



UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

ARCHIVIO DELLA RICERCA

University of Parma Research Repository

Landslide time-of-failure forecast and alert threshold assessment: A generalized criterion

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Original

Landslide time-of-failure forecast and alert threshold assessment: A generalized criterion / Segalini, A.; Valletta, A.; Carri, A.. - In: ENGINEERING GEOLOGY. - ISSN 0013-7952. - 245:(2018), pp. 72-80. [10.1016/j.enggeo.2018.08.003]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11381/2849383 since: 2021-10-13T12:08:47Z

Publisher:

Elsevier B.V.

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.enggeo.2018.08.003

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

Landslide time-of-failure forecast and alert threshold assessment: a generalized criterion

A. Segalini^a, A. Valletta^b, A. Carri^a

^a Università degli Studi di Parma, DIA, Parco Area delle Scienze 181/A, Parma 43124, Italy

^b Sapienza Università di Roma – CERI, Piazzale Aldo Moro 5, Roma 00185, Italy

Corresponding author: A. Segalini – email: andrea.segalini@unipr.it tel: +39 0521905952

ORCID: 0000-0001- 8023-9326

Abstract

The forecast of a landslide's time of failure and the definition of alert thresholds are fundamental aspects in the study of natural hazards. However, these tasks are particularly difficult due to the large number of parameters and factors involved, and are therefore usually performed with a site-specific approach. This work describes an attempt to generalize the behavior of a landslide approaching collapse, with particular attention to the definition of a general criterion to define alert thresholds. The procedure started with the creation of a database of displacement data recorded for historical landslides, then the inverse velocity model was applied to these datasets to evaluate the time of failure under the assumption of linear behavior during the accelerating phase. A model calibration was conducted to best describe the monitored data and highlight any non-linear trend. A curve describing the velocity versus time relationship was then computed for each single slope failure case using the parameter obtained through this operation. In the final step of the study, these curves were processed with a normalization procedure, thus obtaining a dimensionless velocity-related coefficient. This parameter allowed the comparison of different landslide datasets on a single graph, which can be used as a general reference to define alert thresholds for emergency purposes. In order to test the criterion's ability to represent landslide behavior, the procedure was also applied to a different case by simulating progressive data acquisition.

Keywords

Landslides, creep, failure forecast, monitoring data, alert thresholds, EWS

Glossary

t_f : time of failure

EWS: Early Warning System

t : time

u : displacements

InSAR: Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar

v : velocity

A , α : Fukuzono empirical parameters

R^2 : Correlation parameter

GRG: Generalized Reduced Gradient

RMSE: Root Mean Square Error

v_{FV} : velocity computed with the Fukuzono-Voight model

$\mu_{v_{FV}}$: mean of the v_{FV} values

$\sigma_{v_{FV}}$: standard deviation of the v_{FV} values

v_n : normalized velocity

1. Introduction

Within the framework of natural risk management and reduction, the prediction of a landslide occurrence is a particularly relevant task from both a scientific and a socio-cultural point of view. Accurate time-of-failure (t_f) forecasting could be a key element to develop an Early Warning System, in order to avoid or at least reduce damage and human losses. However, this is one of the most challenging problems regarding slope stability analysis, due to the large number of factors and parameters influencing landslide behaviour and its triggering, and has been the main focus of several studies.

A first approach was presented in the early 1960s, when Saito and Uezawa (1961) proposed a method based on the comparison between displacement records and creep rupture curves obtained from load-controlled triaxial tests. Saito went on to present successful applications of this method in further studies (Saito, 1969; 1979). Relevant improvements to Saito's theory were achieved, thereby leading to the development of a phenomenological method by Fukuzono (1985) based on small-scale laboratory tests. Results show that the inverse of displacement velocity decreases with time during the tertiary creep phase, characterized by an acceleration of slope deformation. Thus, the time of failure can be forecasted by locating the point where the line interpolating the monitoring data intercepts the x-axis, corresponding to a theoretical infinite velocity. The effectiveness of this method has been proven by various studies concerning retrospective analysis of different cases, such as open pit mines (Carlà et al., 2017a), experimental man-made slopes (Petley, 2004), and catastrophic natural events (Kilburn and Petley, 2003). More recently, Mufundirwa et al. (2010) proposed another method to assess t_f based on a $t(du/dt) - du/dt$ curve, where u and t indicate displacement and time, respectively. Time-of-failure estimation can be obtained by evaluating the slope of this curve.

Following the development of these methods, several authors discussed the possibility of defining alert thresholds levels. Cruden and Masoumzadeh (1987) proposed three velocity levels, corresponding to three accelerating creep stages, with reference to a specific section of an open-pit mine. The main objective was to define a critical time when evacuation of pit personnel and equipment should begin. Intrieri et al. (2012) approached the task by studying the most critical periods

1 of the entire dataset of the Torgiovanetto landslide, and subsequently derived three different velocity threshold levels to
 2 be implemented in an *ad-hoc* EWS. Crosta and Agliardi (2002) applied Voight’s model in order to define “characteristic
 3 velocity curves” representing the theoretical behaviour of the Ruinon landslide approaching failure. Each curve refers
 4 specifically to a monitored sub-area of the landslide, and can be used to define velocity thresholds: for the specific case
 5 presented in the paper, the authors chose 30- 15- and 7-day alert velocity thresholds. Manconi and Giordan (2015) adopted
 6 a different approach, proposing an EWS where the definition of the alert levels is integrated with a time-of failure-
 7 prediction model. By evaluating the model’s reliability, a specific threshold can be updated thanks to a near-real time
 8 monitoring system.
 9 A generalization procedure is discussed in this paper in order to overcome the site-specific feature associated with these
 10 thresholds. Considering that the computational cost of the evaluation of specific alert levels becomes gradually higher as
 11 the number of monitored landslide increases, the definition of a generalized criterion could prove useful to set appropriate
 12 thresholds according to the case.

13 2. Material and Methods

14 2.1. Time-of-failure forecast methods

15 As previously stated, a series of different methods have been developed to solve the challenging problem of time-of-
 16 failure evaluation. Federico et al. (2012) provided a study where these approaches are investigated from an analytical
 17 point of view, also by taking into consideration different monitoring technologies that can be applied to obtain useful
 18 parameters. Moretto et al. (2017) also studied this subject by examining different monitoring activities related to
 19 historically recorded landslides, and analysed the reliability of four different failure forecast methods (FFMs) based on
 20 the available data. Particular attention has been paid to satellite-based technologies, notably InSAR (Interferometric
 21 Synthetic-Aperture Radar), while other authors have explored different techniques such as Persistent Scatter
 22 Interferometry (Wasowski and Bovenga, 2014) to improve monitoring quality (examples of this approach are presented
 23 in Herrera et al., 2013 and Wasowsky et al., 2014).

