

LB/TH/22/2026

TH6227

GEOTECHNICAL RISK ASSESSMENT OF LANDSLIDES ON NATURAL SLOPES

Milinda Prasad Amarasinghe

218092G

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

October 2025

GEOTECHNICAL RISK ASSESSMENT OF LANDSLIDES ON NATURAL SLOPES

Milinda Prasad Amarasinghe

218092G

Thesis/Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

October 2025

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any other University or Institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date: 16/03/2026

The above candidate has carried out research for the PhD thesis under my supervision. I confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and correct.

Name of Supervisor: Emeritus Professor S. A. S. Kulathilaka

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 16/3/2026

ABSTRACT

Landslides are one of the most frequent natural hazards that affect humans, causing significant damage to properties and resulting in fatalities and injuries. Rainfall has been identified as the major triggering factor for landslides, and the tropical region is severely affected due to heavy rainfalls and favourable geological and hydrological conditions prevailing in these regions. Moreover, the landslide impact tends to be severe due to the high economic, political and social vulnerability in the region. However, limited studies have delved into the complex conditions that prevail in these regions. In this thesis, an extensive review was conducted on landslide risk assessment and management. Special emphasis was placed on Sri Lanka as a representative tropical country where landslides are prevalent due to rainfall, complex subsurface conditions, and it is still developing, where many challenges exist, and limited studies have been conducted. This study aimed to assess the landslide susceptibility and hazard for regions with limited data, integrating heuristic methods, process-based methods and machine learning (ML) for landslide prediction, zonation and threshold development. Initially, the applicability of well-established process-based methods was investigated using case studies to predict landslides. Then, using these methods, the critical slopes within a catchment area were identified, and process-based slope stability analysis was conducted, identifying the failure initiation area with extreme event rainfall conditions. Then the runout area for these critical slopes was determined using process-based runout assessment with the initiation area identified. Finally, a framework was developed based on process-based parametric analysis integrated with ML for slope scale prediction of failure and zonation as a quick tool for predicting the landslide hazards. This research delivers robust, scalable, and data-efficient regional landslide risk assessment tools, particularly valuable in data-scarce or resource-constrained settings. Its strong predictive capability and practical adaptability enhance its potential for integration into landslide risk management.

Keywords: landslides, susceptibility, hazard, limit equilibrium, machine learning, transient seepage

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my beloved family, whose unwavering support, patience, and encouragement have carried me through every challenge and your belief in me has been my greatest strength.

To my teachers and supervisors, for your wisdom, patience, and belief in my potential. Your encouragement lit the path when I struggled to see it myself.

This work is a tribute to the kind-hearted people of my beautiful island nation, Sri Lanka, for their resilience and generosity. Your commitment to free education, funded through your hard-earned taxes, has given me and countless others the chance to dream beyond our circumstances. Amidst hardship and uncertainty, you have built bridges of opportunity. I carry your spirit and pride with me in every word of this thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my gratitude to my supervisors for the project, Emeritus Professor S. A. S. Kulathilaka from University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka; Professor Dilan Robert and Professor Annan Zhou from RMIT University, Australia; and Dr H.A.G. Jayathissa from National Building Research Organisation, Sri Lanka, for their unwavering support, guidance and supervision throughout the PhD journey. Their patience with my mistakes, willingness to listen to my endless questions and thoughts on different aspects of research, supporting me through hard times and encouraging me all the way up to this point is invaluable.

I sincerely appreciate the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, Department of Civil and Infrastructure Engineering, School of Engineering of RMIT University, for granting me the opportunity to undertake this PhD program and providing me with the research scholarship that enabled me to pursue this journey. I am incredibly thankful for the two principal supervisors from the two institutions, Emeritus Professor S.A.S. Kulathilaka and Professor Dilan Robert, for generously adjusting their busy schedules for weekly discussions and offering the flexibility I needed to pursue this work. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Professor U.P. Nawagamuwa and Professor L.I.N. De Silva of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for their valuable feedback and insightful comments that helped improve the quality of this project. Their constant encouragement has been instrumental in motivating me to pursue and stay committed to this path. I thank the non-academic staff of the Geotechnical Engineering laboratory of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for their facilitation and assistance with the laboratory work.

I greatly appreciate the support from the National Building Research Organisation for their role as the industry partner in the project. Without their support, this work could not have been a success. I would like to convey my utmost respect and appreciation to the Director General of NBRO, Dr Asiri Karunawardene, for his steadfast support for this project. I extend my sincere thanks to the Director of the Geotechnical Engineering Division of NBRO, Mr K.N. Bandara, for his invaluable guidance and assistance in organising field investigations and facilitating essential resources even under strict economic restrictions due to the economic crisis prevailed in Sri Lanka. His continued

support has been a blessing for this program. Special thanks should go to Mr. Suranga Dissanayake for his flexibility in arranging the field investigation teams for the research work at the times I needed. I thank Mrs. Hasali Hemasinghe for providing me with guidance on the GIS platform and the required data for the project. I thank my colleagues at NBRO Lilanka, Buddhika, Wathsala, Thamali, Gangani, Aruna, Mihira, Sanchitha, Manuja, Raneesha, Darsha, Dileesha, Lasanda and Lahiru for their consistent support, encouragement, and help with accessing critical project data. Moreover, the laboratory staff and field investigation team of the NBRO, Sri Lanka, are greatly appreciated for their support and for facilitating me in sample collection and laboratory experiments.

