Methodological Study to Classification of Damage State Immediately Subsequent to the Banjarnegara Indonesia Earthquake On 2018
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Abstract. This paper presents a preliminary methodological study of a seismic risk assessment in a residential area to classification of damage state immediately subsequent after earthquake happen. This paper compared with difference research of a seismic risk assessment in the same area, i.e. Kertosari, Banjarnegara Indonesia. This methodological study to identified compatibility of the building vulnerability assessment with Naïve Bayes Classifier (NBC) method for determine the probability of damage that has 5 different damage statuses (slight, moderate, extensive, complete and none), where the criteria damage states in vulnerable building has additional damage parameters based on the latest building damage regulations issued in 2013, which have totally 104 data difference criteria. The results from determine the probability of damage processing using the NBC methodology in Kertosari Banjarnegara that most type of damage states is extensive damage. There is a difference with 2018 research data, where the most damage state is the moderate damage, and there is also a difference with the Banjarnegara Municipal Disaster Management Authority (BPBD Banjarnegara) data, which has the most damage state is the complete damage. The difference is caused by the criteria in determining the damage conditions are still too general and the uncertainty value is high. Therefore, it is necessary to improve and detailed the building type model and damaged condition criteria for Indonesian buildings, based on the assessment and suggestion of experts who have good and long experience in earthquake risk management and understand the state of damage to Indonesian building regulations, such as: (1) researchers/scientists; (2) small and medium-sized contractors; (3) construction supervisors; (4) government officials; (5) business leaders; (6) academics/educators; (7) non-governmental organizations, in order to obtain an assessment of damage to residential houses quickly and accurately.

1. Introduction
The seismic risk assessment process can be divided into two main groups namely seismic hazard and vulnerability. Seismic vulnerability depends upon model building type, and damage state effected from the hazard and seismic hazard is the event capable of causing damage while seismic vulnerability represents the degree of loss of an element resulting from hazard. It can depict in the equation $R = H \times V / C$, where $R$ is a risk, $H$ is a hazard, $V$ is a vulnerability, and $C$ is capacity [1,2]. It can be understood that the failure of buildings and many victims when the earthquake came one of them due to vulnerable buildings [3–5]. In seismic risk assessment, many researchers need experts to judgment an evaluation and decision-making process. The expert could have totally different opinions about the
potential earthquake vulnerability of a building if compared to the opinions of another expert, due to
the differences in their knowledge and experience [6,7]. Research on the vulnerability of buildings in a
developing country, is still low, including Indonesia. Contrary, information from the building
vulnerability assessment can be helpful for risk mitigation and emergency response planning and
important as a based guideline to build any new building for preventing of losses [5], [8–11]. In line
that, this research aim to develop a simple guide to resolution building type model and the criteria of
damage state for compatible Indonesian building using NBC methodology in determine the probability
of damage that has 5 different damage state (slight, moderate, extensive, complete, and none).

2. The general background of the study

2.1 Banjarnegara Earthquake
The Meteorological, Climatological, and Geophysical Agency (BMKG) obtain information data as to
Banjarnegara Earthquake in April 2018 [12]. Time of the incident on Tuesday, 18 April 2018 at
13:28:35 WIB, scale: 4,4 SR. Location in 7,21°LS and 109,65°BT with Depth 4 Km, earthquake
shocks felt strong enough in Kertosari Villages, Banjarnegara District and surrounding areas. There
were various damage states of building i.e. slight by 88 houses damage, moderate by 31 houses
damage, extensive and complete by 82 houses damage [13]

2.2 Predicting and estimating accuracy damage state using Naïve Bayes Classifier (NBC)
Classification is one of the most important techniques in datamining for data analysis. In datamining,
different classification techniques are available to predict the outcome for a given dataset. There are
many classification methods for predicting and estimating accuracy; one such famous method is Naïve
Bayes Classifier. Naïve Bayes is very popular as it is easy to build, however to the assumption of
conditional independence among predictor’s results in loss of accuracy damage states. One of the
main reasons for the better performance of Naïve Bayes Classifier is the assumption of independence
among predictors [6,7].

3. Methods

3.1. Naïve Bayes Classifier (NBC)
Classification is a process of grouping data based on certain characteristics into predetermined classes.
The Naïve Bayes Classifier is a datamining classification method which takes probabilities of
attributes belonging to class for prediction. NBC is a supervised classification approach which can
be used effectively to model a predictive problem probabilistically [14]. Naïve Bayes classifier is
based on Bayes’ Theorem where predictors are treated as Independent. In Naïve Bayes method the
overall probabilities of attributes belonging to a class are calculated by resuming that the likelihood
of an attribute on a given class value is not dependent on other attributes. This presumption leads NBC to
to better results and is called conditional independence [14–16]. Is known \( X = \{x_1,x_2,...,x_k\} \) is the
attribute influence the C class. Naïve Bayes theorem is described as follows:

\[
P(C|X) = P(X|C) \cdot \frac{P(C)}{P(X)} \tag{1}
\]

Where:
- \( P(\cdot) \) = predictor prior probability
- \( P(C) \) = the relative frequency of the sample C class
- \( P(X|C) \) = likelihood
- \( P(C|X) \) = posterior Probability
The conditional Independence is explained in this scenario as, the predictor \( x \) value on class \( c \) has
no effect on the other predictor’s values.

