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Abstract

The Seven Sister States of the North Eastern Region of India, located on the complex seismotectonic belt, is characterized by high seismicity. A comprehensive seismic hazard exposure assessment is carried out by quantifying hazard using a probabilistic approach, vulnerability by factor analysis, and exposure mapping by integrating seismic hazard and vulnerability. Peak ground acceleration (PGA) values at bedrock are calculated with the help of ground motion prediction equations (GMPE) for 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years (475 years) and 100 years (950 years), and 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years (2475 years). The resulting spatial distribution of the PGA values considering return periods of 475, 950, and 2475 years are presented through seismic hazard maps. The social vulnerability analysis indicates that 21 districts covering 91.43% area of the state of Assam and the entire state of Tripura are under high vulnerability. With the help of spatial cluster analysis, it is found
that 17.14% of the study area are having an average social vulnerability index (SVI) score of 0.329 and therefore can be considered as hotspots. Through seismic hazard analysis, it is observed that more than 50% of the area of North East India is under moderate to very high exposure class. The seismic hazard maps developed can help in disaster mitigation planning and execution leading to sustainable development goals and targets.
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### 1. Introduction

The North Eastern Region (NER) of India comprises eight states, namely Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Tripura, and Sikkim. The Seven Sister States (SSS) of India is a popular term for the seven contiguous states in NER except for Sikkim. The Himalayan arc ranges, extending from west-northwest to east-southeast of India, lies near the subduction zone of Indian and Eurasian tectonic plates. Due to the collision of the Indian plate with the Tibet plateau towards the northern part and the Burmese landmass towards the east, the formation of seismotectonic features like the Himalayan thrust, Arakan-Yoma, Naga Hills, and Tripura fold have resulted (Verma and Kumar 1987). The Himalayan tectonic feature in north-eastern India is very complex and exhibits high seismicity. Due to its geological, geomorphological, and seismotectonic setting, the NER is highly exposed to seismic hazards. The region has suffered extensive loss of lives and damage to property due to significant earthquakes in the past. On 28 April 2021, an $M_w$ 6.0 earthquake occurred near Dhekiajuli in Assam, India, leading to ground cracking and the collapse of several houses. For the past few decades, The NER has been experiencing high seismic risk, which can be attributed to an increase in population density and unplanned rapid urbanization and infrastructure developments.
Quantifying seismic risk by assessment of hazard and vulnerability at a regional level is a significant step towards effective disaster risk reduction and mitigation strategies. Seismic hazard deals with the quantification of ground motion at a particular site in a specific time interval which can be expressed in terms of peak ground acceleration (PGA) or spectral acceleration (SA), or any other ground motion parameter (GMP) (Kramer 1996). The vulnerability could be either social or physical. However, it is primarily defined by the social, economic, natural, and built environmental conditions of a community that affects its susceptibility towards the hazards significantly (Cutter et al. 2008). The physical vulnerability deals with the building stock in the vicinity and their susceptibility to hazard. In contrast, social vulnerability is concerned with identifying vulnerable groups of the society in the region and the factors that can affect it directly or indirectly (Cutter 1996). Therefore, the combined study of seismic hazard and social vulnerability will enable the policymakers, urban planners, and other concerned authorities to pre-identify the localities prone to high potential seismic hazards. Moreover, such a study shall help in understanding the impact of the seismic hazard on the lives of the people living in the vicinity of such disaster-prone areas.

In the past, many researchers like Sharma and Malik (2006), Raghukanth and Dash (2010), NDMA (2010), Raghukanth et al. (2011), Nath and Thingbaijam (2012), Das et al. (2016), Dixit et al. (2016), and Ghione et al. (2021) have contributed to different aspects of seismic risk assessment for the NER of India with a common goal to reduce the disaster risk. At the regional level, such seismic hazard studies are also available, Sitharam and Sil (2014) for the state of Tripura and Mizoram; Baro et al. (2018) for the Shillong Plateau, Meghalaya; Bahuguna; and Sil (2020) for the state of Assam. However, these studies have only focused on the seismic hazard assessment, either deterministically (DSHA) or probabilistically (PSHA), but have not considered the vulnerability aspect which is an equally important issue. Worldwide, several studies have been conducted on social vulnerability in regards to seismic
Hazard by considering different assessment frameworks like the Hazard of Place Model, HoP (Cutter 1996), the BBC model (Brikmann 2013), Disaster of Resilience of Place model, DROP (Cutter et al. 2008), and methods like multicriteria analysis, MCA (Martins et al. 2012; Frigerio et al. 2016; Armas and Gavris 2017; Derakhshan et al. 2020; and Agrawal et al. 2021). In the Indian scenario, most seismic hazard vulnerability studies are directed towards the built environment (Sarmah and Das 2018; Dutta, Halder, and Sharma 2021). For NER, social vulnerability assessment (SVA) due to climate change and environmental hazards were performed by Maiti et al. (2017) and Das et al. (2021), respectively. However, social vulnerability studies of the NER due to seismic hazards are very limited. This is primarily because such studies involve diverse seismic and demographic databases which are relatively difficult to obtain. The present study has investigated this issue through probabilistic seismic hazard analysis and social vulnerability studies.

The objective of the present study is to develop the updated seismic hazard map of the Seven Sister States of northeast India using PSHA based on the updated earthquake catalogue and conduct social vulnerability assessment and exposure to seismic hazard. A circle of radius 500 km (around 26.16°N and 93.28°E) covering the entire NER is constructed for the development of the seismotectonic model, and the region is segmented into 0.2° x 0.2° grids (Anbazhagan et al. 2019). Following the PSHA approach, the seismic hazard is assessed at the center of each grid. The data obtained is then utilized to quantify the PGA values at the bedrock level for 10% probability of exceedance in 50 and 100 years and 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years. Subsequently, the PGA values are plotted in the GIS environment leading to seismic hazard maps.