24 These methods use different approaches to the time-of-failure evaluation process, but are all based on the assumption that
 25 displacements display continuous acceleration, following a hyperbolic trend before failure occurrence. This behaviour is
 26 called “accelerating creep”, or “tertiary creep”, and is described by the creep theory. Terzaghi (1950) first approached the
 27 correlation between the accelerating phase and landslide movements, and research carried out by other authors identified
 28 the presence of relevant creep deformations before failure (Ter-Stepanian, 1980; Tavenas and Leroeuil, 1981). As for the
 29 ability of each specific method to accurately predict the time of failure of a landslide, Intrieri and Gigli (2016) applied the
 30 three approaches proposed by Saito (1961), Fukuzono (1985) and Mufundirwa (2010) to different cases, also trying to
 31 assess the influence of different factors in the failure forecast process. The effectiveness of each method is represented by
 32 a Predictability Index (PI), ranging from 1 to 5, evaluated for each specific landslide monitored. The results showed a
 33 similar performance of the Saito and Fukuzono models, while the approach proposed by Mufundirwa generally performed
 34 more poorly. The authors noted that the Saito and Fukuzono methods achieved different results in terms of quality with
 35 respect to the specific cases, underlining the independence and non-redundancy of these models.

36 Based on the results reported in literature, which show good effectiveness in time-of-failure forecast, the inverse velocity
 37 method is applied in this paper. Due to its easier applicability, it is also more suited to obtain a faster prediction compared
 38 to other approaches, which can prove to be a crucial factor in guaranteeing EWS efficiency.
 39

40 2.2. Inverse velocity method

41 As previously stated, the inverse velocity method developed by Fukuzono (1985) relies on the interpretation of the tertiary
 42 creep phase, where the material displacements follow an accelerating trend ultimately leading to the landslide collapse.
 43 By studying small-scale models, the author derived proportionality, represented by a power law equation, between the
 44 logarithm of acceleration and the logarithm of velocity. Starting from this hypothesis, the author proposed the following
 45 equation as an instrument to evaluate landslide time of failure:

$$46 \quad \frac{1}{v} = \left(A(\alpha - 1)(t_f - t) \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \quad [1]$$

47
 48 where v represents the surface velocity and t_f is the time of failure. The trend of the inverse-velocity vs time curve depends
 49 on parameter α , which controls the linearity or non-linearity of the plot. As stated by Fukuzono (1985; 1990), the value
 50 of this parameter usually ranges between 1.5 and 2.2 for natural slopes. The hypothesis of linearity, corresponding to $\alpha=2$,
 51 is generally a good assumption to estimate the time of failure, especially when data close to failure are considered for the
 52 analysis (Rose and Hungr, 2007). It is worth noting that, when slopes influenced by man-made structures are considered,
 53 lower values of α are frequently obtained (Bozzano et al. 2014).

1 From a physical point of view, the Fukuzono model was studied in detail and validated by Voight (1988, 1989), who
2 interpreted the equation as a fundamental law governing various forms of material failure. The result is a general
3 relationship describing the behaviour of materials in terminal stage of failure:

$$\ddot{u} = A\dot{u}^\alpha \quad [2]$$

5 where \ddot{u} and \dot{u} are the displacements acceleration and velocity, respectively. As stated by the author, the term u could be
6 interpreted in terms of conventional geodetic observation, seismic quantities or geochemical observation (Voight 1988).
7 Following this line, the same equation has been successfully implemented to predict volcanic eruptions (Voight 1988;
8 1990; Cornelius and Voight 1995).

9 While the inverse velocity method has proven to be an effective and useful resource in different instances, it is necessary
10 to specify that its application must be carefully evaluated depending on the case. In particular, the value of t_f should not
11 be considered as an exact prediction of the landslide collapse, since the method applied generally indicates that the failure
12 is likely in proximity of the intersection point (Carlà et al., 2018). Following this concept, Carlà et al. (2017b) proposed
13 an approach based on long-time and short-time moving average evaluation, aimed to identify the “time window” during
14 which the collapse could take place.

15 Moreover, when applying this procedure to predict the time of failure of a landslide, these considerations regarding the
16 method’s applicability should be taken into account:

- 17 - Since the monitoring activity of slope displacements is only one aspect of a very complex phenomenon (i.e.
18 predisposing factors and driving forces), this method should not be applied in isolation.
- 19 - Generally, the inverse velocity model struggles to represent brittle failures properly, due to the extremely rapid
20 evolution of a rock mass displaying this behaviour. However, as noted by Carlà et al. (2017b), significant
21 improvements to this problem can be achieved by using a high-frequency monitoring system able to accurately
22 represent the accelerating phase.
- 23 - As stated by Intrieri and Gigli (2016), natural or instrumental noise can hinder time-of-failure prediction,
24 therefore data processing operations are recommended to improve the prediction reliability (Mazzanti et al.,
25 2015; Dick et al., 2015).
- 26 - The possibility of trend changes, driven by observable or unknown factors, should always be kept in mind.
27 Because of this, it is recommended to continue the monitoring activity as long as possible prior to failure and to
28 constantly update the model with new data to improve the forecast procedure (Rose and Hungr, 2007).

29
30 Even with its limitations, the approach proposed by Fukuzono has proven to be a successful tool to track the landslide
31 evolution, allowing its integration in different EWSs for risk reduction purposes (Atzeni et al., 2015; Manconi and
32 Giordan, 2016; Sättele et al., 2016). In this paper, the authors applied the inverse velocity method to analyse historical
33 landslides datasets, in order to forecast the time of failure and, subsequently, derive a series of normalized velocity curves.

34 **2.3. Historical landslides collection**

35 The following approach was adopted to achieve the goal of this study:

- 36 - creation of a database including historical landslides reported by scientific literature, complete with pre-failure
37 displacement or velocity data recorded by different monitoring systems;
- 38 - plotting of a graph with this information through digitizing software;
- 39 - application of the Fukuzono model on the dataset in order to forecast the time of failure of the specific landslide;
- 40 - calibration of the A and α parameters of the model to obtain a better interpolation of the recorded dataset;
- 41 - definition of a characteristic velocity curve for each single case describing the landslide’s behaviour during the
42 30 days before failure occurrence;
- 43 - normalization of this curve to assess a generalized series of velocity versus time-to-failure curves.

