

1 Spatial prediction of slope failure in the Caspian forest using an adaptive
2 neuro-fuzzy inference system and GIS

3

4 **Abolfazl Jaafari¹, Akbar Najafi¹, Javad Rezaeian², Masoud Shafipour Omrani²**

5 1- Department of Forestry, Faculty of Natural Resources, Tarbiat Modares University, Noor, Iran

6 2- Department of Industrial Engineering, Mazandaran University of Science and Technology, Babol, Iran

7

8 **Abstract**

9 The main goal of this study was to produce a slope failure susceptibility map to support road
10 designing and timber harvest planning. For this purpose, 15 data layers, including slope failure
11 slope failure conditioning-factors, and a landslide inventory map were exploited to detect the
12 most susceptible areas. Subsequently, slope failure susceptibility maps were produced using an
13 adaptive neuro-fuzzy interface system (ANFIS) and GIS. The accuracy of the obtained maps was
14 then evaluated by receiver operating characteristics (ROC). The ANFIS model with the input
15 conditioning-factors of slope degree, slope aspect, altitude, and lithology performed the best
16 among the various ANFIS models explored in the study. The predicted susceptibility levels were
17 found to be in good agreement with the occurrences of pre-existing slope failures, and, hence, the
18 produced maps are trustworthy for forestry activities and hazard mitigation planning.

19 **Keywords:** ANFIS; Landslide susceptibility; Road construction; Timber harvesting

20 **1. Introduction**

21 Construction and maintenance of road networks in mountainous forests are of challenging tasks
22 because of geological and topographical complexities. The situation becomes more severe if a
23 road network passes through a highly hazardous zone with respect to slope failure. Roadside
24 slope failure is a common problem in the Caspian forest as naturally formed slopes are disturbed
25 by road construction activities. The first attempts to road construction on steep terrains of the
26 Caspian forest date back to the 1980s and early 1990s (Jaafari et al. 2014). History has shown
27 that roads with improper terrain stability assessment in this area can cause significant slope
28 failures and landslides. This trend is expected to continue in future; some estimates suggest that
29 significant portions of the Caspian forest are prone to mass wasting and the forestry activities that
30 regularly happening on this forest have the potential to accelerate landslide rates and magnitudes
31 (IPBO, 2000). Therefore, landslide susceptibility maps are needed, particularly at the basin scale;
32 they are a useful tool to make informed environmental decisions regarding the risks of proposed
33 development (Guzzetti et al. 2006, Conforti et al. 2014).

34 According to Varnes (1978), the term “landslide” describes a wide variety of processes that result
35 in the downward and outward movement of slope-forming materials including rock, soil,
36 artificial fill, or a combination of them. On the other hand, landslide susceptibility can be defined
37 as the probability of spatial occurrence of landslides on the basis of the relationships between
38 distribution and a set of conditioning factors (Guzzetti et al. 2005). Landslide susceptibility
39 assessment allows for the identification of slopes for which failure probability is high and to
40 consequently make prevention and protection decisions accordingly (Guillard and Zezere 2012).
41 Landslide susceptibility assessment can be used in several scientific studies; estimation of the
42 cost of road development and maintenance (Saha et al. 2005), pavement maintenance priority

43 map for highways (Pantha et al. 2010), and prediction of debris flow source areas (Blahut et al.
44 2010).

45 The effectiveness of slope stability studies around the world is apparent from the high prediction
46 results of landslide susceptibility assessment reports from models such as logistic regression
47 (e.g., Pourghasemi et al. 2013a), knowledge-based analytical hierarchy process (AHP) (e.g.,
48 Pourghasemi et al. 2013a, Pourghasemi et al. 2012a), fuzzy logic (e.g., Pourghasemi et al.
49 2012a), artificial neural networks (ANNs) (e.g., Zare et al. 2013, Conforti et al. 2014), support
50 vector machine (SVM) (e.g., Pradhan 2013, Pourghasemi et al. 2013b) and adaptive neuro-fuzzy
51 interface system (ANFIS) (e.g., Pradhan 2013, Bui et al. 2012, Vahidnia et al. 2010).