To my father, Sirimewan Amarasinghe, and my mother, Chandrika Nissanka, who I owe everything. Their unwavering love and belief in me have been my foundation. Their support in good times and bad times, knowing that they are there to catch me if I fall, has been the strength in my life. I thank my sister, Gayani Amarasinghe, her husband, Lakshan Dissanayake and my brother, Kalana Amarasinghe, for being with me throughout the journey, encouraging me to pursue this path. I also thank my parents-in-law, relatives and my extended family for always supporting me, encouraging me and cheering me on to my success. Thanks to the many friends who supported me, whether in Sri Lanka, Australia, or across the world, for your words of encouragement, late-night conversations, and gestures that kept me going.

Most importantly, I express my heartfelt gratitude to my beloved wife, Bimali Dilhara. Her unwavering support, countless sacrifices, and constant reassurance during the most difficult moments have made this achievement possible. She put aside her own dreams and career to stand by me, and for that, I am forever grateful.

I extend my deepest respect to all my teachers and lecturers who have contributed to my academic and personal development over the years. I am eternally indebted to the people of Sri Lanka, whose support through free education and healthcare empowered me to pursue this path. It is through this system that I was given the wings to fly. Finally, I extend my heartfelt thanks to everyone who has been part of my life's journey. Each of you has shaped me in your own way, and I carry a piece of that with me always.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xxii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxiv
CHAPTER 1	1
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Research Questions	5
1.3 Significance of the Study	5
1.4 Aims and Objectives	9
1.5 Expected Research Outcomes	10
1.6 Research Scope.....	11
1.7 Structure of the Thesis.....	11
CHAPTER 2	13
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	13
2.1 Overview	13
2.2 Landslides.....	14
2.3 Impact of Landslides	20
2.3.1 Global Landslide Databases.....	22
2.4 Spatial and Temporal Distribution of Landslides.....	25
2.4.1 Spatial and Temporal Distribution of Rainfall for Sri Lanka	28

2.5	Factors Affecting the Landslide Mechanism.....	32
2.5.1	The Effect of Geological Structures on Landslides	34
2.5.2	Effects of Soil Formations and their Characteristics for Landslides in the Tropics.....	38
2.5.3	Ground Conditions in Sri Lanka and the Effect on Landslides	45
2.5.4	Landslide Hydrology.....	46
2.5.5	Treatment of Anisotropy in Residual Soil Slopes.....	51
2.6	Landslide Risk Assessment	53
2.6.1	Scope Definition, Susceptibility, and Hazard Assessment	55
2.6.2	Consequence Analysis	62
2.6.3	Risk Estimation	62
2.6.4	Risk Evaluation	63
2.7	Landslide Risk Management	65
2.7.1	Reducing the Likelihood of Landslides	68
2.7.1.1	Slope Geometry Modification.....	69
2.7.1.2	Surface and Subsurface Drainage	70
2.7.2	Retention Structures and Internal Slope Reinforcements	76
2.7.2.1	Controlling Landslide Movements.....	77
2.7.2.2	Monitoring and Landslide Early Warning.....	77
2.7.3	Case Studies for Landslide Remediation Measures Used in Rainfall-Induced Landslides.....	80
2.8	Quantitative Landslide Susceptibility Assessment.....	88
2.8.1	Different Infiltration Models.....	89
2.8.2	Slope Stability Models	94
2.8.3	Reliability Based Designs	100
2.8.3.1	Reliability Methods and Applications in Slope Stability	101
2.8.4	Landslide Runout Analysis	102
2.8.4.1	Empirical Methods	104