3.2 Discrete Probability
There are given free attributes (independence), the value of probability can be given as follows:

\[
P(x_1 \ldots ,x_k|C) = P(X_1|C) \cdot \ldots \cdot P(X_k|C) \tag{2}
\]
If the attribute is to discretion, then $P(X_i|C)$ estimated as frequentation relative of the sample which has a value of $x_i$, as attribute in class $C$. The conditional Independence is explained in this scenario as; the predictor $(x)$ value on class $(c)$ has no effect on the other predictor’s values.

4. Results and Discussion

The methods of NBC are to calculate the discrete probability of damage states, there are none, slight, moderate, extensive and complete. Where, every house will get impact of all damage states, but the highest rank/the most type of damage states can be difference among them. Based on research before [8] and data additional criteria of damage states from Ministry of Public Works (PU) [17], there are 7 objects of assessment for classified of damage states [18]: 1.Building Condition, 2.Damage of column and beam, 3.Damage of wall, 4.Damage of roof, 5.Damage of plafond, 6.Damage of electrical installation and 7.Damage of door/window. The 7 criteria divide on to 104 damage states (slight, moderate, extensive, complete and none), as sample as in Table 1.

| No. | Object of Assessment                          | Damage States          |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1   | Building still stands                         |                        |
|     | House Condition ($X_1$)                       |                        |
|     | Column and Beam ($X_2$)                       |                        |
|     | Wall ($X_3$)                                 | Most columns, beams and/or roofs are damaged |
|     | Roof ($X_4$)                                 | A small part of wall is broken |
|     | Plafond ($X_5$)                              | Roof collapsed         |
|     | Electrical Installation ($X_6$)               | Most of walls and ceiling are collapsed |
|     | Door/window ($X_7$)                          | Door/window is totally damaged |
| 2   | Building still stands                         |                        |
|     | Column beam partially is broken               |                        |
|     | Wall ($X_3$)                                 | Cracks on the plastering walls |
|     | Roof ($X_4$)                                 | Loose roof/tile cover |
|     | Plafond ($X_5$)                              | Some of ceiling coverings are broken |
|     | Electrical Installation ($X_6$)               | Some electrical installations are damaged |
|     | Door/window ($X_7$)                          | Door/window is partially damaged |
| 3   | Building collapsed completely                 |                        |
|     | House Condition ($X_1$)                       |                        |
|     | Column and Beam ($X_2$)                       |                        |
|     | Wall ($X_3$)                                 | Most of walls and ceiling are collapsed |
|     | Roof ($X_4$)                                 | Some of roof trusses are broken |
|     | Plafond ($X_5$)                              | Roof/tile cover cannot be separated |
|     | Electrical Installation ($X_6$)               | Electrical installation is not damaged |
|     | Door/window ($X_7$)                          | Door/window is not broken |
| 4   | Building still standing                       |                        |
|     | House Condition ($X_1$)                       |                        |
|     | Column and Beam ($X_2$)                       |                        |
|     | Wall ($X_3$)                                 | Wall partially collapsed |
|     | Roof ($X_4$)                                 | Broken ceiling         |
|     | Plafond ($X_5$)                              | Ceiling is not damaged |
|     | Electrical Installation ($X_6$)               | Electrical installation is not damaged |
|     | Door/window ($X_7$)                          | Door/window is not broken |
| 5   | Building still stands                         |                        |
|     | House Condition ($X_1$)                       |                        |
|     | Column and Beam ($X_2$)                       |                        |
|     | Wall ($X_3$)                                 | Wall does not crack     |
|     | Roof ($X_4$)                                 | Ceiling is not damaged |
|     | Plafond ($X_5$)                              | Ceiling is not damaged |
|     | Electrical Installation ($X_6$)               | Electrical installation is not damaged |
|     | Door/window ($X_7$)                          | Door/window is not broken |

And then an object of assessment calculated depends on probability which has difference damage states use equation 1, as in Table 2.
Table 2. Probability of Damage States

|         | Slight (S) | Moderate (M) | Extensive (E) | Complete (C) | None (N) |
|---------|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|----------|
| Probability | 0.17308    | 0.41346      | 0.36538       | 0.03846      | 0.009615385 |

And then criteria of damage states, are calculated depends on damage states using Equation 1, as sample as in Table 3.

Table 3. Sample of scoring Damage Criteria from Building Conditions (X1)

| X1 | Building Conditions |
|----|---------------------|
|    | Slight (S) | Moderate (M) | Extensive (E) | Complete (C) | None (N) |
| P (Building is remains standing) = | 1 | 1 | 0.3421 | 0 | 1 |
| P (Building is totally collapse) = | 0 | 0 | 0.0263 | 1 | 0 |
| P (Building is incline) = | 0 | 0 | 0.6316 | 0 | 0 |

To calculate the highest rank/the most type of damage states of damage probability of decision damage state use Equation 2, as in Table 4.