44 The cases collected (Table 1) show relevant differences, depending on the typology of the system implemented to monitor
45 the landslide evolution. A variation in the quality and frequency of acquisition was observed. Some of the landslides
46 included in the database were monitored for a time long enough to show the transition between the secondary and tertiary
47 creep phase, while other data series were recorded once the accelerating phase had already started. Other relevant
48 differences are present in terms of volume, materials, failure mechanism and triggering factors.

Name	Volume [m ³]	Material	Failure Mechanism	Trigger	Monitoring duration [d]	References
Afton Mine	28x10 ⁶	Rock	Toppling	Excavation, Blasting	68	Glastonbury and Fell, 2002
Asamushi	1x10 ⁵	Rock	Sliding	Weathering	7	Saito, 1969
Betze Post SE	18x10 ⁶	Rock	Compound	Groundwater	45	Rose and Hungr, 2007
Betze Post SW	2x10 ⁶	Rock	Rock Slide	Rainfall	5	Rose and Hungr, 2007
Bomba	12x10 ⁶	Soil	Slump	Excavation	1290	Urciuoli and Picarelli, 2008
Braced up Cliff	1.2x10 ⁴	Rock	Toppling	Frost Action, Snow Melt	1886	Schumm and Chorley, 1964
Cavallerizzo	5x10 ⁶	Rock, Soil	Rock Slide, Earth Flow	Rainfall, Snowfall	7	Iovine et al., 2006
Chuquicamata	4.1x10 ⁶	Rock	Compound	Excavation, Seismic Actions	140	Voight and Kennedy, 1979
Delabole Quarry	-	Rock	Toppling	Rainfall	5900	Boyd et al., 1973
Dosan Line	6x10 ⁴	Rock	Flow	Erosion	3	Saito, 1969
Hogart Pit	2x10 ⁵	Rock	Toppling	Rainfall, Snow Melt, Excavation	285	Brawner and Stacey, 1979
Huanglongxi	3.9x10 ⁵	Rock	-	Rainfall, Human Activities	6	Li et al., 2012
La Chenaula	1.6x10 ⁶	Rock	Roto-Translation	Toe Erosion	912	Noverraz and Bonnard, 1992
La Saxe	8.4x10 ⁶	Rock	Rock Slide	Snow Melt	30	Manconi and Giordan, 2016
Maoxian	18x10 ⁶	Rock	Rock Avalanche	Rainfall	1014	Intrieri et al., 2018
Mt Beni	5x10 ⁶	Rock	Rock Slide, Toppling	Water and Snow	240	Gigli et al., 2011
Nevis Bluff	3.2x10 ⁴	Rock	Rotation	Excavation	272	Brown et al., 1980
Ohto	2x10 ⁵	Rock	Rock Slide	Rainfall (Typhoon)	90	Suwa et al., 2010
Ooigawa	6x10 ⁴	Soil	Earth Flow	Erosion	10	Saito, 1969
Preonzo	2.2x10 ⁵	Rock	Rockfall	Rainfall	12	Geoprævent, 2012
Puigcerçòs	10.12x10 ⁵	Rock	Rockfall	Gradual Degradation	2217	Royà et al., 2015
Selborne	1.8x10 ⁴	Soil	Roto-Translation	Groundwater	400	Petley, 2004
Town of Peace River	-	Rock	Roto-Translation	Rainfall	180	Kim et al., 2010
Tuckabianna West	1.25x10 ⁶	Rock	Translation	Excavation	37	Glastonbury and Fell, 2002
Vajont	270x10 ⁶	Rock	Roto-Translation	Groundwater	70	Sornette et al., 2004
Xintan	30x10 ⁶	Rock	Rock Slide	Rainfall, Groundwater	2550	Keqiang and Sijing, 2006


1 Table 1 - Landslides database collected from scientific literature including details about volume, material, failure mechanism,
2 triggering factors, duration of the monitoring period, and reference

3

4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Since the recorded data are displayed in different units depending on the case, all the datasets were converted into mm/d so as to be able to compare different cases. The monitoring data reported in scientific literature were digitized using the software *Engauge Digitizer*, thus allowing the application of the inverse velocity method and the time-of-failure prediction. An example of this operation is presented in Fig. 1, reporting the displacement-time graph relative to benchmark #5 of the Vajont landslide (after Sornette et al., 2003) and the resultant digitized dataset.




8
9 Fig. 1 - Example of a monitoring dataset digitizing operation. (a) Monitoring displacement vs time graph registered on benchmark #5
10 of the Vajont landslide (after Sornette et al., 2003), where displacements are reported in m; (b) Digitized dataset (in mm)

11 A time-of-failure forecast was performed following the Fukuzono method with the dataset obtained from this step. For
12 each landslide, the predicted time of failure was computed by applying a linear regression corresponding to a value of
13 $\alpha=2$ on the inverse-velocity versus time dataset.

14 As indicated and recommended by the scientific studies previously reported, the forecast model was applied to the
15 accelerating phase to achieve higher accuracy in the time-of-failure prediction. The tertiary creep starting point,
16 corresponding to the first datum of the inverse velocity model, was selected manually with the objective of minimizing
17 the R^2 parameter, thus obtaining a more accurate fitting of the dataset available. Fig. 2 presents an example of this
18 operation, referring to the Vajont benchmark #5 previously mentioned.

19



20
21 Fig. 2 - Example of the linear Fukuzono model application and the corresponding R^2 value, with a detail of the intersection between
22 the linear regression and the x-axis

23

1

2 While the linear regression is considered a good approximation and has been used in different conditions as a valid failure
3 forecasting method, taking into account the non-linear trend could allow a more accurate description of the landslide's
4 behaviour before collapse is reached. For this reason, calibration of the A and α parameters was conducted for each single
5 case after evaluating the time of failure, in order to better fit the monitored data. To achieve this goal, the GRG
6 (Generalized Reduced Gradient) non-linear method implemented in the *Solver* add-in component of Microsoft Excel was
7 used (a detailed review of this method can be found in Lasdon et al., 1974). The variation in parameters aims to minimize
8 the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE).