2.8.4.2	Numerical Models	106
2.8.5	Landslide Susceptibility Using Machine Learning	113
2.8.5.1	Logistic Regression (LR)	117
2.8.5.2	Artificial Neural Network (ANN)	117
2.8.5.3	Random Forest (RAF)	119
2.8.5.4	Support Vector Machine (SVM)	121
2.8.5.5	Performance Evaluation	122
2.9	Summary and Research Gaps	125
2.9.1	Summary	125
2.9.2	Research Gaps	127
CHAPTER 3		128
3	METHODOLOGY	128
3.1	Overview	128
3.2	Stage 1: Slope Stability Evaluation of Heterogeneous Unsaturated Soil Slopes Based on Case Studies of Rainfall-Induced Landslides	129
3.3	Stage II: Process-Based Landslide Susceptibility Identification for a Catchment Area and Rainfall Threshold Development	132
3.4	Stage III: Prediction of Rainfall-Induced Shallow Landslide Runout Integrating Hydromechanical Slope Stability Analysis	135
3.5	Stage IV: Integrating Parametric Hydromechanical Slope Stability Analysis with Machine Learning for Landslide Susceptibility Mapping	136
CHAPTER 4		139
4	STAGE I- SLOPE STABILITY EVALUATION OF HETEROGENEOUS UNSATURATED SOIL SLOPES BASED ON CASE STUDIES OF RAINFALL- INDUCED LANDSLIDES	139
4.1	Overview	139
4.2	Detailed Methodology	139
4.2.1	Site Selection for the Case Study	139
4.2.1.1	Case study I	141

4.2.1.2	Case study II.....	144
4.2.2	Material Properties	147
4.2.2.1	Sample Collection for Laboratory Testing	147
4.2.2.2	Material Testing.....	149
In-situ Density Test		149
Index Testing		150
Shear Strength Parameters		152
Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity.....		154
SWCC and HCF Determination.....		154
4.2.3	Rainfall Event.....	159
4.2.4	Transient Seepage Analysis	160
4.2.5	Slope Stability Analysis	165
4.3	Results	168
4.3.1	Failure Analysis of Case study I	168
4.3.1.1	Slope Water Storage.....	168
4.3.1.2	Pore Water Pressure Variation with the Rainfall Event.....	169
4.3.1.3	Failure Mechanism with the Rainfall Event	173
4.3.2	Failure Analysis of Case study II.....	178
4.3.2.1	Slope Water Storage.....	178
4.3.2.2	Pore Water Pressure Variation with Different Rainfall Patterns ..	178
4.3.2.3	Failure Mechanism with the Rainfall Event	182
4.3.3	Comparison of the Results	187
4.3.3.1	Slope Water Storage and Pore Pressure Variation Under Rainfall	187
4.3.3.2	Failure Mechanism of Colluvial Soil	188
4.4	Chapter Summary	190
CHAPTER 5		192
5	STAGE II- LANDSLIDE HAZARD EVALUATION FOR A CATCHMENT AREA UNDER EXTREME RAINFALL EVENTS	192
5.1	Overview	192
5.2	Detailed Methodology	192

5.2.1	Selection of the Catchment Area.....	192
5.2.1.1	Data Availability.....	192
5.2.1.2	Catchment Delineation.....	193
5.2.1.3	Catchment Area.....	195
5.2.1.4	Landslides in the Catchment Area.....	196
5.2.2	Sample Collection	197
5.2.3	Material Testing	198
5.2.4	Extreme Rainfall Events	203
5.2.5	Selection of Critical Slopes for Slope Stability	210
5.2.5.1	Currently Available Susceptibility Maps for the Catchment Area.....	210
5.2.5.2	Geomorphological Statistical Map.....	211
5.2.5.3	Comparison of the Two Susceptibility Maps and Selection of Critical Slopes	219
5.2.6	Hydromechanical Slope Stability Evaluation of Critical Slopes	219
5.2.7	Probabilistic Analysis	221
5.3	Validation Slope Studies	222
5.4	Slope Stability and Hazard Classification Based on Probability for the Critical Sections	231
5.5	FoS Variation with the Temporal Rainfall Distribution.....	239
5.6	Rainfall Threshold for the Catchment Area	241
5.7	Setting up the Landslide Area.	242
5.8	Chapter Summary	246
CHAPTER 6		248
6	STAGE III- PREDICTION OF RAINFALL-INDUCED SHALLOW LANDSLIDE RUNOUT INTEGRATING HYDROMECHANICAL SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS	248
6.1	Overview	248
6.2	Detailed Methodology	248
6.2.1	Runout Assessment Using the LS-RAPID Software Tool.....	248

6.2.2	Ring Shear Test Material Properties	251
6.2.3	Initiation Area	253
6.2.4	Pore Pressures	254
6.2.5	Verification of the Landslide Runout Analysis.....	255
6.2.6	Prediction of Landslide Runout Extent for the Critical Slopes.....	257
6.3	Results	258
6.3.1	Pore Water Pressure	258
6.3.2	Validation of the Runout Framework	260
6.3.3	Prediction of Landslide Runout	263
6.4	Chapter Summary	274
CHAPTER 7		276
7	STAGE IV- INTEGRATING PARAMETRIC HYDROMECHANICAL SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS WITH MACHINE LEARNING FOR LANDSLIDE SUSCEPTIBILITY MAPPING	276
7.1	Overview	276
7.2	Detailed Methodology	277
7.2.1	Parameter Selection.....	277
7.2.2	Numerical Parametric Analysis.....	280
7.2.3	Machine Learning	282
7.2.3.1	Classification of Slopes Using Machine Learning.....	282
7.2.3.2	The Use of ANN for the Prediction of FoS and PoF	284
7.2.3.3	Performance Evaluation for Classification and Regression.....	285
7.2.4	GIS and the Parameter Development for the Catchment Area	285
7.3	Results	288
7.3.1	Numerical Parametric Analysis Results.....	288
7.3.2	Classification.....	290
7.3.3	ANN Model for the Prediction of FoS and PoF.....	293