52 In the case of ANFIS, developed by Jang (1993), a little application to the landslide related
53 studies has been reported (Bui et al. 2012). ANFIS is a multilayer feed-forward network in which
54 each node performs a particular function on incoming signals and has a set of parameters
55 pertaining to this node (Jang 1993). ANFIS combines fuzzy logic and ANNs by utilizing the
56 mathematical properties of ANNs in tuning a rule-based fuzzy inference system that
57 approximates how the human brain processes information (Akib et al. 2014).

58 The main objective of an ANFIS model is to determine the optimum values of the equivalent
59 fuzzy inference system parameters by applying a learning algorithm using input–output datasets.

60 The parameter optimization is done in such a way during the training session that the error
61 between the target and the actual output is minimized. Further information on ANFIS can be
62 found in Jang (1993).

63 Landslide susceptibility assessment involves handling, processing and interpreting a large
64 amount of territorial data. Thus, Geographical Information Systems (GIS) have proved to be very
65 useful in susceptibility assessment (Aleotti and Chowdhury 1999, Ayalew et al. 2005), as it

66 allows frequent updating of the database related to spatial distribution of the landslide events and
67 their predisposing factors, as well as the susceptibility assessment procedures (Aleotti and
68 Chowdhury 1999). In recent years, the use of GIS-based approaches to study landslides are
69 intensively reported; GIS-based frequency ratio and index of entropy models (Jaafari et al., 2014;
70 Pourghasemi et al. 2012b), and GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis (Feizizadeh and
71 Blaschke 2013). Bui et al., (2012) used a GIS-based ANFIS model for LSM in Vietnam. Their
72 results showed that ANFIS can be considered as a robust method for landslide modeling. Pradhan
73 (2013), in a comparative study, addressed the ability of the decision tree, support vector machine
74 and ANFIS models for LSM within a GIS environment. According to the results, all the models
75 faired reasonably well, however, the success rate showed that ANFIS has better prediction
76 capability among all models.

77 In this study, we address the slope failure (landslide) susceptibility assessment in the Caspian
78 forest using ANFIS within a GIS environment. The study is intended to tackle the main causal
79 factors and to delimit the most susceptible zones for slope failure as a useful tool for the
80 engineers involved in road construction and timber harvesting. The produced susceptibility maps
81 are also compared with the known landslide locations according to the area under the curve
82 (AUC) of receiver operator characteristic (ROC) curve in order to test the reliability and accuracy
83 of the approach used. The susceptibility assessment presented in this study enable planners to
84 avoid areas where forestry activities could cause slope failure and helps identify where field-
85 based assessments are necessary.

86

87 **2. Materials and methods**

88 **2.1. Study area characteristics**

89 Our study area is situated in Mazandaran Province, northern Iran. The study area having an
90 approximate area of 52 km² located between 36°29'10" N and 36°32'50" N latitude and 51°40'60"
91 E and 51°48'20" E longitude (Fig. 1). The area is a part of the Educational and Experimental
92 Forest of Tarbiat Modares University (EEFTMU) in the Caspian forest with slope variations
93 between flat and >50°, and altitudes between 160 and 2190 m. Slope shape varies but frequently
94 they represent convex and concave elements and are, mainly, incised by concave valleys. In this
95 area, the stream network flows from the north-east to the south and south-west with a dendritic
96 pattern. Given the proximity to the Caspian Sea, the study area enjoys a humid and mild climate
97 with average annual precipitation between 414 to 879 mm. The average summer and winter
98 temperature are recorded to be 22.5 and 10 °C, respectively. The vegetation cover is quite
99 continuous, formed by deciduous trees with dominant species of *Fagus orientalis* Lipsky,
100 *Carpinus betulus* L., *Acer velutinum* Boiss, and *Quercus castaneifolia* C.A. Mey.