For SVA, the indicators are selected by the application of principal component analysis (PCA) and factor analysis (FA) within the framework of the HoP model for the generation of the social vulnerability index, SVI (Agrawal et al. 2021). Additionally, with the help of spatial statistical
and cluster analysis tools in the GIS environment, hotspot and cold spot clusters within the study area are identified. Finally, the seismic hazard map is integrated with the SVI, and exposure maps for the NER are developed.

2. Study Area

The present study area consists of the Seven Sister States (SSS) of northeast India, namely, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, and Tripura. It lies between 20°N-30°N latitude and 87°E-98°E longitude (Fig. 1). Geographically, it can be classified into the Eastern Himalayas, Barak valley, Patkai hills, and Brahmaputra valley plains (Verma 2018).

Fig. 1 Study area: Seven Sister States in NER of India

The presence of the Indo-Burmese plate boundary in the eastern region and the Indo-Eurasian plate boundary in the northern region (Baro et al. 2018), makes the NER one of the most seismically active regions in the world. As per IS1893 (2016), it is categorized as the most
severe seismic zone in India i.e. zone V. Its tectonic setting is shown in Fig. 2. In the past, several high-intensity earthquakes such as the 1869 Cachar earthquake, 1897 Shillong earthquake, 1918 Meghalaya earthquake, 1947 Arunachal Pradesh earthquake, and 1950 Assam earthquake; have severely affected this region.

Fig. 2 Seismotectonic features of NER of India

In all states of the SSS, except Mizoram, more than 70% population live in rural areas (Census 2011). The primary source of their economy is agriculture. This is because due to inaccessible terrain and lack of transportation networks, few industries have developed in this region. High population density is observed in the states of Assam and Tripura with 439.43 and 389.11
people per sq. km, respectively, which is possibly due to the presence of better employment opportunities. In Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram, the population density is the lowest i.e. 17.26, 58.90 people per sq. km, respectively (Fig.1). The population of Assam constitutes more than 65% of the total population of the SSS region (Census 2011). High population growth, increased infrastructure, unplanned urbanization, and complex seismotectonic regime tends to increase the seismic risk of this region. Therefore, a comprehensive seismic hazard analysis and social vulnerability assessment at the regional level is highly essential for effective disaster risk management leading to the reduction of loss of lives and property.

3. Methodology

The present study consists of (a) seismic hazard assessment, (b) social vulnerability assessment, and (c) quantification of exposure to the seismic hazard; details of which are presented below.

3.1 Seismic Hazard Assessment (SHA)

The probabilistic approach (PSHA), adopted in the present study, can effectively consider the uncertainties in the earthquake magnitude, location, and time of occurrence, etc. Like DSHA, PSHA does not focus on an exclusive event for worst-case scenarios; instead, it contemplates all possible earthquakes from all potential seismic sources. For PSHA, seismicity of each source zone, uncertainties in location, size, and ground motion to obtain the probability that a GMP will be exceeded during a particular period is taken into account (Kramer 1996).

3.1.1 Data Acquisition

The earthquake catalogue for the NER is compiled over an area of radius of 500 km, centered around the coordinate point of 26.16°N and 93.28°E. The details of 8959 earthquake events from 1760 to 2021 (261 years) were obtained from the databases like the National Center for Seismology (NCS), India, Bhukosh-Geological Survey of India, United States Geological
Survey (USGS), and International Seismological Center (ISC), etc. The compiled catalogue comprises events in different magnitude scales, like body-wave magnitude ($m_b$), surface-wave magnitude ($M_S$), local magnitude ($M_L$), and moment magnitude scale ($M_w$). For a rational seismic hazard analysis, a uniform magnitude scale is necessary the details of which are explained below.

### 3.1.2 Homogenization and Declustering

The earthquake catalogue is homogenized to a common magnitude scale (i.e., $M_w$) using an orthogonal regression approach (Wason et al. 2012). There are 349, 277, and 130 data points for the orthogonal regression between $m_b$ and $M_w$, $M_L$ and $M_w$, and $M_S$ and $M_w$, respectively (Fig 3). The newly developed region-specific regression relation between moment magnitude ($M_w$) and other magnitude scales for the NER are shown in Table 1.

![Fig. 3 Conversion from (a) $m_b$ to $M_w$, (b) $M_L$ to $M_w$, and (c) $M_S$ to $M_w$](image)

### Table 1 Relation between different magnitude scales

| Scale       | data points | Relation                          | $R^2$ |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------|
| $m_b$ to $M_w$ | 349         | $M_w = (1.008 \pm 0.018) m_b - (0.095 \pm 0.086)$ | $2.4 \leq m_b \leq 6.9$ | 0.896 |
| $M_L$ to $M_w$ | 277         | $M_w = (0.919 \pm 0.022) M_L + (0.286 \pm 0.085)$ | $2.5 \leq M_L \leq 7.0$ | 0.864 |
| $M_S$ to $M_w$ | 130         | $M_w = (0.715 \pm 0.031) M_S + (1.796 \pm 0.151)$ | $3.0 \leq M_S \leq 7.2$ | 0.803 |
From the unified earthquake catalogue, the foreshocks and aftershocks are removed by declustering as they are dependent on the mainshock, spatially and temporally (Zhuang, Ogata and Vere-Jones 2002). In this study, an open-source software ZMAP (v7.0) by Wiemer (2001) is utilized to eliminate the dependent events by following the methodology proposed by Gardner and Knopoff (1974) which follows a Poisson distribution (Stiphout et al. 2012). A similar procedure has been followed by Sitharam and Sil (2014), and Anbazhagan et al. 2019. After declustering, it was found that 26.34% of the events are interdependent and, therefore, were eliminated from the data set. Consequently, only 6599 events are retained in the dataset, among which 4837 events are greater than $M_w$ 3.5.