7.3.4	Sensitivity Analysis.....	295
7.3.5	Prediction of Landslide Susceptibility Parameters for the Catchment Area	297
7.3.6	Verification of the Map.....	301
7.4	Chapter Summary	303
CHAPTER 8		305
8	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	305
8.1	Overview	305
8.2	Major Conclusions	305
8.2.1	Stage I: Slope Stability Evaluation of Heterogeneous Unsaturated Soil Slopes Based on Case Studies of Rainfall-induced Landslides	305
8.2.2	Stage II: Landslide Hazard Evaluation for a Catchment Area Under Extreme Rainfall Events	307
8.2.3	Stage III: Prediction of Rainfall-induced Shallow Landslide Runout Integrating Hydromechanical Slope Stability Analysis	308
8.2.4	Stage IV: Integrating Parametric Hydromechanical Slope Stability Analysis with Machine Learning for Landslide Susceptibility Mapping	309
8.3	Contribution to the Field of Knowledge.....	311
8.4	Recommendations for Future Research	312
REFERENCES.....		314
ANNEXURES		359
Annexure A: List of Publications.....		359
Annexure B: Results for Parametric Analysis and Hyperparameter Tuning of Machine Learning		360

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Destructive potential of landslides (modified after National Building Research Organisation (2023))	1
Figure 2.1: Framework for the literature review	14
Figure 2.2: Landslide classification based on the type of movement and materials based on Varnes 1978 classification (British Geological Survey) Reproduced with the permission of the British Geological Survey © UKRI 2025. All Rights Reserved... 15	
Figure 2.3: Classification of the impact of landslides (adapted from Alimohammadlou et al. (2013)).....	20
Figure 2.4: The rain-induced landslide distribution from the GFLD (adapted from Froude and Petley (2018)).....	26
Figure 2.5: Variation of the monthly percentage of fatal landslide distribution and mean monthly rainfall for (a). South Asia, (b). East Asia, (c). South East Asia, (d). Central America, (e). South America & (f). Caribbean. (Data from Froude and Petley (2018); Petley (2010); Sepúlveda and Petley (2015); UNIDSR (2024))	28
Figure 2.6: The distribution of (a). Average annual rainfall (in mm), (b). Elevation range and the climate zones, and (c) Provincial boundaries (adapted from Kumarihamy et al. (2022)).....	30
Figure 2.7: Variation of monthly percentage of fatal landslides and mean monthly rainfall for Sri Lanka and different administrative provinces ((a). Sri Lanka, (b). Distribution of fatal landslides, (c). Sabaragamuwa, (d). Uva, (e). Central, (f). Southern, (g). Western, (h). Northwestern.) (Data from UNIDSR (2024))	31
Figure 2.8: Landslide fatalities between 1974 and 2024 (Data from UNIDSR (2024))	32
Figure 2.9: Different landslide causative factors (adapted from Cruden and Varnes (1996)).....	33
Figure 2.10: Rock joints and the discolouration due to weathering in gneissic rock.	35
Figure 2.11: (a). Feldspar-rich weathered rock formations form whitish clay (b). thinly banded rock foliations	37

Figure 2.12: Different structural features in metamorphic rock formations (a). bedding planes arranged in parallel orientation, (b). competent charnockitic rock remains unweathered (c) the charnockite boudinage remains unweathered within the weathered, less competent layers, resulting in the heterogeneous soil profile and (d). tension cracks appeared due to the weakening of the subsurface due to heterogeneity and pore water pressure.....	38
Figure 2.13: (a). weathering grade and movement type relationship (modified after Migoñ (2010) and (b) a typical weathering profile.	40
Figure 2.14: Relict discontinuities (a). Closely spaced joints infilled with loose material(b) sliding block failure along relict discontinuities.	43
Figure 2.15: Schematic illustration of the effect of rainfall on pore pressure distribution in soil slopes.....	49
Figure 2.16: Framework for landslide risk management (modified after Australian Geomechanics Society (2000); Fell et al. (2005))	55
Figure 2.17: The landslide susceptibility zones and Guidelines for developments in Sri Lanka (modified from Landslide Studies Services Division (1995))	61
Figure 2.18: Proposed landslide risk criteria (F-N criteria) for landslides and boulder falls from natural terrains in Hong Kong (adapted from Geotechnical Engineering Office (1998)).....	64
Figure 2.19: Landslide risk treatment strategies	65
Figure 2.20: Methods for landslide remediation	69
Figure 2.21: Different mitigation and movement control measures (a). vegetation and surface cover, (b). trench drain construction, (c). radial sub-horizontal drains, (d). inside of the drainage well during drilling for sub-horizontal drains, (e). drainage well, (f). surface drainage with retaining structures (g). slope reinforcement with soil nailing and surface drainage with vegetation, (h). anchor reinforcement, (i). retention of rock, (j). steel fence, and (k). hanger nets (images from Sri Lanka).....	71
Figure 2.22: Schematic illustration of surface and subsurface drainage measures that can be implemented.....	74