101 The major portion of the study area is underlain by dolomitic limestone. Alborz fault, as the most
102 important fault in the area, is a reverse fault that follow the west-east orientation and dip toward
103 south. This fault is active, and most of earthquakes and landslides which occurred in Mazandaran
104 Province are the result of displacements and the activity of this fault (Darvishzadeh 2004).
105 Therefore, our study area, as one of the most susceptible areas to natural hazards and slope
106 instability, is characterized by the prevalence of slides of shallow translational, deep translational,
107 rotational subtypes, small debris flows and rock falls.

108

109 **2.2. Spatial database construction**

110 **2.2.1. Landslide inventory map**

111 Since landslide occurrences in the past and present are keys to future spatial prediction (Guzzetti
112 et al. 1999), a landslide inventory map is a pre-requisite for such a study (Bui et al. 2012). The
113 landslide inventory map of our study area was compiled by inheriting the landslide locations
114 from aerial photographs interpretation and field-based inspection. In the aerial photographs,
115 historical landslides could be mapped by using evidences such as breaks in the forest canopy,
116 denudes vegetation on the slope, bare soil, and other typical geomorphic characteristics (Pradhan
117 2013, Jaafari et al. 2014). Given the abundant over- and understory vegetation in the study area,
118 we also conducted multiple field surveys and observations to produce a more detailed and
119 reliable landslide inventory map.

120

121 **2.2.2. Slope failure (landslide) conditioning factors**

122 The recognition and mapping of an appropriate set of instability factors related to slope failures
123 require a previous information of main causes of landslides (Guzzetti et al. 1999). In the present
124 study, the conditioning factors were selected among the most commonly used in literature to
125 assessment slope failures susceptibility (Table 1). The significance of these factors in landsliding
126 has explicitly been presented in Jaafari et al. (2014). Incorporation into the GIS was via a 20-m
127 Digital Elevation Model (DEM) of the study area, and the slope degree, slope aspect, altitude,
128 plan curvature, TWI, SPI, STI layers were created from the DEM using ArcGIS and SAGA GIS.
129 Distance to faults and distance to streams were computed using spatial analyst tool of ArcGIS.
130 The geological map prepared by Geological Survey of Iran (GSI) on 1:100,000 scale was used
131 for the present study. The rainfall map was prepared using the mean annual precipitate data from
132 the meteorological station for the study area over last 20 years. Extensive investigations by the

133 Tarbiat Modares University on the study area have been the major source of data associated with
134 NDVI, forest plant community, forest canopy, and timber volume used in the present study.
135 Since raster dataset has enriched capability for spatial analysis, all factor layers were converted
136 into raster format. Given the extent of the study area and the landslide distribution, grid cells
137 having a spatial resolution of 20×20 m (Ozdemir 2011, Bui et al. 2012, Kayastha et al. 2012,
138 Ozdemir and Altural 2013, Jaafari et al. 2014) were selected as the mapping unit, which was
139 small enough to capture the spatial characteristics of landslide susceptibility and large enough to
140 reduce computing complexity.
141 In this study, we also carried out a series of tests by considering different input datasets from the
142 landslide conditioning factors. The purpose of selecting various datasets was to explore the
143 influence of parameter enrichments on the performance of the ANFIS model and, additionally
144 importance of the added parameter on the landslide assessments (Pradhan 2013). From table 2
145 can be seen that dataset-1 includes maximum number of landslide conditioning factors, and it
146 continues to narrow down to dataset-5 (Table 2).

