 83 – 92
- 360 Thierry P, Stieltjes L, Kouokam E, Ngueya P, Salley P (2008) Multi-hazard risk mapping and assessment on  
361 an active volcano: the GRINP project at Mount Cameroon. *Natural Hazards* 45(3): 429–456
- 362 UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2004) *Reducing disaster risk: a challenge for*  
363 *development*. United Nations Development Programme, Bureau for crisis prevention and recovery,  
364 New York
- 365 USGS (2012) Deaths from Earthquakes in 2008.  
366 [http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eqarchives/year/2008/2008\\_deaths.php](http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eqarchives/year/2008/2008_deaths.php). Accessed October  
367 2013
- 368 Van Westen CJ (2008) RiskCity: a training package on the use of GIS for urban multi - hazard risk  
369 assessment. In: Sassa D and Canuti P (eds) *Proceedings of the First World Landslide Forum*. United  
370 Nations University Press, Tokyo, 665-668
- 371 Villagran de Leon JC (2006) *Vulnerability: a conceptual and methodological review*. The United Nations  
372 University, Institute for Environment and Human Security
- 373 Wang J, Shi P, Yi X, Jia H, Zhu L (2008) The regionalization of urban natural disasters in China. *Natural*  
374 *Hazards* 44(2): 169–179
- 375 Wipulanusat W, Nakrod S, Prabnarong P (2009) Multi-hazard risk assessment using GIS and RS  
376 applications: a case study of Pak Phanang basin. *Walailak Journal of Science and Technology* 6(1):  
377 109-125
- 378 Wisner B, Blaikie P, Cannon T, Davis I (2004) *At risk: natural hazards, people’s vulnerability and disasters*.  
379 2nd ed. Routledge, London
- 380 Zou ZH, Yun Y, Sun JN (2006) Entropy method for determination of weight of evaluating indicators in  
381 fuzzy synthetic evaluation for water quality assessment. *Journal of Environmental Sciences* 18(5):  
382 1020–1023