Figure 2.23: Schematic illustration of (a) rectification drainage measures at Watawala landslide & (b) monitoring instrumentation and drainage measures at Badulusirigama landslide (modified after Chandler and Broise (2000); Kankanamge (2020))	75
Figure 2.24: Watawala landslide (a) current condition of the railway track, (b) water flowing through the directional drains at the toe and (c). Regular maintenance work to prevent clogging of the drains.....	82
Figure 2.25: Monitoring data for the Badulusirigama landslide before and after countermeasures. (a). extensometer readings, (b). groundwater level and rainfall (c). inclinometer BB-2 vertical profile, displacement profile and rainfall and (modified after Technical Cooperation for Landslide Mitigation Project, 2018).....	84
Figure 2.26: Rectification measures at the Ginigathhena landslide.....	85
Figure 2.27: Kahagolla landslide (a). rectification measures implemented at the site, (b). locations for the monitoring instruments & (c). monitoring data before and after constructing countermeasures.	86
Figure 2.28: Variation in the coefficient of permeability and volumetric water content in unsaturated soil (adapted from Fredlund (1995))	92
Figure 2.29: Schematic illustration of different zones in a landslide runout (adapted from Mitchell et al. (2020)).....	103
Figure 2.30: Schematic representation of the conceptual relationship for the angle of reach and the exceedance probability concept based on the empirical approach (adapted from McDougall (2017)).....	105
Figure 2.31: (a) Model architecture for ANN with two hidden layers and (b) neuron model (adapted from Zhou (2021)).....	118
Figure 2.32: Activation functions (a) Hyperbolic Tangent Sigmoid (Tanh), (b) Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU), (c) Logistic Sigmoid (Sigmoid) and (d) Linear function (adapted from Zhou (2021)).....	119
Figure 2.33: RAF model with multiple decision trees (adapted from Merghadi et al. (2020)).....	120
Figure 2.34: (a) linear classification of 2D data in SVM and (b) conversion from the input space to feature space (adapted from Yao et al. (2008)).....	122

Figure 2.35: Confusion matrix (adapted from Qi and Tang (2018))	123
Figure 3.1: Overall framework for the methodology	129
Figure 3.2: Framework for Stage I	130
Figure 3.3: The framework used for hydromechanical slope stability analysis.....	130
Figure 3.4: Framework for stage II	133
Figure 3.5: Framework for Stage III	136
Figure 3.6: Framework for Stage IV	137
Figure 4.1: Landslide locations	140
Figure 4.2: (a) layout plan, borehole locations and (b) cross-section for Case study I (Kithulgala Landslide)	142
Figure 4.3: (a) subsidence in the footpath, (b) subsidence in the highway, (c) relative movements in the soil compared to the wall and (d) cracks in the wall due to movement.....	144
Figure 4.4: (a) layout plan, borehole locations and (b) cross-section for Case study II (Sobasiripura landslide)	145
Figure 4.5: (a) Tension cracks at the crown of the slide & (b) colluvium layers and the scar for the slide.	146
Figure 4.6: Undisturbed box sample collection and sealing the surface with wax to prevent moisture loss.....	148
Figure 4.7: Borehole samples illustrating the subsurface soil layers, (a) Kithulgala BH02 and (b) Sobasiripura BH03	148
Figure 4.8: In situ density test sample collected using the core cutter.....	149
Figure 4.9: Particle size distribution for the KPT-01 and KPT-02 for Case study II.	151
Figure 4.10: Particle size distribution for the STP-01 and STP-02 for Case study II.	151
Figure 4.11: Shear stress vs normal stress relationship for Case study I	153
Figure 4.12: Shear stress vs normal stress relationship for Case study II.....	153