147

148 **2.3. Preparation of training and validation dataset**

149 In landslide modeling, the landslide inventory map need to be split into two subsets for training
150 and validation. Without the splitting, it would not be possible to validate the results (Jaafari et al.
151 2014). In this study, the inventory map was randomly divided into two datasets. Part 1 that
152 contains 70% of the data (73 landslides) used in the training phase of the five ANFIS models.
153 Part 2 is a validation dataset with remaining 30% of the data (31 landslides) for the validation of
154 the models and to estimate their accuracy. All of the 73 landslide locations in the part 1 dataset
155 denoting the presence of landslides were assigned the value of 1. The same number of points

156 denoting the absence of landslide were randomly sampled from the landslide-free area and
157 assigned a value of 0. Values for the 15 landslide conditioning factors were then extracted to
158 build a training dataset (Bui et al. 2012, Pradhan 2013). This dataset contains a total of 146
159 points, with one target variable denoting the landslide presence/absence and the 15 landslide
160 conditioning factors. This dataset was further randomly partitioned into three subsets including:
161 training, testing and checking to develop the ANFIS models (Ghajar et al. 2012). Training set
162 was used to adjust the connections weights, membership functions and model parameters. Testing
163 set was used to evaluate the trained ANFIS performances and generalizations power. Checking
164 set was used to check the performance of the model through the training process and stop the
165 training to avoid over-fitting. This method of data division is recommended to control over-fitting
166 of the models (Jang et al. 1997). In this study, approximately 70% (102 points) of the extracted
167 database was randomly selected as the training dataset, 15% (22 points) as testing dataset, and the
168 remaining 15% (22 points) as the checking dataset. In this study, we used a commercially
169 available canned software, called Neuframe (Neusciences 2000), to select the datasets at random.
170 Due to the different scales of input variables, and in order to increase the speed and accuracy of
171 data processing, input data need to be normalized in the range of 0 and1 before using them in the
172 ANFIS model (Ghajar et al. 2012). For this purpose, the extracted values from landslide
173 conditioning factors were normalized using the normalization formula as follows:

174
$$X_n = \frac{X_i - X_{\min}}{X_{\max} - X_{\min}} \quad (1)$$

175 A part of normalized data used as training, testing and checking the ANFIS model is shown in
176 table 3.

177

178 **2.4. Development the ANFIS models for the spatial prediction of slope failure**

179 In the light of suggestion by Pradhan (2013), we employed type-3 ANFIS model (Takagi and
180 Sugeno 1983) to produce susceptibility maps of our study area. In this type of ANFIS model, the
181 output of each rule is a linear combination of input variables added by a constant term. The final
182 output is the weighted average of each rule's output. In this study, we constructed a total of five
183 ANFIS models to produce susceptibility maps of the study area. To implement ANFIS,
184 MATLAB programming language version R2011a was used. GENFIS1 and GENFIS2 functions
185 are two available methods that have been widely used for generating the initial fuzzy inference
186 system (FIS). The GENFIS1 generates an initial Sugeno-type FIS for ANFIS training using a grid
187 partition, and the GENFIS2 uses a subtractive clustering generates to generate the initial Sugeno-
188 type FIS. As proposed by Chui (1997), due to the large number of input variables considered in
189 our study, GENFIS2 function was used to generate the initial FIS for ANFIS training by first
190 applying subtractive clustering on the data. GENFIS2 accomplished this by extracting a set of
191 rules that models the data behavior.

192 After constructing the Sugeno-type FIS for our five ANFIS models, each model is trained by
193 considering 200 epochs. Finally, the output data obtained from the models were converted to GIS
194 grid data to create the slope failure susceptibility maps.

195

196 **2.5. Validation and comparison of susceptibility maps**

197 Prediction modeling does not have a scientific significance without computing the validity of the
198 results. In this study, the susceptibility assessment results were tested using known landslide
199 locations. Testing was performed by comparing the known landslide location data with the
200 landslide susceptibility map. In order to validate the results of the susceptibility assessment, AUC

201 of ROC curve (Bui et al. 2012, Pourghasemi et al. 2012a, Pradhan 2013, Pourghasemi et al.
202 2013a, Jaafari et al. 2014) was used. The ROC curve is a graphical representation of the trade-off
203 between the false-negative and false-positive rates for every possible cutoff value.
204 The area under the ROC curve (AUC) characterizes the quality of a forecast system by describing
205 the system's ability to anticipate the correct occurrence or non-occurrence of pre-defined
206 "events". The best method has a curve with the largest AUC; the AUC varies between 0 and 1,
207 where 1 indicates perfect prediction, while 0.5 indicates random prediction. The larger the ROC
208 value is, the better the compatibility between dependent and independent variables. The
209 quantitative-qualitative relationship between AUC and prediction accuracy can be classified as
210 follows: 0.9–1, excellent; 0.8–0.9, very good; 0.7–0.8, good; 0.6–0.7, average; and 0.5–0.6, poor
211 (Yesilnacar 2005).