![Seismic source zone demarcation with major faults and declustered-homogenized earthquake](image)

**Fig. 4** Seismic source zone demarcation with major faults and declustered-homogenized earthquake
3.1.3 Seismic Source Zonation

Seismic source zonation is considered an essential pre-requisite for the seismic hazard study. In the present study, the study area is divided into five source zones that are distinct in terms of fault properties, seismic source, geology, and plate tectonics (Fig. 4).

3.1.4 Completeness of Catalogue

For PSHA, it is also necessary to check for completeness of the data in terms of magnitude and time. The magnitude of completeness ($M_c$) is the lowest magnitude above which the catalogue, in a selected space-time window, is considered to be complete (Rydelek and Sacks 1989; Wiemer and Wyss 2000). $M_c$, in the present study, is obtained through the maximum curvature method (MAXC). A similar procedure has been adopted by various scholars worldwide (Woessner and Wiemer 2005). The open-source software ZMAP (v 7.0) by Wiemer (2001) was used for this purpose and the obtained values of the $M_c$ are presented in Table 2.

The completeness study of seismic data in terms of time, as shown in Fig. 5, was performed using the statistical analysis proposed by Stepp (1972). The magnitude ranges of $M_w$ 3.0 – 4.0, 4.0 – 5.0, 5.0 – 6.0, 6.0 – 7.0, 7.0 – 8.0, and $\geq$ 8.0, correspond to 60, 70, 100, 120, 150 and 260 years, respectively.

Fig. 5 Completeness of the earthquake catalogue with time
3.1.5 Evaluation of Seismic Parameters

The seismicity of a region can be described by seismic parameters \( a \) and \( b \), which correlate with the rate of occurrence of an event of a particular size. The distribution of event sizes in a given period is best described by a most widely accepted Gutenberg-Richter recurrence law (Kramer 1996) as given by Eq. 1.

\[
\log(N) = a - b(M_w)
\]  

(1)

Where \( N \) represents the number of cumulative events, per year, greater than an event of given moment magnitude; \( a \) and \( b \) are constants of regression, known as seismic parameters.

Based on the completeness study, the earthquake catalogue of the recent 70 years is considered to evaluate recurrence relation for each source zone (Fig. 6). The total number of earthquakes above the magnitude of completeness are 566, 431, 722, 2247, and 871 in the source zones 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The obtained values of seismic parameters \( a \) and \( b \) are summarized in Table 2.

**Fig. 6** Gutenberg-Richter relation for each source zone

**Table 2** Seismic Parameters and \( M_C \) values

| Source zones | \( M_C \) (using MAXC) | Seismic parameters | \( R^2 \) |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------|
|              |                       | \( a \)            | \( b \)   |           |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3.60 | 4.06±0.36 | 0.84±0.07 | 0.96 |
| 2 | 3.50 | 3.67±0.36 | 0.77±0.07 | 0.95 |
| 3 | 3.40 | 4.23±0.33 | 0.85±0.06 | 0.96 |
| 4 | 3.50 | 4.70±0.19 | 0.86±0.03 | 0.98 |
| 5 | 3.70 | 4.90±0.37 | 1.02±0.07 | 0.97 |

### 3.1.6 Evaluation of Maximum Magnitude ($M_{\text{max}}$)

The largest possible earthquake, $M_{\text{max}}$, that a seismic source can produce ever is an important input parameter for PSHA. In this study, $M_{\text{max}}$ is evaluated based on the conventional incremental value method, IVM (Gupta 2002; Anbazhagan et al. 2019) and the procedure suggested by Kijiko and Sellevo (1989), typically referred to as KS89. A similar procedure has been used by others as well (Sitharam and Sil 2014).

It is based on the doubly truncated G-R relation (Kijiko 2004) as given below.

$$
M_{\text{max}} = m_{\text{max}}^{\text{obs}} + \Delta, \text{ where } \Delta = \frac{E_1(n_2) - E_1(n_1)}{\beta \exp(-n_2)} + m_{\text{min}} \exp(-n) \tag{2}
$$

Where, $M_{\text{max}}$ is the calculated maximum magnitude, $m_{\text{max}}^{\text{obs}}$ is the observed maximum magnitude associated with each fault, $n$ is the number of events above $M_C$ in the region and $m_{\text{min}}$ denotes the minimum magnitude. It should be mentioned here that the KS89 procedure can be applied only when the seismic parameter ‘$b$’ of the region is known.

Based on $M_C$ value, $m_{\text{min}}$ in the present study is taken as 3.5 ($M_w$). $n_i = \frac{n}{1 - \exp(-\beta(m_{\text{max}} - m_{\text{min}}))}$

$n_2 = n_1 \exp[-\beta(m_{\text{max}} - m_{\text{min}})]$, and $E_1(n_i)$ is an exponential integral function which can be
approximated as 

\[ E_i(n_i) = \frac{n_i^2 + a_1n_i + a_2}{n_i(n_i^2 + b_1n_i + b_2)} \exp(-n_i), \]

where \( a_1 = 2.334733, \ a_2 = 0.250621, \ b_1 = 3.330657 \) and \( b_2 = 1.681534 \) (Abramowitz and Stegun 1970).

However, the incremental value method, which is relatively simple and applied by many researchers, \( M_{max} \) is obtained by adding a constant value of 0.5 to \( m_{max}^{obs} \) value of each seismic source (Gupta 2002; Anbazhagan et al. 2019; Bhuguna and Sil 2020). Values of \( M_{max} \) calculated by both methods are given in Table 3.