Figure 4.13: (a) WP4C soil water potential lab instrument and (b) sample cup and the compactor.....	156
Figure 4.14: SWCC for Case study I	157
Figure 4.15: HCF for Case study I.....	158
Figure 4.16: SWCC for Case study II	158
Figure 4.17: HCF for Case study II.....	159
Figure 4.18: Rainfall record for the month of May 2016 from the closest rain gauges to the site.	160
Figure 4.19: Boundary condition and mesh for Case study I (a). Boundary condition for deformation analysis and FE mesh in PL, (b). Boundary condition for seepage analysis in PL, and (c). Mesh and boundary conditions for seepage analysis in GS.	164
Figure 4.20: Boundary condition and mesh for Case study II (a). Boundary condition for deformation analysis and FE mesh in PL, (b). Boundary condition for seepage analysis in PL, and (c). Mesh and boundary conditions for seepage analysis in GS.	165
Figure 4.21: Degree of saturation variation of the slope (a) Day 0, (b) Day 6, (c) Day 9, (d) Day 10 and (e) Day 12 for Case study I.	171
Figure 4.22: Section for analysis in Case study I and $x=50$ m, 100 m and 150 m locations	171
Figure 4.23: Pore water pressure variation along section profiles (a) $x=50$ m, (b) $x=100$ m and (c) $x=150$ m in Case I.....	172
Figure 4.24: Change in pore water pressure and slip surface with rainfall on (a) Day 0, (b) Day 3, (c) Day 6, (d) Day 10, (e) Day 11 and (f) Day 12 for Case study I.....	176
Figure 4.25: FoS variation for each day for the two methods with rainfall for Case study I.....	177
Figure 4.26: Degree of saturation variation of the slope (a) Day 0, (b) Day 6, (c) Day 9, (d) Day 10 and (e) Day 12 for Case study II.....	180
Figure 4.27: Section for analysis in Case study II and $x=50$ m, 100 m and 150 m locations	180

Figure 4.28: Pore water pressure variation along section profiles (a) $x=50$ m, (b) $x=100$ m, (c) $x=150$ m and (d) $x=200$ m in Case study II.....	182
Figure 4.29: Change in groundwater table and slip surface with rainfall on (a) Day 0, (b) Day 3, (c) Day 6, (d) Day 10, (e) Day 11 and (f) Day 12 for Case II	186
Figure 4.30: FoS variation for each day for the two methods with rainfall for Case II	186
Figure 4.31: Mechanism of failure (a) Kithulgala Landslide and (b) Sobasiripura landslide	190
Figure 5.1: Selection of the 1:10,000 grids for LiDAR data.....	194
Figure 5.2: Selected catchment area (a) location, (b) DEM for the delineated catchment area and (c) hill shade map for the catchment area.....	195
Figure 5.3: Rainfall intensity distribution from 1987 to 2022.	196
Figure 5.4: Sampling locations	198
Figure 5.5: Particle size distribution for test pit samples	199
Figure 5.6: Particle size distribution for the disturbed samples	200
Figure 5.7: Relationship between shear stress and normal stress for undisturbed samples.....	201
Figure 5.8: SWCC for the undisturbed samples and the mean distribution.....	202
Figure 5.9: HCF for the undisturbed samples and the mean distribution	203
Figure 5.10: Rainfall events for the catchment area	204
Figure 5.11: Annual maximum rainfall distribution for 3-days, 5-days and 10-day cumulative values.....	205
Figure 5.12: Gumbel extreme value distribution for 10-day cumulative rainfall	208
Figure 5.13: Rainfall temporal distribution patterns	209
Figure 5.14: Landslide susceptibility map for the catchment area by NBRO.	211
Figure 5.15: Landslide and non-landslide locations selected within the catchment area.	212

Figure 5.16: The Geomorphic maps for the (a) aspect, (b) curvature, (c) elevation, (d) plan curvature, (e) terrain roughness, (f) slope, (g) soil thickness and (h) TWI.....	214
Figure 5.17: Susceptibility map prepared based on geomorphological parameters using GIS, ML and statistical analysis.	218
Figure 5.18: Selected critical sections based on the two susceptibility maps.....	218
Figure 5.19: Critical slip surface of failure for (a) Section 01, (b) Section 02, (c) Section 03, (d) Section 04, and (e) Section 05.....	226
Figure 5.20: (a) FoS variation for Section 01-04 with the critical rainfall event in 2016 and (b) FoS variation for Section 05 with the critical rainfall event in 1989.....	230
Figure 5.21: Critical slope sections under RF I and RF II (a) Section 06, (b) Section 07, (c) Section 08, (d) Section 09, (e) Section 10, (f) Section 11, (g) Section 12, (h) Section 13, (i) Section 14, (j) Section 15, (k) Section 16, (l) Section 17, (m) Section 18, (n) Section 19, and (o) Section 20.....	238
Figure 5.22: FoS variation with the RF I for critical sections.....	239
Figure 5.23: FoS variation with the RF II for critical sections.	240
Figure 5.24: Cumulative rainfall 5 days and 3 days prior to failure and threshold.	242
Figure 5.25: Aspect ratio and length of initiation area for landslides recorded in May 2017 in Sri Lanka.	244
Figure 5.26: Framework for landslide hazard mapping using the results for 2D slope stability analysis.....	245
Figure 5.27: Landslide hazard zonation map based on the slope stability analysis results.	246
Figure 6.1: Forces acting on the sliding soil column element of LS-RAPID (adopted from Sassa et al. (2010))	250
Figure 6.2: The ring shear apparatus and the mould.....	252
Figure 6.3. Critical slopes selected within the catchment area	254
Figure 6.4: Satellite images for the failure events in 2016 for slope sections (a) L01 before failure (Google Earth, 2016b), (b) L01 after failure (Google Earth, 2017b), (c)	