9

10 2.4. Normalized velocity curves definition

11 Once the parameters of the Fukuzono model had been assessed, the possible behaviour of the landslide approaching
12 failure could be described. In particular, the next step entailed the definition of a theoretical velocity versus time
13 characteristic curve describing the landslide's predicted velocity at a certain temporal distance from collapse. This
14 operation could be carried out under the assumption that the A , α and t_f parameters provide a phenomenological description
15 of the mechanical behaviour of the landslide approaching failure. Crosta and Agliardi (2002) used a similar methodology
16 to define alert velocity thresholds for the Ruinon rockslide, with the main objective to deliver useful information regarding
17 emergency management.

18 These curves resulted from the application of the following equation, derived from the Fukuzono-Voight model (Voight,
19 1988):

$$20 \quad v_{FV} = \left(A(\alpha - 1)(t_f - t) \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \quad [3]$$

21 where $\alpha > 1$, $t_f > t$ and all the aforementioned parameters, relative to each single landslide, are taken into account. A time
22 interval ranging from 0 to 30 days has been chosen in this paper, meaning that the curve represents the theoretical
23 velocities reached by the landslide starting from 30 days before failure to the moment of collapse, identified by the
24 presence of a vertical asymptote ($v_{FV} \rightarrow \infty$).

25 Each curve computed in this way must be considered site-specific, because the model parameters were inferred from the
26 monitoring data of a particular case, and each landslide displayed unique displacement and velocity data. For these
27 reasons, a comparison between velocity curves derived from different landslides is meaningless. To overcome this
28 problem, the next step involved a procedure aimed to normalize the velocity data obtained by applying the model. The
29 result of this operation was a new dimensionless velocity parameter v_n , which would allow a comparison between data
30 acquired from different cases. In particular, the definition of a common trend in landslide evolution could prove very
31 useful in the evaluation of generalized alert velocity thresholds.

32 To achieve this goal, the following formulation was proposed:

$$33 \quad v_n = \frac{v_{FV} - \mu_{v_{FV}}}{\sigma_{v_{FV}}} \quad [4]$$

34 where v_{FV} is the velocity previously obtained by applying Equation 3, while $\mu_{v_{FV}}$ and $\sigma_{v_{FV}}$ are the mean value and the
35 standard deviation of the v_{FV} values represented by the curve, respectively. The application of this procedure returned a
36 normalized-velocity versus time curve, which can be used to define a generalized trend to describe the behaviour of a
37 landslide approaching failure.

38 3. Results and discussion

39 3.1. Time-of-failure forecast

40 In this paper, the prediction of a landslide's time of failure was computed by applying the Fukuzono inverse velocity
41 method, under the hypothesis of linear behaviour near collapse. This assumption was made since its combination of good
42 predictions and simplicity of use has been highlighted in several scientific studies (Rose and Hungr, 2006; Gigli et al.,
43 2011; Dick et al., 2015).

44 Results obtained from the back-analysis on the database of historical landslides, reported in Table 2, show that the linear
45 regression of the datasets referring to the accelerating phase offers a good prediction of the time of failure. Out of the 26
46 cases included in this study, 11 were correctly forecasted by the inverse velocity method, obtaining a predicted time of
47 failure equivalent to the actual day of collapse. Additionally, in 18 of the 26 cases examined the difference between
48 effective and estimated time of failure Δt_f is equal to or less than 3 days. Moreover, a large variability of the A parameter
49 was noted, with a range of three orders of magnitude between extreme values.

50 Another parameter considered to assess the effectiveness of the model is the R^2 coefficient, which provides a measure of
51 the accuracy of the linear regression applied to the datasets. This parameter ranges from 0 to 1, representing no correlation
52 and perfect correlation respectively.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

The results show that 62% of the cases present a value of $R^2 > 0.9$, while 81% are greater than 0.8 and 88% display a value of $R^2 > 0.7$. Small values of the correlation coefficient could be attributed to different factors, such as a landslide's behaviour diverging from linearity (i.e. asymptotic) or insufficient quality and/or quantity of monitoring data. In particular, evidence of inadequate monitoring data was noted throughout the digitizing operation. This aspect affects the accuracy of the model directly, as it performs better when high frequency monitoring data are available. Indeed, a detailed displacement representation could prove fundamental to accurately assess the future behaviour of the landslide.

Name	Actual time of failure [d]	Forecasted time of failure [d]	R^2 [-]	Linear Regression		Non-linear model	
				A	α	A	α
Afton Mine	69	69	0.95	0.0014	2.00	0.0016	1.94
Asamushi	7	7	0.85	0.0046	2.00	0.0056	1.96
Betze Post SE	45	45	0.99	0.0121	2.00	0.0119	2.00
Betze Post SW	5	5	0.99	0.0183	2.00	0.0173	2.01
Bomba	1320	1352	0.86	0.0041	2.00	0.0038	2.15
Braced up Cliff	1910	1904	0.92	0.0529	2.00	0.0548	1.53
Cavallerizzo	6	6	0.99	0.0654	2.00	0.0779	1.96
Chuquicamata	263	263	0.77	0.0006	2.00	0.0004	2.10
Delabole Quarry	5899	5954	0.74	0.0218	2.00	0.0205	1.96
Dosan Line	3	3	0.97	0.0105	2.00	0.0098	2.01
Hogart Pit	291	286	0.97	0.0022	2.00	0.0024	1.97
Huanglongxi	5	5	0.91	0.0151	2.00	0.0109	2.00
La Chenaula	884	890	0.29	0.0821	2.00	0.0767	1.94
La Saxe	21	21	0.95	0.0025	2.00	0.0135	1.77
Maoxian	1018	1020	0.94	0.0827	2.00	0.0777	1.93
Mt Beni	258	260	0.93	0.0002	2.00	0.0015	2.13
Nevis Bluff	287	279	0.98	0.0191	2.00	0.0191	2.00
Ohto	92	91	0.95	0.0303	2.00	0.0400	1.90
Ooigawa	9	9	0.99	0.1216	2.00	0.2813	1.85
Preonzo	13	13	0.64	0.0028	2.00	0.0024	2.03
Puigcercòs	2198	2264	0.88	0.0116	2.00	0.0106	1.94
Selborne	600	597	0.97	0.1495	2.00	0.1570	2.03
Town of Peace River	178	181	0.60	0.1241	2.00	0.1371	2.05
Tuckabianna West	38	37	0.88	0.0426	2.00	0.0343	2.07
Vajont	70	71	0.98	0.0307	2.00	0.0319	1.97
Xintan	2800	2805	0.88	0.0007	2.00	0.0008	2.00


8 Table 2 - Results obtained from the time of failure prediction and calibration procedures for each landslide included in the database