3.1.7 Deaggregation of Seismic Sources

The recurrence relations for different seismic regions of the study area are evaluated, but it is also essential to assess the seismic activity rate of each fault to proceed further with the PSHA. For this purpose, an approach similar to Raghukanth and Iyenger (2006) and NDMA (2010) is adopted in this study. A conservation property is heuristically used to develop recurrence relations. The number of earthquakes per year with \( M_w \geq m_{min} \) i.e., \( N(m_{min} = 3.5) \) in a region is calculated from the G-R relation of that region using Eq. 1. Since all these events are associated with the faults within the region, it should be equal to the sum of the number of earthquakes occurring on individual faults, i.e. \( N(m_{min}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i(m_{min}) \), where \( N_i(m_{min}) \) is the annual frequency of events of \( M_w \geq m_{min} \) on the \( i^{th} \) fault in the region, \( (i =1,2,3,\ldots,n) \). The annual frequency of events, \( N_i(m_{min}) \) on any fault, depends on the fault length and past seismic activity of the fault. The evaluation of \( N_i(m_{min}) \) involves two basic assumptions: (1) longer faults will have a higher capacity to rupture into smaller segments, and (2) shorter faults may be more active in producing relatively smaller size events. Correspondingly, \( N_i(m_{min}) \) is obtained using the following equation
Where \( a_i = L_i \sum L_i \) is the weighing factor for length of \( i^{th} \) fault \((L_i)\), \( \chi_i \) is another weighting factor defined as the ratio of the number of earthquakes associated with \( i^{th} \) fault to the total number of earthquakes in the region. In this study, 21 active seismic sources are identified and the detail of each fault in terms of the number of earthquakes associated with it, its length, weighing factors, and the evaluated maximum magnitude, are given in Table 3. The \( b \)-value of each fault is considered to be equal to the \( b \)-value of the region in which the fault is located, and the equation obtained is given below:

\[
N_i(m) = N_i(m_{\text{min}}) \left[ 1 - \frac{1 - e^{-(\beta(m - m_{\text{max}}))}}{1 - e^{-(\beta(m_{\text{max}} - m_{\text{max}}))}} \right] \quad (4)
\]

Where, \( m_{\text{min}} \) is the minimum threshold magnitude, \( m_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum potential magnitude of the fault \( i \), and \( \beta = 2.303b \). The individual fault level recurrence relations are shown in Figs. 7a-e.

### 3.1.8 Ground Motion Prediction Equation (GMPE)

The knowledge of site-specific attenuation relation is significant for the evaluation of GMP, but due to lack of good quality data, previously developed models for the same or of other regions based on similar tectonic features can be used (Nath and Thingbaijam 2012; Das et al. 2016).

In the present study, six GMPEs are selected (Table 4) and validated through the recorded strong motion data obtained from the NER of India. For this purpose, PGA vs hypocentral distance graphs, shown in Fig. 8a-e, are obtained for different combinations of magnitude and focal depth using the selected GMPEs given in Table 4. The observed PGA values from strong ground motion records for the same magnitude focal depth \((M_w, h)\) combination are also
plotted, as shown in Fig. 8(a-e). It can be seen that irrespective of the $M_w$ and $h$ combinations, ANBA2013 and NATH2012 predicted PGA values are relatively lower than the observed ones. Besides, ATBO2003 is found to have overestimated the PGA for shorter distances and underestimated for longer distances (Fig. 8). BAHU2020 also underestimates the PGA, making it the lower bound in few cases. For focal depths greater than 45 km, the PGA values given by the JAIN2000 model lies in the range of observed values, and for lesser depth, the RAMK2020 model is found to be more appropriate. Therefore, in the present study, GMPEs RAMK2020 (Ramkrishnan et al. 2020) is adopted for seismic source zones with an average focal depth of less than 45 km and JAIN2000 (Jain et al. 2000) is adopted for seismic source zones with an average focal depth greater than or equal to 45 km, respectively.

Fig. 7 Fault level recurrence relation for source (a) zone 1, (b) zone 2, (c) zone 3, (d) zone 4, and (e) zone 5
**Fig. 8** Comparison of GMPEs with the observed PGA values for a different combination of moment magnitude and hypocentral distance (km): (a) $M_w$ 5.0, $h$ 43, (b) $M_w$ 5.9, $h$ 15, (c) $M_w$ 6.0, $h$ 34, (d) $M_w$ 7.3, $h$ 90, (e) $M_w$ 6.0, $h$ 1.
| Source zones | Fault name                          | Fault ID | Events associated with each fault | Length (km) | $\alpha_i$ | $\chi_i$ | Observed $M_{max}$ | Calculated $M_{max}$ |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------------|------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
|             | Main Central Thrust (MCT)           | 1        | 345                               | 631.43      | 0.49       | 0.59     | 6.8               | 7.3               |
|             | Main boundary Thrust (MBT)          | 2        | 242                               | 654.35      | 0.51       | 0.41     | 6.8               | 7.3               |
|             | Siang Fault (SiF)                   | 3        | 73                                | 87.47       | 0.18       | 0.16     | 6.6               | 7.1               |
|             | Lohit Thrust (LT)                   | 4        | 180                               | 94.79       | 0.20       | 0.40     | 6.3               | 6.8               |
|             | Mishmi Thrust (MT)                  | 5        | 194                               | 293.11      | 0.62       | 0.43     | 7                 | 7.5               |
|             | Shan-Sagaing Fault (SSF)            | 6        | 750                               | 704.60      | 1.00       | 1.00     | 7.6               | 8.1               |
|             | Eastern boundary thrust and Kabaw Fault (EBT & KBF) | 7        | 1619                              | 821.53      | 0.42       | 0.71     | 7.3               | 7.8               |
|             | Chaurachandpur-Mao Fault (CMF)      | 8        | 345                               | 174.39      | 0.09       | 0.15     | 7.2               | 7.7               |
|             | Naga Thrust (NT)                    | 9        | 143                               | 481.99      | 0.25       | 0.06     | 7.3               | 7.8               |
|             | Disang Thrust (DT)                  | 10       | 180                               | 475.78      | 0.24       | 0.08     | 7                 | 7.5               |
| Sl. No. | GMPE                        | Abbreviation | Remark                     |
|--------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| 1      | Jain et al. (2000)          | JAIN2000     | For Central-Himalayan region |
|        | (a) non-subduction zone: $\ln(PGA) = -3.443 + 0.706M - 0.8028\ln(R)$ with SE = 0.44 |              |                             |
(b) subduction zone: \( \ln(PGA) = -0.332 + 0.00233R + 0.59\ln(R) \) with SE = 0.59