212

213 **2. Results and discussion**

214 A total of 103 landslides that occurred during recent years were detected and mapped through the
215 aerial photographs interpretation and field surveys within 52 km² to assemble a database to
216 evaluate the spatial distribution of slope failures in the study area (Fig. 1). Shallow landslides
217 were dominant, but large deep-seated landslides also observed in the study area.

218 The susceptibility maps produced by the five ANFIS models are shown in Fig. 2a–e. According
219 to Van Westen et al. (2006) the susceptibility classes, categorized with such terms as "very
220 high", "high", "moderate", "low" and "very low" risk, should be defined on the experience
221 of the expert with support from sufficient models and depend on the likelihood that a slide will
222 occur and the consequences that such an event would have for the elements at risk. In our study,
223 each susceptibility map is assigned a set of symbol (I to V) to indicate the likelihood of slope

224 failure (landslide) initiation. A detailed interpretation of susceptibility classification is presented
225 in table 4. From this table, it is seen that the susceptibility classes I, II, III, IV and V range from
226 very low to very high susceptible, providing a relative ranking of the likelihood of a landslide
227 occurring after road construction or timber harvesting. It is worth noting that the assignment and
228 interpretation of the susceptibility classes is subjective and specifically reflects forest
229 management considerations that are applied by the managers who make decision about
230 management purposes. Therefore, other interpretations can also be added to the susceptibility
231 symbol, if necessary. These may include: soil erosion potential, risk of sediment delivery to
232 streams, and the potential for landslide debris to enter streams.

233 Five ANFIS models developed herein offer the possibility to compare the landslide distribution
234 map with each conditioning factor. When ROC curves of these five models were considered
235 together, their overall performances are found to be close to each other. From figures 4 and 5 can
236 be seen that the most successful ANFIS model is model 5, which has much less attributes than
237 model 1–4. According to obtained AUC, model 5 has slightly higher prediction performance
238 (75.75) than the other models (Fig. 4). Therefore, we can conclude here that altitude, slope angle,
239 aspect, and lithology are most suitable conditioning factors for landslide susceptibility mapping
240 in the study area. After ANFIS model 5, which produced the best results, ANFIS model 4 was
241 determined as the second successful model from the viewpoint of AUC criteria (72.48) (Fig. 3
242 and 4). According to Remondo et al. (2003a, b), the best landslide susceptibility models can be
243 produced only with the digital elevation models (DEM)-derived factors. They concluded that
244 some of the landslide conditioning factors, such as the lithology and the land cover (vegetation),
245 improve predictions only slightly. Other factors, such as regolith thickness, do not improve the
246 predictions at all, probably because the variables are not represented accurately enough.

247 However, a different result was reported by Pradhan (2013), who found that the increment on the
248 number of conditioning factors has a positive impact on the overall prediction performance of
249 landslide susceptibility assessment using ANFIS. Given that there is no common guiding
250 principle for selecting landslide conditioning factors (Ayalew et al. 2005), the results are quite
251 different according to various researchers and study areas.

252 Our results suggest that the high and very high susceptibility classes cover more than 50 % of the
253 study area. Due to the dynamic nature of precipitation, deforestation and anthropogenic activities
254 (e.g. a road with steep cuts is constructed in a slope which was considered as low susceptible
255 before), the presented landslide susceptibility maps are subjected to change. Hence, these map
256 needs to be updated continuously depending on the dynamics of changes in the area.