9

10 3.2. Model calibration

11 Calibration of A and α parameters was conducted to obtain a better representation of landslide behaviour in the final stage
 12 of its evolution towards failure (an example of this operation is reported in Fig. 3). This procedure could prove to be a
 13 significant factor since evaluation of the velocity-time curve depends on these parameters, thus a non-linear behaviour
 14 should be taken into consideration. Regarding parameter α , the results acquired from this operation and reported in Table
 15 2 are consistent with the range of values obtained by Fukuzono (1985, 1989), being included within an interval of 1.5-
 16 2.2. While significant variations can be noted, it is worth reporting that for 14 out of 26 cases the absolute variation of α
 17 is less than 0.05 compared to the original $\alpha=2$ value. Furthermore, 19 out of 26 cases reported a variation of the α value
 18 to less than 0.1, while 24 out of 26 featured a $\Delta\alpha < 0.2$. The calibration also showed that the majority of the landslides (13
 19 versus 9) tends to assume a value of $\alpha < 2$, corresponding to a convex trend in the inverse velocity plot. Regarding
 20 parameter A, the calibration showed an increment in the variation with the increasing of the divergence from the linear
 21 behaviour, reaching a difference of one order of magnitude in those cases where a pronounced non-linear trend is present.

22



1

2 Fig. 3 - Comparison between the linear regression (black dashed line) and non-linear curve (red continuous line) obtained from the
 3 calibration procedure, with corresponding A and α parameters. The case presented refers to the La Saxe landslide, studied by Manconi
 4 and Giordan (2016)

5


6 **3.3. Definition and normalization of velocity curves**

7 The parameters obtained from the calibration and the forecasted time of failure t_f were included in Equation 3 to define a
 8 characteristic velocity curve specifically for each case. The result is a curve, ranging from 0 to 30 days, describing the
 9 theoretical velocity value assumed by the landslide at a certain temporal distance from the collapse. As stated before, due
 10 to the variability and uniqueness of the parameters governing the model behaviour, the curves must be considered site-
 11 specific. For this reason, alert thresholds can be accurately assessed only when characteristic curves evaluated from local
 12 data are taken into account.

13 The theoretical velocities resulting from the model application were normalized by applying Equation 4 so as to overcome
 14 this problem. This procedure aims to define a new parameter that could allow the identification of a common trend
 15 between different cases. A time interval ranging from 0 to 30 was chosen to compare the curves, with a time step of 0.5
 16 days, so as to frame all the cases included in the study in a single plot. The result of this operation, as showed in Fig. 4,
 17 is a graph containing a curve for each landslide monitored.

18 The dimensionless parameter obtained from the normalization increases its value with the approach of the collapse,
 19 located at $t=0$ days, where a vertical asymptote is reached. As can be seen from the resulting graph (Fig. 4), the
 20 normalization procedure successfully rescaled the velocity values. Nonetheless, a difference appears when the landslides
 21 approach failure, in particular at $t=10$ days from collapse the curves start to display a peculiar behaviour, which becomes
 22 more evident as the curves approach the vertical asymptote.

23



1
2 Fig. 4 – Normalized-velocity versus time plot, including all the cases considered in the present study

3
4
5 On analysis of the model, the dissimilarity seems to depend of the α parameter, which in the Fukuzono model represents
6 the linearity or non-linearity of the trend. By taking the “linear” curve featuring $\alpha=2$ as reference, it can be noted that,
7 when the non-linear behaviour is defined by a value of $\alpha < 2$, the flex point where the curve changes its trend appears later.
8 A value of $\alpha > 2$ instead leads to an earlier increasing in terms of normalized velocity. The difference compared to the
9 reference case becomes more evident as the behaviour diverges from linearity (i.e. Braced up Cliff in Fig. 4, featuring a
10 value of $\alpha=1.53$). Additionally, one of the features emerging from the normalization of the velocity values is the
11 negligibility of the A parameter, which plays no role in defining the dimensionless velocity curves. This could prove to
12 be a very interesting aspect since this parameter can have a wide range of values, as shown in the present study, and a
13 certain degree of uncertainty in the model is removed by neglecting this term. Following this line, each curve represented
14 in a normalized-velocity versus time plot can be referred to the value of α derived from the calibration of the Fukuzono
15 model, thus setting a generalized graph of reference to assess alert thresholds according to specific needs.

16 4. Application of the generalized criterion

17 In the process of developing the generalized criterion, the complete monitoring dataset was taken into account from the
18 start of the accelerating phase to the last measure available before collapse for each landslide. This approach should not
19 be considered as representative of a real case, where data are gradually acquired with the advancing of the monitoring
20 activity. In order to test the procedure with a more realistic approach, in the following chapter another landslide, not
21 included in the database, is presented and analysed by simulating progressive acquisition of monitoring data. Thanks to
22 this approach, it should be possible to evaluate the efficiency of the criterion proposed and its ability to represent the
23 behaviour of the landslide approaching failure.

24 The procedure will be applied according to the following steps:

- 25 a) Once the first point of the accelerating phase is identified, the following three data are taken into account to
26 provide the starting dataset;
- 27 b) The inverse velocity method is applied to estimate the time-of-failure theoretical value, assuming the
28 hypothesis of linearity in the $1/v - t$ trend;
- 29 c) Equation 3 is applied to compute the theoretical displacement velocities. The formulation includes linear A
30 and α values;
- 31 d) The model calibration is carried out by minimizing the RMSE evaluated between the monitoring data and
32 velocity data computed in the previous step;
- 33 e) The theoretical velocity curve is computed by using the value of t_f evaluated in step b), and model parameters
34 A and α obtained in step d);

- f) By evaluating the mean and standard deviation of the velocity values computed in the previous step, the value obtained from the monitoring activity can be normalized according to Equation 4. This procedure should allow a comparison with the theoretical curve defined by a specific value of the α parameter;
- g) When new monitoring data are available, they are added to the dataset and the procedure is repeated starting from step b).

4.1. The Kagemori Quarry landslide

The slope failure occurred on 20 September 1973 at Kagemori limestone quarry, located in the Saitama prefecture near Tokyo, Japan. Yamaguchi and Shimotani (1986) reported a rockslide slope movement with an estimated volume of 300'000-400'00 m³ of limestone rock debris. According to the authors, the sliding surface observed after collapse was "irregular and complex", probably due to the influence of small-scale slides following the main failure. Fig. 5 reports the displacement dataset used to test the generalized criterion.