Where PGA in g, R is the shortest source-to-site distance, and SE is the standard error

2 Atkinson and Boore (2003)

\[
\ln Y = c_1 + c_2M + c_3h + c_4R - g \cdot \ln R + s_i (c_5S_c + c_6S_D + c_7S_E)
\]

where \( Y \) in cm/s\(^2\), \( R = \sqrt{D_{\text{fault}}^2 + \Delta^2} \), \( \Delta = 0.00724 \times 10^{0.507M} \), \( c_1 = 2.991 \), \( c_2 = 0.03525 \), \( c_3 = 0.00759 \), \( c_4 = -0.00206 \), \( g = 10^{(1.2-0.18M)} \), \( \sigma_1 = 0.20 \) (intra-event) and \( \sigma_2 = 0.11 \) (inter-event) for interface events (h<50km) and \( c_1 = -0.04713 \), \( c_2 = 0.6909 \), \( c_3 = 0.01130 \), \( c_4 = -0.00206 \), \( g = 10^{(0.301-0.01M)} \), \( \sigma_1 = 0.23 \) and \( \sigma_2 = 0.14 \) for in-slab events (h>50km) and \( (c_5, c_6, c_7) = (0.19, 0.24, 0.29) \) for all events. \( s_i \) is frequency-dependent constant. \( S_c, S_D, \) and \( S_E \) are equal to zero for site class B (NEHRP), \( V_{S,30} > 760 \text{m/s} \).

3 Nath et al. (2012)

\[ \ln(P) = 9.143 + 0.247M - 0.014(10 - M)^3 - 2.67\ln(r_{rup} + 32.9458e^{(0.0663M)}) \]

where \( P = \text{PGA (g)} \), \( r_{rup} = \text{fault-rupture distance (km)} \). Standard Deviation = 0.330.

4 Anbazhagan, Kumar and Sitharam (2013)

\[ \log(Y) = -1.283 + 0.544M + b \cdot \log(X + e^{(0.381M)}) + \sigma \]

where \( Y = \text{Spectral acceleration (SA (g))} \), \( X = \sqrt{R^2 + h^2} \), where \( R = \text{epicentral distance (km)} \), \( h = \text{focal depth (km)} \), \( b \) is decay parameter (-1.792), and \( \sigma = 0.283 \) (for 0 s period).

5 Ramkrishnan, Sreevalsa and Sitharam (2020)
\[
\log y = -2.135 + 0.437M - 1.099\log(X + e^{-0.80M}) \pm 0.549
\]

where \(y = \text{PGA (g)}\), \(X = \text{hypocentral distance (km)}\), and \(SE = \pm 0.549\)

| Region                  | Equation                                                                 |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Central-Himalayan       | \[
\log y = -2.135 + 0.437M - 1.099\log(X + e^{-0.80M}) \pm 0.549
\] |
| Assam                   | \[
\ln(PGA) = 6.680 + 1.134M - 0.001R - 0.7098\ln R
\] |

Where, \(M\) is moment magnitude

287 Where, \(M\) is moment magnitude
3.1.9 PSHA of NER India

In order to evaluate seismic hazard at bedrock level, using a probabilistic approach, the entire study area was divided into a grid size of 0.2° x 0.2°. Each grid centre is considered as the site of interest at which the seismic hazard in terms of PGA is evaluated by considering all the active seismic sources within a radius of 500 km.

The procedure followed for PSHA assumes that an event within a seismic source follows a stationary Poisson process (Kramer 1996). The probability of GMP, \( Y \), exceeding a specified level, \( y \), in a specified period \( T \), at a given site is expressed as

\[
P(Y > y) = 1 - \exp(\mu_y T)
\]

(6)

Where, \( \mu_y \) is the mean annual rate of exceedance as detailed below

\[
\mu_y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i (m_{\text{min}}) \int_{m} \int_{r} P(Y > y | m, r) p_{R|M} (r | m) p_m (m) dr dm
\]

(7)

In this equation, \( n \) is the total number of faults present, \( N_i (m_{\text{min}}) \) is the annual frequency of events on an \( i^{th} \) fault having \( m \geq m_{\text{min}} \), \( p_m (m) \) is the probability density function (PDF) corresponding to the magnitude, \( p_{R|M} (r | m) \) is the conditional PDF corresponding to hypocentral distance \( (r) \), and \( P(Y > y | m, r) \) is the probability of exceedance of GMP, \( Y \), over \( y \), for an event of magnitude \( m \) occurring at a distance \( r \) from the site. \( \mu_y \) incorporates the temporal, spatial, and magnitude uncertainty of a future event and ground motion uncertainty produced by them at the site. Eq. 7 shows the summation of individual contributions of 21 faults \( (i = 1, 2, 3 \ldots 21) \) for the assessment of hazard at each site to obtain the annual exceedance of PGA. All the above-mentioned calculations are performed using MATLAB.

The typical PDF of magnitude and distance is shown in Fig. 9. To produce the hazard curve considering all the sources, \( \mu_y \) of a particular site of interest are summed up and plotted against
the target PGA level, \( y \). Fig. 10 shows the hazard curves for Shillong city. Using the hazard curves, the PGA value for 10% probability of exceedance over 50 and 100 years of return period and 2% probability of exceedance over 50 years of return period are obtained. Correspondingly, thematic maps, at each site of interest, are produced using ArcGIS.