257 There is always a trade-off between the quality of the data and the cost/resources involved and
258 the reliability of the landslide susceptibility assessment. In order to achieve the best quality/cost
259 relation, it is very important to invest in landslide inventory databases (Van Westen et al. 2008).

260

261 **4. Conclusion**

262 This study analyzed the potential of slope failure in Iranian mountain forest using ANFIS models
263 within a GIS environment. The outcome of GIS-based ANFIS application was a set of
264 susceptibility maps, which could be used to predict the stability of slopes from 15 basic factors
265 including slope degree, slope aspect, altitude, lithology, rainfall, distance to faults, distance to
266 streams, plan curvature, TWI, SPI, STI, NDVI, forest plant community, forest canopy, and
267 timber volume. Our findings suggest that all of the five ANFIS models have performed
268 reasonably well with more than $AUC > 70$ prediction performance. Therefore, they are
269 trustworthy for forestry activities and hazard mitigation planning. However, the best model can

270 be produced only through using altitude, slope angle, aspect, and lithology. When the purpose of
271 the study was considered, forest engineers can select one of these models according to their
272 circumstances in order to produce susceptibility maps.

273 The susceptibility assessment of slope failure represent an essential resource of knowledge of our
274 study area for its capacity for supporting individual uses or combination of uses, such as road
275 construction and timber harvesting. Managers and foresters can then make decisions and prepare
276 prescriptions that will have highly predictable results for producing sustainable products,
277 maintaining site quality, and substantially reducing risk of any adverse impacts. Unfortunately,
278 such studies are far from common in the Caspian forest, implying great difficulty for comparative
279 analyses. It is therefore worthwhile to apply the method used in this study to different
280 environmental settings.

281

282 **References**

283 Akib, S., Mohammadhassani, M., Jahangirzadeh, A., 2014: Application of ANFIS and LR in
284 prediction of scour depth in bridges. *Computers and Fluids* 91: 77-86.

285 Aleotti, P., Chowdhury, R., 1999: Landslide hazard assessment: summary review and new
286 perspectives. *Bulletin of Engineering geology and the Environment* 58: 21–44.

287 Ayalew, L., Yamagishi, H., 2005: The application of GIS-based logistic regression for landslide
288 susceptibility mapping in the Kakuda–Yahiko Mountains, Central Japan. *Geomorphology* 65 (1–
289 2): 15–31

290 Blahut, J., van Westen, C.J., Sterlacchini, S., 2010: Analysis of landslide inventories for accurate
291 prediction of debris-flow source areas. *Geomorphology* 119(1): 36-51.

292 Bui, D.T., Pradhan, B., Lofman, O., Revhaug, I., Dick, O.B., 2012a: Landslide susceptibility
293 mapping at Hoa Binh province (Vietnam) using an adaptive neuro fuzzy inference system and
294 GIS. *Computers and Geosciences* 45: 199–211.

295 Chiu, S.L., 1997: An efficient method for extracting fuzzy classification rules from high
296 dimensional data. *Advanced Computational Intelligence* 1: 1–7.

297 Conforti, M., Pascale, S., Robustelli, G., Sdao, F., 2014: Evaluation of prediction capability of
298 the artificial neural networks for mapping landslide susceptibility in the Turbolo River catchment
299 (northern Calabria, Italy). *Catena* 113: 236-250.

300 Darvishzadeh, A., 2004: *Geology of Iran*. Amirkabir Publisher, Tehran (In Persian)

301 Feizizadeh, B., Blaschke, T., 2013: GIS-multicriteria decision analysis for landslide susceptibility
302 mapping: comparing three methods for the Urmia lake basin, Iran. *Natural Hazards* 65: 2105–
303 2128.

304 Ghajar, I., Najafi, A., Torabi, S.A., Khamehchiyan, M., Boston, K., 2012: An Adaptive Network-
305 based Fuzzy Inference System for Rock Share Estimation in Forest Road Construction. *Croatian*
306 *Journal of forest engineering* 33(2): 313-328.