Fig. 5 - Displacement recorded at Kagemori Quarry before the collapse (data digitized from Yamaguchi and Shimotani, 1986)

As can be noted from the results of the time-of-failure prediction reported in Table 3, the inverse velocity method increases the forecast quality with the progressive addition of new monitoring data. Specifically, at $t=397.2$ days, the value of t_f estimated by applying a linear regression coincides with the actual failure recorded at $t=404$ days. The two following iterations of the forecast procedure confirm the prediction, displaying the same t_f value. According to these results, an accurate time-of-failure assessment could have been determined approximately 7 days before the actual collapse. Concerning the model calibration, it can be noted that parameters A and α display relatively small variation throughout the evolution of the accelerating phase. In particular, 7 days before the slope failure, the calibration of the α coefficient returns a value of $\alpha=2.05$ which remains constant until the last monitoring data are received. The maximum variation observed for this parameter in previous steps is $\Delta\alpha=0.01$.


Time t [d]	Time of failure t_f [d]	Δt [d]	A [-]	α [-]	v_n
385.5	405.2	19.7	0.0137	2.06	-0.3336
394.1	406.1	12.0	0.0141	2.04	-0.2587
397.2	404.3	7.1	0.0146	2.05	0.1771
399.6	404.2	4.6	0.0148	2.05	0.3056
401.8	404.3	2.5	0.0148	2.05	0.8886

Table 3 - Results obtained from the time-of-failure forecast, model calibration and normalization procedures

The monitoring data available after the onset of acceleration (identified at $t=360$ days) are progressively added to the dataset and normalized by applying the procedure described at the beginning of this chapter. It is important to note that, for each instrumental measure, the values of A and α could change from the ones estimated with the previous dataset. Therefore, it is fundamental to re-evaluate the velocity curve with the new calibrated parameters. This procedure should allow to obtain the updated values of $\mu_{v_{FV}}$ and $\sigma_{v_{FV}}$, to normalize the measured velocity properly.

The resulting non-dimensional coefficients v_n can be compared with the theoretical generalized curve featuring the same value of the α parameter. According to the parameters resulting from the calibration phase, in this case the $\alpha=2.05$ curve

1 is taken into account. Fig. 6 displays a good correspondence between the monitoring data and the curve previously
2 computed, highlighting the effectiveness of the generalized trend to represent the landslide's behaviour.



3
4 Fig. 6 - Comparison between normalized monitoring data and the generalized curve featuring the corresponding a value

5 5. Conclusions and final remarks

6 In this study, a procedure to describe a generalized criterion useful to compare events with different features and to help
7 define alert thresholds has been established. To achieve this goal, a database of historical landslides was created in order
8 to perform a back-analysis on the datasets available. For each single case, the time of failure was computed through the
9 application of the inverse velocity method developed by Fukuzono (1985). The results obtained from this step showed
10 high accuracy of the model under the hypothesis of linearity when applied on the final stage of the landslide evolution,
11 defined by an accelerating trend and described by the tertiary phase of the creep theory. Furthermore, to better adapt the
12 model to the monitored data, calibration of the two empirical parameters A and α was carried out. For the events reported
13 in this study, the values of α are compatible with the standard range relative to natural slopes (1.5 to 2.2); furthermore,
14 the calibrated value of many of the cases is quite close to the linearity reference. With the newly computed parameters, a
15 theoretical curve has been derived for each case, describing the displacement velocity predicted at a certain time before
16 collapse. In order to generalize these curves and compare landslides displaying different features, a normalization
17 procedure was conducted, thus obtaining a new dimensionless parameter. Due to the correspondence between these new
18 values, this operation allowed overcoming the site-specific feature and representing all the landslides included in the
19 database in a single chart. Notably, these curves have no dependence on parameter A , while the variation of parameter α
20 influences their behaviour when approaching collapse. Finally, the criterion was applied to a different case by simulating
21 progressive data acquisition. This analysis evidenced that the method proposed can provide an effective tool to describe
22 the theoretical behaviour of the landslide during the accelerating phase. The results obtained for this specific case indicate
23 that, by analysing the displacement data, the correct time of failure of the Kagemori Quarry landslide could have been
24 predicted about 7 days before the actual collapse.

25
26 While the procedure presented successfully achieved the initial purpose of this paper, it is worth reporting some final
27 considerations about the method described in this study.

28 All the displacements data reported in scientific literature and employed in this study refer to the slope surface, with no
29 information available concerning underground behaviour. This could prove to be an important factor when complex
30 landslides are taken into account, since surface and underground behaviour can be significantly different. Following this
31 approach, Ishizawa et al. (2013) presented a study regarding the effectiveness of underground displacement monitoring
32 on a sand model slope.

33 As stated above, the inverse velocity method must be applied on the accelerating phase of the landslide. However, a
34 universal method to identify the exact point where the transition between secondary and tertiary creep takes place has not
35 been developed yet.