**Fig. 9** Probability density function (PDF) for (a) magnitude uncertainty, (b) epicentral distance uncertainty

**Fig. 10** Seismic hazard curves (Shillong city)

### 3.2 Social Vulnerability Assessment

In the present study, the HoP model is adopted for assessing the social vulnerability (SV) of different districts of SSS. The HoP model (Cutter 1996) tries to combine social and biophysical vulnerability to produce overall place vulnerability (Cutter et al. 2003). This model has been used in many social vulnerability studies worldwide (Ge et al. 2013; Frigerio et al. 2016;
Agrawal et al. 2021). Details of the methodology adopted for the social vulnerability analysis, SVA are presented and discussed in the following subsections.

3.2.1 Data Acquisition

The social vulnerability assessment depends on the indicators like population, age, gender, literacy, employment status, stock of built structures, etc. (Cutter et al. 2003; Wood et al. 2010; Depietri 2013, 2020; Kolathayar 2021; Siagian et al. 2014; Fatemi et al. 2017). For the present study, data regarding these indicators comprising 54 variables were collected, at the district level, from India's 15th housing and population census (Census 2011). Multi-collinearity analysis was performed on the collected set of variables, and a subset of 33 variables was retained and used to create indices for SV in Table 5.

Table 5 List of common social vulnerability indicators and their variables.

| Sl. No. | Indicator | Variables                                      |
|--------|-----------|------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Population composition | P01 Population density          |
| 2      |          | P02 Male (%)                                   |
| 3      |          | P03 Female (%)                                 |
| 4      |          | P04 Population belongs to socially backward class (%) |
| 5      |          | Age01 Age less than 07 (%)                     |
| 6      |          | Age02 Age group of 07 to 60 (%)                |
| 7      |          | Age03 Above the age of 60 (%)                  |
| 8      |          | L01 Effective literacy rate                    |
| 9      |          | L02 Illiterate (%)                            |
| 10     |          | L03 Illiterate female (%)                      |
| 11     |          | EO01 Population belongs to MW1 class (%)       |
| 12     |          | EO02 Female population belongs to MW1 class (%)|
| 13     |          | EO03 Population belongs to the OMW2 class (%)  |
| 14     |          | EO04 Female population belongs to the OMW2 class (%) |
| 15     |          | EO05 Population belongs to MrW3 class (%)      |
| 16     |          | EO06 Female population belongs to MrW3 class (%) |
| 17     |          | EO07 Population belongs to the OMrW4 class (%) |
| 18     |          | EO08 Female population belongs to the OMrW4 class (%) |
| 19     |          | EO09 Non-permanent employment (%)              |
| 20     |          | EO10 Female population with non-permanent employment (%) |
| 21     |          | EO11 Non-working population (%)                |
| 22     |          | EO12 Non-working female population (%)         |
| 23     |          | BM01 With brick or stone roof (%)              |
| 24     | Building material | BM02 With kutcha roof (%)       |
26 BM03 With kutha wall (%)  
27 BM04 With kutha floor (%)  
28 House condition HC01 Residential houses in dilapidated condition (%)  
29 HC02 Residential cum other houses in dilapidated condition (%)  
30 Family size HH01 Houses with 4-5 households (%)  
31 HH02 Houses with 6 or more households (%)  
32 Amenities A01 Houses with no electricity and have dependence upon kerosene or other oil as a source of light (%)  
33 A02 Houses with no water source within or near the premises of the house (%)  

1MW: Main Workers; Workers who worked for more than six months in the reference period  
2OMW: Other Main Workers; Main workers falling under OW  
3MrW: Marginal Workers; Workers who worked for less than six months  
4OMrW: Other Marginal Workers; Marginal worker falling under OW  

3.2.2 Evaluation of SVI

The social vulnerability index (SVI) is evaluated using the steps summarized below.

1. Variables of vulnerability indicators are selected, and high multi-collinearity among the variables is checked.

2. After eliminating the highly correlated variables, the remaining set of variables are checked for sample adequacy using KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) and Bartlett’s test. If the KMO value > 0.7 and Bartlett’s test of sphericity shows a significance value < 0.05, the dataset is considered adequate, and the factor analysis (FA) is employed (Sharma 1996).

3. The principal component analysis (PCA) is utilized for factor extraction. Factors with eigenvalue > 1.0 are extracted and rotated using the varimax method of factor rotation with Kaiser normalization, as shown in Table 6. The extracted factors are confirmed by tracking the changes in the slope of the scree plot shown in Fig. 11.

4. The factor score is generated for extracted factors using the Anderson-Rubin method. All these steps are performed using IBM SPSS (v 26).
5. The generated scores are aggregated (Ge et al. 2013), and a composite index (SVI) is generated using the weightage factor \(w_i\), calculated based on the percentage variance explained by factor \(i\) \(v_i\) out of the total variance explained by all the factors \(v_t\) as in Eq. 8.

8. Then the composite SVI is obtained by using Eq. 9.

\[
w_i = v_i / v_t
\]  

(8)

\[
SVI = \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} w_i \times \text{Factor } i
\]  

where \(n_f\) is the number of factors

(9)

6. The SVI scores are classified into five vulnerability classes, and thematic maps are created to display the spatial distribution of social vulnerability using ArcGIS.

**Table 6** Selected variables based on PCA

| Factor | Extracted variables                                                                 | Eigenvalue | Variance explained (%) | Weightage factor \(w_i\) |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1      | HC01, A01, L02, P02, L03, Age01, HC02, BM03, EO12, HH02, EO11, BM02, and A02       | 19.528     | 37.87                  | 0.42                    |
| 2      | BM01, EO03, EO07, HH01, Age03, and P04                                             | 2.080      | 27.35                  | 0.30                    |

**Fig. 11** Scree plot
3.2.3 Spatial Cluster Analysis

A global spatial autocorrelation is performed to analyze the autocorrelation of the dataset throughout the study area, and Global Moran’s I value that ranges from -1 to 1, was obtained (Karuppusamy et al. 2021). A spatial statistical tool for hotspot analysis (Getis-Ord Gi*) in ArcGIS is employed to identify the spatial clusters within a specific area (Brandt et al. 2020). The hotspots are located based on the values of statistically significant \( z \) for 99, 95, and 90 % confidence levels. Typically the hotspots exhibit higher \( z \) scores and lower \( p \) scores (Al-Dogom et al. 2018). In this analysis, a zone of indifference is selected for the spatial relationship conceptualization, and a threshold distance of 71542 m is used. False discovery rate (FDR) correction is applied to identify spatial clusters at the local level better.