L02 before failure (Google Earth, 2016a) and (d) L02 after failure (Google Earth, 2017a).....	256
Figure 6.5: Pore water pressure ratio variation with the rainfall and FoS	259
Figure 6.6: Runout validation (a) L01 initiation area, (b) L01 runout extent 2D, (c) L01 runout extent 3D, (d) L01 comparison of the analysis and actual extent, (e) L02 initiation area, (f) L02 runout extent 2D (g) L02 runout extent 3D and (h) L02 comparison of the analysis and actual extent.....	262
Figure 6.7: 3D representation of the runout extent from LS-RAPID for (a) Section L03, (b) Section L04, (c) Section L05, (d) Section L06, (e) Section L07, (f) Section L08, (g) Section L09, (h) Section L10, (i) Section L11, (j) Section L12, and (k) Section L13	269
Figure 6.8. Predicted landslide runout area from LS-RAPID (a) L03, (b) L04, (c) L05, (d) L06, (e) L07 (f) L08, (g) L09, (h) L10, (i) L11, (j) L12 and (k) L13.....	270
Figure 6.9. The H/L ratio and landslide volume compared to empirical data from Brideau et al. (2019); Corominas (1996); Hunter and Fell (2003); Wong et al. (2004)	272
Figure 6.10. Relationship between the landslide runout area and landslide volume.....	273
Figure 6.11: Landslide susceptibility map for the catchment area.....	274
Figure 7.1: Rainfall patterns used in the parametric analysis	280
Figure 7.2: Geometry and boundary conditions for parametric analysis.....	281
Figure 7.3: Raster layers used as input (a) elevation range, (b) slope angle, (c) soil layer 1 thickness (modified from Landslide Studies Services Division (1995)) and (d) soil layer 2 thickness.	287
Figure 7.4: Distribution of the (a) slope height, (b) slope angle, (c) soil layer 1 thickness and (d) soil layer 2 thickness.....	288
Figure 7.5: Hydromechanical slope stability analysis distribution for (a) classification, (b) FoS and (c) PoF	289
Figure 7.6: Classification of the area as stable and unstable for (a) RF I, (b) RF II, (c) RF III, (d) RF IV, (e) RF V, and (f) RF VI.	292

Figure 7.7: Target value and the predicted value comparison for (a) FoS and (b) PoF	295
Figure 7.8: Sensitivity analysis for the input parameters (a) for FoS and (b) for PoF.	296
Figure 7.9: FoS distribution for the area under (a) RF I, (b) RF II, (c) RF III, (d) RF IV, (e) RF V, and (f) RF VI.	298
Figure 7.10: PoF distribution for the area under (a) RF I, (b) RF II, (c) RF III, (d) RF IV, (e) RF V, and (f) RF VI	299
Figure 7.11: APoF distribution for the area under (a) RF I, (b) RF II, (c) RF III, (d) RF IV, (e) RF V, and (f) RF VI	300
Figure 7.12: Percentage of landslide buffers falling in each category identified in (a) FoS, (b) PoF and (c) APoF maps.	302

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Classification of landslides and name forming (modified after Cruden and Varnes (1996); Hungr et al. (2014)).....	18
Table 2.2: Comparison of landslide databases (adapted from Gómez et al. (2023); Panwar and Sen (2020))	24
Table 2.3: Different landslide movement types based on the weathering grade of granitic rock (modified after Durgin (1977); Migoñ (2010)).....	41
Table 2.4: Rock types in HC and the mass movements (modified after Cooray (1994a))	45
Table 2.5: Methods for landslide susceptibility and hazard assessment (adapted from Corominas et al. (2014); Dai et al. (2002); Pardeshi et al. (2013); Shano et al. (2020))	58
Table 2.6: Landslide zoning mapping scale, applications and hazard dictators (adapted from Corominas et al. (2014); Fell et al. (2008)).....	67
Table 2.7: Different monitoring equipment, their monitored activities, the method of monitoring and the equipment used in Sri Lanka	78
Table 2.8: Equations derived for infinite slope stability under different seepage conditions (modified from Crosta, (1998) and Zhang et al., (2011)).....	96
Table 2.9: Comparison of different methods of slices (adapted from Duncan (1996); Fredlund and Krahn (1977))	98
Table 2.10: Models for basal shear resistance (adapted from Hungr and McDougall (2009); McKinnon et al. (2008)).....	109
Table 2.11: Landis and Koch scale (adapted from Landis and Koch (1977))	124
Table 4.1: Borehole idealisation for Case study I.....	143
Table 4.2: Borehole idealisation for Case study II.....	146
Table 4.3: In situ density test results.....	150
Table 4.4: Index properties for the two case studies.....	152
Table 4.5: Material properties used in slope stability modelling of Case study I....	166