307 Guillard, C., Zezere, J., 2012: Landslide Susceptibility Assessment and Validation in the
308 Framework of Municipal Planning in Portugal: The Case of Loures Municipality. *Environmental*
309 *Management* 50:721–735.

310 Guzzetti, F., Carrara, A., Cardinali, M., Reichenbach, P., 1999: Landslide hazard evaluation: a
311 review of current techniques and their application in a multi-scale study, Central Italy.
312 *Geomorphology* 31: 181–216.

313 Guzzetti, F., Reichenbach, P., Ardizzone, F., Cardinali, M., Galli M., 2006: Estimating the
314 quality of landslide susceptibility models. *Geomorphology* 81:166–184.

315 Guzzetti, F., Reichenbach, P., Cardinali, M., Galli, M., Ardizzone, F., 2005: Probabilistic landslide
316 hazard assessment at the basin scale. *Geomorphology* 72: 272–299.

317 Iranian Plan and Budget Organization (IPBO)., 2000: Guidelines for design, execute and using
318 forest roads No: 131. (2ed.). Office of the Deputy for technical affairs. Bureau of technical affairs
319 and standards, 170 pp

320 Jaafari, A., Najafi, A., Pourghasemi, H.R., Rezaeian, J., Sattarian, A., 2014: GIS-based frequency
321 ratio and index of entropy models for landslide susceptibility assessment in the Caspian forest,
322 northern Iran. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology* 11: 909 – 926.
323 DOI: 10.1007/s13762-013-0464-0

324 Jang, J.S., 1993: ANFIS: adaptive-network-based fuzzy inference system. *Systems, Man and*
325 *Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on* 23(3): 665-685.

326 Jang, J.S.R., Sun, C.T., Mizutani, E., 1997: *Neuro-Fuzzy and Soft Computing: A Computational*
327 *Approach to Learning and Machine Intelligence (Matlab Curriculum Series)*. Prentice Hall.

328 Kayastha, P., Dhital, M.R., De Smedt, F., 2012: Landslide susceptibility mapping using the
329 weight of evidence method in the Tinau watershed, Nepal. *Natural Hazards* 63 (2): 479–498.

330 Neusciences., 2000: Neufame Version 4.0. Neusciences Corp., Southampton. Hampshire, United
331 Kingdom.

332 Ozdemir, A., Altural, T., 2013: A comparative study of frequency ratio, weights of evidence and
333 logistic regression methods for landslide susceptibility mapping: Sultan Mountains, SW Turkey.
334 *Journal of Asian Earth Science* 64: 180-197.

335 Ozdemir, A., 2011: Landslide susceptibility mapping using Bayesian approach in the Sultan
336 Mountains (Aks_ehir, Turkey). *Natural Hazards* 59(3): 1573-1607.

337 Pantha, B.R., Yatabe, R., Bhandary, N.P., 2010: GIS-based highway maintenance prioritization
338 model: an integrated approach for highway maintenance in Nepal mountains. *Journal of*
339 *Transport Geography* 18(3): 426-433.

340 Pourghasemi, H.R., Pradhan, B., Gokceoglu, C., 2012a: Application of fuzzy logic and analytical
341 hierarchy process (AHP) to landslide susceptibility mapping at Haraz watershed, Iran. *Natural*
342 *Hazards* 63(2): 965-996.

343 Pourghasemi, H.R., Mohammady, M., Pradhan, B., 2012b: Landslide susceptibility mapping
344 using index of entropy and conditional probability models in GIS: Safarood Basin, Iran. *Catena*
345 97: 71–84.

346 Pourghasemi, H.R., Moradi, H. R., Aghda, S.F., 2013a: Landslide susceptibility mapping by
347 binary logistic regression, analytical hierarchy process, and statistical index models and
348 assessment of their performances. *Natural Hazards* 69(1): 749-7

349 Pourghasemi, H.R., Jirandeh, A.G., Pradhan, B., Xu, C., Gokceoglu, C., 2013b: Landslide
350 susceptibility mapping using support vector machine and GIS at the Golestan Province,
351 Iran. *Journal of Earth System Science* 122(2): 349-369.