3.3 Exposure Assessment

For the seismic exposure assessment, the PGA values for the 475-year return period are classified into five hazard classes (Fig. 17a) and integrated with the SVI. The resulting seismic exposure map (Fig. 17b) was analyzed using a risk matrix (Derakhshan et al. 2020) as shown in Fig 12.

| Social Vulnerability | Hazard Classes |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Very low (1)         | 1 2 3 4 5      |
| Low (2)              | 2 4 6 8 10     |
| Moderate (3)         | 3 6 9 12 15    |
| High (4)             | 4 8 12 16 20   |
| Very high (5)        | 5 10 15 20 25  |

Fig. 12 Risk matrix
4. Results and Discussion

In the present study, the results of PSHA are presented in terms of PGA at bedrock level, which is obtained from the hazard curve i.e. PGA vs. mean annual rate of exceedance. The SVI was generated by applying the FA and PCA as the factor extraction method. The results of SHA and SVI were then integrated to prepare the exposure maps for the study region.

From Table 7, it can be seen that the seismic parameters, $a$ and $b$, obtained from the present study, compare well with the values reported by others (NDMA 2010; Sharma and Malik 2006; and Bahuguna and Sil 2020). For SSS in the present study, the PGA values corresponding to return periods of 475, 950, and 2475 years, obtained using GMPE (Ramkrishnan et al. 2020, Jain et al. 2000), are in the range of 0.14-0.69g, 0.17-0.86g, and 0.22-0.93g, respectively. The calculated PGA values for some selected cities in the region are compared with those from previous studies as shown in Table 8. It can be seen that the calculated PGA values in the present study are relatively lower than those reported by Nath and Thingbaijahm (2012). In the case of cities like Aizwal, Imphal, and Kohima, the PGA values for low probability of exceedance (return period = 475 years) are comparable with that of NDMA 2010 (Table 8). In contrast, at Aizwal and Imphal, the calculated PGA values are less than that reported by Sharma and Malik (2006) and higher than that by Sil et al. (2013). At Guwahati and Shillong, the calculated PGA values are in a higher range than that reported by Ghione et al. (2021). Such variations are attributed to the selection of different seismic source zones and different ground attenuation models, which can be considered as a limitation of the PSHA method.

The spatial distributions of PGA at the bedrock level for SSS are shown in Fig. 13a-c. The northern and western part of the region shows higher PGA values. This is due to the influence of MFT, MCT, and Dauki Fault. Similarly, the area in the vicinity of Mishimi Thrust and Lohit
Thrust also shows higher PGA values. Therefore, this region can be classified as a high seismic hazard zone.

**Table 7** Comparison of estimated seismic parameters with previously reported values

| Parameter | Das, Sharma, and Wason (2016) | NDMA (2010) | Sharma and Malik (2006) | Bahuguna and Sil (2020) | Present study |
|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| $a$       | 1.68-5.76                     | -           | -                      | 0.15-4.52               | 3.67-4.89     |
| $b$       | 0.43-1.07                     | Zone4: 0.71±0.04 Zone5: 0.66±0.03 Zone7: 0.67±0.08 Zone8: 0.73±0.04 Zone10: 0.80±0.02 Zone11: 0.66±0.04 | 0.42-1.04 | 0.18-0.9 | 0.77-1.02 |
| $M_c$     | 3.6-4.6                       | -           | -                      | -                       | 3.4-3.7       |

**Table 8** Comparison of estimated PGA values obtained for important cities with previously reported values

| Sl. No. | City        | PGA (g) | Present Study‡ | NDMA (2010)† | Nath and Thingbaijam (2012)‡ | Other studies |
|---------|-------------|---------|----------------|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 1       | Guwahati    | 0.60-0.85 | 0.23-0.40 | 0.66-1.40 | 0.35 (Ghione, Poggi and Lindholm 2021)‡; 0.46-0.92 (Bahuguna and Sil 2020)‡ | 0.22 (Das, Sharma and Wason 2016)‡; 0.11-0.20 (Sil, Sitharam and Kolathayar 2013)‡ |
| 2       | Agartala    | 0.32-0.47 | 0.12-0.20 | 0.25-0.60 | Malik 2006)‡; 0.1-0.17 (Sil, Sitharam and Kolathayar 2013)‡ | 0.3 (Sharma and Malik 2006)‡ |
| 3       | Aizawl      | 0.20-0.32 | 0.22-0.45 | 0.45-1.20 | 0.18-0.8 (Pallav et al. 2012)‡ | 0.45 (Ghione, Poggi and Lindholm 2021)‡ |
| 4       | Imphal      | 0.28-0.42 | 0.30-0.55 | 0.70-1.40 | 0.55 (Ghione, Poggi and Lindholm 2021)‡ | 0.72-1.30 |
| 5       | Shillong    | 0.61-0.83 | 0.25-0.45 | 0.72-1.30 | 0.55 (Ghione, Poggi and Lindholm 2021)‡ | 0.72-1.30 |
Itanagar 0.55-0.88 0.28-0.45 0.70-1.20
Kohima 0.25-0.40 0.25-0.55 0.60-1.30

For return period of * 475 years; † 475–2475 years; †† 475–4950 years

Fig. 13 Spatial distribution of PGA at the bedrock level for a return period of (a) 475 years, (b) 950 years, and (c) 2475 years

The SVI for the study area is developed considering three significant factors that are obtained by FA. Based on PCA of 33 variables, using Kaiser criterion of factor retention, three significant factors comprised of 24 variables with eigenvalues >1.0 are retained. The KMO value of 0.897 (>0.7) and a significant value of 0 (<0.05) in Bartlett’s test are obtained that indicates sufficient data adequacy for statistical analysis (FA and PCA). The selection of factors is also confirmed by observing the change in slope of the scree plot (Fig. 11). These three factors cumulatively explain the 90.534 percent variance among the datasets. The descriptive statistic of each factor is given in Table 6.