36

6. References

- Atzeni, C., Barla, M., Pieraccini, M., Antolini, F., 2015. Early warning monitoring of natural and engineered slopes with Ground-Based Synthetic-Aperture Radar. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering* (2015) 48:235-246. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00603-014-0554-4>
- Boyd, JM., Hinds, DV., Moy, D., Rogers, C., 1973. Two simple devices for monitoring movements in rock slopes. *Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology and Hydrogeology* (1973), 6(3-4):295-302. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.QJEG.1973.006.03.12>
- Bozzano, F., Cipriani, I., Mazzanti, P., Prestininzi, A., 2014. A field experiment for calibrating landslide time-of-failure prediction functions. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics & Mining Sciences* 67 (2014) 69-77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrmms.2013.12.006>
- Brawner, CO., Stacey, PF., 1979. Hogart Pit slope failure, Ontario, Canada. In *Rockslides and Avalanches*, B; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1979: pp. 691-70. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-41508-0.50029-6>
- Brown, I., Hittinger, M., Goodman, R., 1980. Finite element study of the Nevis Bluff (New Zealand) rock slope failure. *Rock Mechanics*, 12, 231-245 (1980). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01251027>
- Carlà, T., Farina, P., Intrieri, E., Botsialas, K., Casagli, N., 2017a. On the monitoring and early-warning of brittle slope failures in hard rock masses: Examples from an open-pit mine. *Engineering Geology* 228 (2017) 71-81. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2017.08.007>
- Carlà, T., Intrieri, E., Di Traglia, F., Nolesini, T., Gigli, G., Casagli, N., 2017b. Guidelines on the use of inverse velocity method as a tool for setting alarm thresholds and forecasting landslides and structure collapses. *Landslides* (2017) 14:517-534. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-016-0731-5>
- Carlà, T., Macciotta, R., Hendry, M., Martin, D., Edwards, T., Evans, T., Farina, P., Intrieri, E., Casagli, N., 2018. Displacement of a landslide retaining wall and application of an enhanced failure forecasting approach. *Landslides* (2018) 15:489-505. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-017-0887-7>
- Cornelius, R., Voight, B., 1995. Graphical and PC-software analysis of volcano eruption precursors according to the Material Failure Forecast Method (FFM). *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 64 (1995) 295-320. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0273\(94\)00078-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0273(94)00078-U)
- Crosta, GB., Agliardi, F., 2002. How to obtain alert velocity thresholds for large rockslides. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth* 27 (2002) 1557-1565. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-7065\(02\)00177-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-7065(02)00177-8)
- Crosta, GB., Agliardi, F., 2003. Failure forecast for large rock slides by surface displacement measurements. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* 40: 176-191 (2003). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1139/t02-085>
- Cruden, DM., Masoumzadeh, S., 1987 Accelerating creep of the slopes of a coal mine. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering* 20,123-13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01410043>
- Dick, GJ., Eberhardt, E., Gabrejo-Liévano, AG., Stead, D., Rose, ND., 2015. Development of an early-warning time-of-failure analysis methodology for open-pit mine slopes utilizing ground-based slope stability radar monitoring data. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* 52:515-529 (2015). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1139/cgj-2014-0028>
- Federico, A., Popescu, M., Elia, G., Fidelibus, C., Internò, G., Murianni, A., 2012. Prediction of time to slope failure: a general framework. *Environmental Earth Sciences* (2012) 66:245-256. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-011-1231-5>
- Fukuzono, T., 1985. A new method for predicting the failure time of a slope. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference and Field Workshop on Landslides* (Tokyo; 1985). Tokyo University Press. 1985:145-150
- Fukuzono, T., 1989. A simple method for predicting the failure time of a slope using reciprocal of velocity. *Technology for Disaster Prevention*, Science and Technology Agency, Japan. *International Coop Agency, Japan* 1(13):111-128
- Fukuzono, T., 1990. Recent studies on time prediction of slope failure. *Landslide News* 4:9-12
- Geopraevent, 2012. Rockfall monitoring Preonzo: Detailed monitoring and analysis of rock movements by interferometric radar (GB-InSAR). Available online at: www.geopraevent.ch (Last access on January 29th, 2018)
- Gigli, G., Fanti, R., Canuti, P., Casagli, N., 2011. Integration of advanced monitoring and numerical modelling techniques for the complete risk scenario analysis of rockslides: The case of Mt. Beni (Florence, Italy). *Engineering Geology* 120 (2011) 48-59. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2011.03.017>

- 1 Glastonbury, J., Fell, R., 2002. Report on the analysis of the deformation behaviour of excavated rock slopes. School of Civil
2 and Environmental Engineering, University of New South Wales, Report n° R403
3
- 4 Herrera, G., Gutiérrez, F., García-Davalillo, J.C., Guerrero, J., Notti, D., Galve, J.P., Fernández-Merodo, J.A., Cooksley, G., 2013.
5 Multi-sensor advanced DInSAR monitoring of very slow landslides: The Tena Valley case study (Central Spanish Pyrenees).
6 Remote Sensing of Environment, Volume 128, 21 January 2013, pages 31-43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2012.09.020>
- 7 Intrieri, E., Gigli, G., 2016. Landslide forecasting and factors influencing predictability. Natural Hazards and Earth System
8 Sciences, 16, 2501-2510, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-16-2501-2016>
- 9 Intrieri, E., Gigli, G., Mugnai, F., Fanti, R., Casagli, N., 2012. Design and implementation of a landslide early warning system.
10 Engineering Geology 147-148 (2012) 124-136. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2012.07.017>
- 11 Intrieri, E., Raspini, F., Fumagalli, A., Lu, P., Del Conte, S., Farina, P., Allievi, J., Ferretti, A., Casagli, N., 2018. The Maoxian
12 Landslide as seen from space: detecting precursor of failure with Sentinel-1 data. Landslides, January 2018, Vol.15, Issue 1, pp
13 123-133. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-017-0915-7>
- 14 Iovine, G., Petrucci, O., Rizzo, V., Tansi, C., 2006. The March 7th Cavour (Cerzeto) Landslide in Calabria – Southern Italy.
15 IAEG Congress, Nottingham, UK 2006 Paper number 785
16
- 17 Ishizawa, T., Sakai, N., Morohoshi, T., Fukuzono, T., 2013. Effectiveness of underground displacement measurement using
18 inclinometer for prediction of slope failure. Landslides – Journal of the Japan Landslide Society Vol.50, n°6 (2013), November,
19 pp.256-267 (in Japanese). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3313/jls.50.256>
20
- 21 Keqiang, H., Sijing, W., 2006. Double parameter threshold and its formation mechanism of the colluvial landslide: Xintan
22 landslide, China. Environmental Geology 2006, 49, 696-707. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00254-005-0108-x>
23
- 24 Kilburn, C.R.J., Petley, D.N., 2003. Forecasting giant, catastrophic slope collapse: lessons from Vajont, Northern Italy.
25 Geomorphology 54 (2003) 21-32. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-555X\(03\)00052-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-555X(03)00052-7)
26
- 27 Kim, T.H., Cruden, D.M., Martin, D., Froese, C.R., Morgan, A.J., 2010. Landslide movements and their characteristic, Town of
28 Peace River, Alberta. Conference Paper, from 63rd Canadian Geotechnical Conference and 6th Canadian Permafrost Conference,
29 at Calgary, Alberta
30
- 31 Lasdon, L.S., Fox, R.L., Ratner, M.W., 1974. Nonlinear optimization using the generalized reduced gradient method. RAIRO-
32 Operations Research – Recherche Opérationnelle Vol.8 Issue 3, pp. 73-103
33
- 34 Li, X., Jiming, K., Zhenyu, W., 2012. Landslide displacement prediction based on combining method with optimal weight.
35 Natural Hazards (2012) 61: 635-646. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-011-0051-y>
36
- 37 Manconi, A., Giordan, D., 2015. Landslide early warning based on failure forecast models: the example of the Mt. de la Saxe
38 rockslide, northern Italy. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 15, 1639-1644, 2015. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-
39 15-1639-2015](https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-15-1639-2015)
40
- 41 Manconi, A., Giordan, D., 2016. Landslide failure forecast in near-real time. Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk, 2016, Vol.7,
42 n°2, 639-648. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2014.942388>
43
- 44 Mazzanti, P., Bozzano, F., Cipriani, I., Prestininzi, A., 2017. New insights into the temporal prediction of landslides by a
45 terrestrial SAR interferometry monitoring case study. Landslides (2015) 12:55-68. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-014-
46 0469-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-014-0469-x)
- 47 Moretto, S., Bozzano, F., Esposito, C., Mazzanti, P., Rocca, A., 2017. Assessment of landslide pre-failure monitoring and
48 forecasting using satellite SAR interferometry. Geosciences 2017, 7, 36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences7020036>
- 49 Mufundirwa, A., Fujii, Y., Kodama, J., 2010. A new practical method for prediction of geomechanical failure-time. International
50 Journal of Rock Mechanics & Mining Sciences 47 (2010) 1079–1090. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrmm.2010.07.001>
- 51 Noverraz, F., Bonnard, C., 1992. Le glissement rapide de La Chenaula. Internationales Symposium INTERPRAEVENT 1992
52 – Bern, pp. 65-76 (in French)
- 53 Petley, D.N., 2004. The evolution of slope failures: mechanisms of rupture propagation. Natural Hazards and Earth System
54 Science, Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union, 2004, 4 (1), pp.147-152
- 55 Rose, N.D., Hungr, O., 2006. Forecasting potential rock slope failure in open pit mines – contingency planning and remediation.
56 International journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Science, February 17, 2006