352 Pradhan, B., 2013): A comparative study on the predictive ability of the decision tree, support
353 vector machine and neuro-fuzzy models in landslide susceptibility mapping using
354 GIS. *Computers and Geosciences*, 51, 350-365.

355 Remondo, J., González, A., Díaz de Terán, J.R., Cendrero, A., Fabbri, A., Chung, C.J.F., 2003b:
356 Validation of landslide susceptibility maps; examples and applications from a case study in
357 Northern Spain. *Natural Hazards* 30:437–449.

358 Remondo, J., González-Díez, A., Díaz de Terán, J.R., Cendrero, A., 2003a: Landslide
359 susceptibility models utilizing spatial data analysis techniques. A case study from the Lower
360 Deba Valley, Guipúzcoa (Spain). *Natural Hazards* 30:267–279.

361 Saha, A.K., Arora, M.K., Gupta, R.P., Viridi, M.L., Csaplovics, E., 2005: GIS-based route
362 planning in landslide-prone areas. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*
363 19(10): 1149-1175.

364 Takagi, T., Sugeno, M. (1983): Derivation of fuzzy control rules from human operator's control
365 actions In: *Proceedings of IFAC Symposium on Fuzzy Information, Knowledge Representation*
366 *and Decision Analysis*, p. 55–60.

367 Vahidnia, M.H., Alesheikh, A.A., Alimohammadi, A., Hosseinali, F., 2010: A GIS based neuro-
368 fuzzy procedure for integrating knowledge and data in landslide susceptibility mapping.
369 *Computers and Geosciences* 36(9): 1101–1114.

370 Van Westen, C.J., Castellanos, E., Kuriakose, S.L., 2008: Spatial data for landslide susceptibility,
371 hazard, and vulnerability assessment: an overview. *Engineering Geology* 102(3): 112-131.

372 Van Westen, C.J., Van Asch, T.W., Soeters, R., 2006: Landslide hazard and risk zonation—why
373 is it still so difficult?. *Bulletin of Engineering geology and the Environment* 65(2): 167-184.

374 Varnes, D.J. (1978): Slope movement types and processes. In: Schuster RL, Krizek RJ (eds)
375 Special report 176: landslides: analysis and control, TRB. National Research Council,
376 Washington DC, p 11–33.

377 Yesilnacar, E., Topal, T., 2005: Landslide susceptibility mapping: a comparison of logistic
378 regression and neural networks methods in a medium scale study, Hendek region (Turkey).
379 *Engineering Geology* 79: 251–266.

380 Zare, M., Pourghasemi, H. R., Vafakhah, M., Pradhan, B., 2013: Landslide susceptibility
381 mapping at Vaz Watershed (Iran) using an artificial neural network model: a comparison between
382 multilayer perceptron (MLP) and radial basic function (RBF) algorithms. *Arabian Journal of*
383 *Geosciences*: 6(8): 2873-2888

384

385

386

387

388

389 **List of figures (color figure only for online version)**

390 **Fig. 1** Location of the study area with landslide inventory map

391 **Fig. 2** Susceptibility map produced by: (a) model-1, (b) model-2, (c) model-3, (d) model-4, (e)
392 model-5

393 **Fig. 3** Prediction rate curves for the susceptibility maps produced in this study

394 **Fig. 4** Success rate curves for the susceptibility maps produced in this study

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406 **List of tables**

407 **Table 1** Classification of the 15 slope failure-conditioning factors used in this study

408 **Table 2** The factors list of the datasets from 1 to 5

409 **Table 3** A part of data used for training, testing and checking the ANFIS models

410 **Table 4** Detailed slope failure susceptibility classification

411

412

413

414

415

416

417