The variable composition of factor 1 indicates the living condition and socioeconomic status of the study region. The spatial distribution of vulnerability in terms of factor 1 is shown in Fig. 14a. The districts of Assam and Tripura, having a high percentage of illiterate population, with poor living conditions, fall under the high to very high vulnerable class. Hence, it can be
said that communities with high illiteracy rates and poor living conditions are less resilient and thereby more vulnerable to seismic disasters. Similar observations have been made by (Frigerio et al. 2016). Factor 2 comprises six variables, governed by building material, aged population, and period of employment. Based on these indices it is observed that the region of Tripura, upper Assam, and Barak valley have a poor quality of built structures, low employment rate, and a high population of old aged people (Fig 14b). All these factors tend to enhance the vulnerability of a region and decrease the society's resilience and coping capacity in case of a disastrous event happening. Factor 3 represents the type of employment and percentage of the female population involved in agriculture and other related activities (Fig. 14c). The Seven Sister States of India with a primary focus on agriculture is relatively less urbanized. Agriculture and small-scale household industries are low-paying jobs, and the female population of this region is found to be mainly involved in it. After the disaster, the non-permanent marginal workers having relatively low-paying jobs, are more likely to lose their jobs due to disruption in daily activities and businesses (Morrow 1999). The spatial distribution of Factor 3 shows that the districts of Assam, Meghalaya, Mizoram, and Manipur, having a high percentage of the population dependent on agriculture and small-scale industries, are under a highly vulnerable class.

**Fig. 14** Spatial distribution of social factors (a) Factor 1, (b) Factor 2, and (c) Factor 3
Fig. 15 shows the spatial distribution of the overall social vulnerability at the district level. It reveals that most districts covering an area of 66.15% of the study area are under low to moderate SVI class, whereas another 14.56% area is under high vulnerability and 19.29% of the area is prone to very high vulnerability. Twenty-one districts of Assam fall under high and very high vulnerable classes, and all districts of Tripura are under high vulnerable classes. These two states share the highest percentage of the population in the study region (i.e., 69.41% for Assam and 8.01% for Tripura). With a population density of 439.43 per sq. km in Assam and 389.11 per sq. km in Tripura and according to the 2011 census data (Fig. 1), 40% population of these districts are illiterate, and about 83% of houses are made of weak building materials are of poor quality. These districts also lack basic amenities like the availability of drinking water, electricity, etc. These factors justify the very high social vulnerability of these districts.

The spatial cluster analysis given in Fig. 16a represents hotspot and cold spot analysis. Fig. 16b depicts an overlay of the spatial distribution of the social vulnerability index with hotspots and cold spots. It is observed that high social vulnerability patterns are located in central Assam and its adjoining neighboring areas, and 17.14% of the total study area emerges as a hot spot with an average SVI score of 0.329. The cold spots are mainly predominant in Nagaland and the northern part of Arunachal Pradesh, spread over about 8.58% of the study area, with an average SVI score of 0.177. With an average SVI score of 0.208, the remaining area is regarded as non-significant areas in terms of the hotspot and cold spot analysis, and those are the north-western and southern parts of the study area.
Finally, the seismic hazard map (Fig 17a) is integrated with the social vulnerability map (Fig 15), and the exposure map of the study area is prepared and analyzed using the risk matrix in Fig. 12. Fig. 17b shows the spatial distribution of exposure to seismic hazards for the NER of India. The results indicate that 3.33%, 38.21%, 29.94%, 14.59%, and 13.92% of the total study area falls under very low, low, moderate, high, and very high seismic exposure classes, respectively. The districts of Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, and Mizoram mostly fall under very low to moderate seismic exposure classes. Low to moderate seismic exposure zones are found for the districts of Manipur and Tripura. In contrast, the districts of Assam and Meghalaya shows high to very high seismic exposure class.
5. Conclusions

In the present study, updated seismic hazard maps in terms of PGA for the return periods of 475, 950, and 2475 years are generated using the PSHA approach. Correspondingly, the PGA values at bedrock level are found to be in the range of 0.14-0.69g, 0.17-0.86g, and 0.22-0.93g, respectively. The states of Meghalaya, Assam, and Arunachal Pradesh exhibit relatively higher PGA values, which is attributed to the dominance of the MFT, Dauki fault, and Mishimi thrust zone. The SVI map is generated using FA and PCA to assess the social vulnerability and exposure to seismic hazards. Based on PCA, three factors consisting of 24 variables are retained, which explains the 90.53% variance among the datasets. Subsequently, the SVI is integrated with the seismic hazard map and an exposure map of the study area is developed.

The spatial distribution of SVI shows that 21 districts covering 91.43% area of Assam and the entire Tripura state are highly vulnerable. The spatial cluster analysis illustrates high social vulnerability patterns in central Assam and some parts of Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur, and Arunachal Pradesh. 17.14% of the study area, having an average SVI score of 0.329, is identified as hotspots. The exposure map shows that more than 50% of the total study area falls under moderate to very high exposure class. The present study provides a reliable tool for
identifying the most socially vulnerable and critically exposed areas of one of the most seismically active regions of the world, i.e. NER of India. The findings from the present study can be of help in sustainable disaster mitigation planning leading to achieving sustainable development goals and targets. The presented exposure map can help the state authorities and local bodies in preparing for disaster risk reduction, develop mitigation strategies, and emergency planning. The study has some inherent limitations which are due to the lack of real-time socio-economic data. Therefore further research considering geotechnical, geological data, and temporal relationships among the various socioeconomic variables and various hazards, is necessary.
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