Table 4.6: Material properties used in slope stability modelling of Case study II ..	167
Table 5.1: Summary for the material testing.....	199
Table 5.2: Index test results for the samples	200
Table 5.3: Material properties for the TP samples	202
Table 5.4: Annual maximum rainfall series and the probability-weighted moments.	207
Table 5.5: Geomorphic variables	213
Table 5.6: Bagged trees and logistic regression results for the feature importance.	217
Table 5.7: Material properties used in the analysis.....	221
Table 5.8: Details of the selected slope sections for validation	224
Table 5.9: Details of failure, annual probability of failure and hazard category for the critical slopes with RF I	232
Table 5.10: Details of failure, annual probability of failure and hazard category for the critical slopes with RF II	233
Table 5.11: Inventory of landslides for the aspect ratio determination (National Building Research Organisation, 2017)	243
Table 6.1. Material properties from the laboratory experiments and the parameter set used in runout analysis	253
Table 6.2: The porewater pressure ratio at failure for critical sections.....	259
Table 6.3. Runout area results.....	271
Table 7.1: Parameters used for the analysis	278
Table 7.2: The hyperparameters used in ML	283
Table 7.3: Different model performance for classification	291
Table 7.4: Stable and unstable area variation.....	293
Table 7.5: Regression error matrices for the ANN model	293
Table 7.6: Categories for zonation of FoS, PoF and APoF maps	297

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI	Artificial Intelligence
ALARP	As Low As Reasonably Practical
ALE	Arbitrary Lagrangian–Eulerian
ALiDAR	Airborne Light Detection and Ranging
ANN	Artificial Neural Network
APoF	Annual probability of failure
AUC	Area Under the Curve
BH	Borehole
CEL	Coupled Eulerian–Lagrangian
CNN	Convolutional Neural Network
CoV	Coefficient of Variation
CWR	Completely Weathered Rock
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
DNN	Deep Neural Network
DQN	Deep Q-Network
DT	Decision Tree
EF	Efficient Factor
EFGM	Element-Free Galerkin Method
EM-DAT	Emergency Event Database
FE	Finite Element
FN	False Negative
f-N	frequency- consequence
F-N	cumulative frequency-consequence
FORM	First-Order Reliability Method
FoS	Factor of safety

FP	False Positive
GbLiDAR	Ground based Light Detection and Ranging
GBM	Gradient Boosting Machine
GbSAR	Ground based Synthetic Aparture Radar
GFLD	Global Fatal Landslide Database
GIS	Geographic Information System
GLC	Global Landslide Catalog
GLE	General Limit Equilibrium
GNSS	Global Navigation Satellite System
GPR	Ground Penetrating Radar
GPS	Global Positioning System
GS	GeoStudio
HC	Highland Complex
HCF	Hydraulic Conductivity Function
HDPE	High Density Polyethylene
InSAR	Interferometric Synthetic Aparture Radar
ISSMGE	International Society for Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering
KC	Kadugannwa Complex
KNN	K-Nearest Neighbors
KTP	Kithulgala Test Pit
LA	Limit Analysis
LE	Limit Equilibrium
LEWS	Landslide Early Warning Systems
LHZM	Likely High Hazard Zone Mapping
LiDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
LR	Logistic Regression

LSTM	Long Short-Term Memory
MCS	Monte Carlo Simulation
ML	Machine Learning
MPM	Material Point Method
MSL	Mean Sea Level
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NB	Naive Bayes
NBRO	National Building Research Organisation
OOB	Out-of-Bag
PL	PLAXIS
PLL	Possible life loss
PoF	Probability of failure
PTSD	Post Traumatic Stress Disorder
QGIS	Quantum Geographic Information System
RAF	Random Forest
ReLU	Rectified Linear Unit
RF	Rainfall Pattern
RFEM	Random Finite Element Method
RMSE	Root Mean Square Error
ROC	Receiver Operating Characteristic
RT	Random Tree
SAC	Soft Actor-Critic
SHALTSTAB	Shallow Landsliding STABility Model
Sigmoid	Sigmoid Function
SINMAP	Stability Index Mapping
SORM	Second-Order Reliability Method

SPH	Smooth Particle Hydrodynamics
SPT	Standard Penetration Test
STP	Sobasiripura Test Pit
SVM	Support Vector Machine
SWCC	Soil Water Characteristic Curve
Tanh	Hyperbolic Tangent
TDR	Time Domain Reflectometry
TN	True Negative
TP	True Positive
TRIGRS	Transient Rainfall Infiltration and Grid-Based Regional Slope-Stability Model
TWI	Topographic Wetness Index
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
UGLD	Unified Global Landslide Database
USCS	Unified Soil Classification System
VC	Vijayan Complex
WC	Wanni Complex