- 1 Rose, ND., Hungr, O., 2007. Forecasting potential rock slope failure in open pit mines using the inverse-velocity method.
2 International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Science 2007; 44:308–32. DOI:
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrmms.2006.07.014>
- 4 Royán, MJ., Abellán, A., Vilaplana, JM., 2015. Progressive failure leading to the 3 December 2013 rockfall at Puigcercós scarp
5 (Catalonia, Spain). Landslides (2015) 12:585-595. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-015-0573-6>
6
- 7 Saito, M., 1969. Forecasting time of slope failure by tertiary creep. In Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on
8 Soil Mechanics Foundation Engineering, 1969; 2:677–683
- 9 Saito, M., 1979. Evidential study on forecasting occurrence of slope failure. Trans. of the Dept. of Geomech. - Armenian
10 Academy of Sciences, Yerevan, URSS
- 11 Saito, M., Uezawa, H., 1961. Failure of soil due to creep. In Fifth International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation
12 Engineering, 1: 315-318, Paris
- 13 Sättele, M., Kautblatter, M., Bründl, M., Straub, D., 2016. Forecasting rock slope failure: how reliable and effective are warning
14 systems? Landslides (2016) 13:737. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-015-0605-2>
15
- 16 Schumm, SA., Chorley, RJ., 1964. The fall of Threatening Rock. American Journal of Science, Vol. 262, November 1964,
17 1041-1054. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2475/ajs.262.9.1041>
18
- 19 Sornette, D., Helmstetter, A., Andersen, JV., Gluzman, S., Grasso, JR., Pisarenko, V., 2004. Towards landslide predictions: two
20 case studies. Physica A 338 (2004) 605-632. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2004.02.065>
21
- 22 Suwa, H., Mizuno, T., Ishii, T., 2010. Prediction of a landslide and analysis monitoring of slide motion with reference to the
23 004 Ohto slide in Nara, Japan. Geomorphology 124 (2010) 157-163
24
- 25 Tavenas, F., Leroueil, S., 1981. Creep and failure of slopes in clays. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 18 (1):106-120. DOI:
26 <https://doi.org/10.1139/t81-010>
- 27 Ter-Stepanian, G., 1980. Creep on natural slopes and cutting. In Proceedings of the third International Symposium on
28 Landslides, 2:95-108, New Delhi
- 29 Terzaghi, K., 1950. Mechanism of landslides. In Application of Geology to Engineering Practice (Berkeley Volume); Geological
30 Society of America: Washington, DC, USA, 1950; pp. 83–123
- 31 Urciuoli, G., Picarelli, L., 2008. Interaction between landslides and man-made works. Landslides and Engineered Slopes – Chen
32 et al. (eds) 2008, Taylor & Francis Group, London
33
- 34 Voight, B., 1988. A method for prediction of volcanic eruptions. Nature 1988; 332:125-130. DOI:
35 <https://doi.org/10.1038/332125a0>
- 36 Voight, B., 1989. A relation to describe rate-dependent material failure. Science 1989; 243:200–203. DOI:
37 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.243.4888.200>
- 38 Voight, B., 1990. The 1985 Nevado del Ruiz volcano catastrophe: anatomy and retrospection. Journal of Volcanology and
39 Geothermal Research, 44 (1990) 349-386. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0273\(90\)90027-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0273(90)90027-D)
40
- 41 Voight, B., Kennedy, BA., 1979. Slope failure of 1967-1969, Chuquicamata mine, Chile. In Developments of Geotechnical
42 Engineering, Volume 14, part B, 1979, Pages 595-632. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-41508-0.50025-9>
43
- 44 Wasowski, J., Bovenga, F., 2014. Investigating landslides and unstable slopes with satellite Multi Temporal Interferometry:
45 Current issues and future perspectives. Engineering Geology 174 (2014) 103-138. DOI:
46 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2014.03.003>
47
- 48 Wasowski, J., Bovenga, F., Dijkstra, T., Xingmin, M., Nutricato, R., Chiaradia, MT., 2014. Interferometry provides insight on
49 slope deformations and landslides activity in the mountains of Zhouqu, Gansu, China. In Sassa K, Canuti P, Yin Y. (eds)
50 Landslide Science for a Safer Geoenvironment. Springer, Cham. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05050-8_56
51
- 52 Yamaguchi, U., Shimotani, T., 1986. A case study of slope failure in a limestone quarry. International Journal of Rock
53 Mechanics and Mining Sciences & Geomechanics Abstracts, Volume 23, Issue 1, February 1986, Pages 95-104. DOI:
54 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-9062\(86\)91670-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-9062(86)91670-0)
55
56
57
58
59

1 **FIGURES DIMENSION AND COLOUR**

Fig.	Column-fitting width	Colour
1	2	Yes
2	2	Yes
3	1.5	Yes
4	2	Yes
5	1.5	Yes
6	2	Yes

2