Table 4. Discrete Probability of Decision Damage State (NBC) in Kertosari Village

| Number | Photo | Coordinate | Discrete Probability of Decision Damage State (NBC) |
|--------|-------|------------|---------------------------------------------------|
|        |       | Highest Rank | Categories                                         |
| 1      | ![Photo](image1.png) | 7°13’21.068"S109°40’12.551"E | 1.0000 Extensive Damage (E) |
| 2      | ![Photo](image2.png) | 7°13’899"S109°40’026"E | 1.0000 Extensive Damage (E) |
| 3      | ![Photo](image3.png) | 7°12’758"S109°40’673"E | 1.0000 Extensive Damage (E) |
In Table 4 the most damage states in Kertosari village is Extensive Damage, which have a difference result to a preliminary survey [8] and BPBD Banjarnegara data [13] in year 2018 as Table 5.

Table 5. Damage data based on a preliminary survey and BPBD Banjarnegara in Kertosari village

| Number | Photo | Building | Latitude  | Longitude  | Damage State       |
|--------|-------|----------|-----------|------------|--------------------|
| 1      |       | House 1  | -7.21415  | 109.67872  | Complete Damage (C) |
| 2      |       | House 2  | -7.22300  | 109.67012  | Complete Damage (C) |
| 3      |       | House 3  | -7.22333  | 109.66958  | Complete Damage (C) |
| 4      |       | House 4  | -7.22232  | 109.66930  | Complete Damage (C) |

In Table 5 the most damage state in Kertosari village is complete damage, and the values of cumulative damage probabilities summarized is moderate damage [8].

5. Conclusion
The results from determine the probability of damage processing using the NBC methodology in Kertosari Banjarnebata that most of damage state is extensive damage. There is a difference with 2018 research data, where the most damage states is the moderate damage, and there is also a difference with the BPBD Banjarnebata data, which has the most damage states is the complete damage. The difference is caused by the criteria in determining the damage conditions are still too general and the uncertainty value is high. Therefore, it is necessary to improve and detailed the building type model and damaged condition criteria for Indonesian buildings, based on the assessment and suggestion of experts who have good and long experience in earthquake risk management and understand the state
of damage to Indonesian building regulations, such as: (1) researchers/scientists; (2) small and medium-sized contractors; (3) construction supervisors; (4) government officials; (5) business leaders; (6) academics/educators; (7) non-governmental organizations, in order to obtain an assessment of damage to residential houses quickly and accurately.

6. References
[1] A. Heijmans and L. P. Victoria, Citizerry-Based & Development-Oriented Disaster Response. Center for Disaster Preparedness, 2001.
[2] D. van Niekerk, Introduction To Disaster Risk Reduction, no. August. 2011, p. 59.
[3] A. S. Elnashai and L. di Sarno, Fundamentals of earthquake engineering from source to fragility, no. 1. John Willey and Sons, Ltd, 2015.
[4] A. H. M. Muntasir Billah and M. Shahria Alam, “Seismic fragility assessment of highway bridges: a state-of-the-art review,” Structure and Infrastructure Engineering, vol. 11, no. 6. Taylor & Francis, pp. 804–832, 2015.
[5] V. Rahimi, M. I. Khodakarami, and R. Vahdani, “Determination of Structural Fragility Curves of buildings with Hazus methodology for Seismic risk Assessment in the city of Semnan , Iran Determination of Structural Fragility Curves of buildings with,” in 10th International Congress on Civil Engineering 5-7 May 2015, 2015, no. May.
[6] K. Netti and Y. Radhika, “Minimizing Loss of Accuracy for Seismic Hazard Prediction using Naive Bayes Classifier,” pp. 75–77, 2016.
[7] O. Otobo, “RISK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TO GUIDE BUILDING CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ’ IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A CASE STUDY OF NIGERIA Odimabo Otobo , Onengiyeeofori February RISK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TO GUIDE BUILDING CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ’ IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A CASE STU,” no. February, 2016.
[8] N. Bawono, Adi Setiabudi;Ali,MI,Ramli, “A Preliminary Study of Seismic Risk Assessment Shortly After the Banjarnergara Indonesia Earthquake on 2018.” 2018.
[9] A. S. Bawono, “Studi Kerentanan Bangunan Akibat Gempa (Studi Kasus Perumahan di Bantul),” Universitas Islam Indonesia, 2009.
[10] M. Khalfan, “FRAGILITY CURVES FOR RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A CASE STUDY ON NON-ENGINEERED UNREINFORCED MASONRY HOMES IN BANTUL, INDONESIA,” McMaster, 2013.
[11] G. G. Penelis and G. G. Penelis, Concrete Buildings in Seismic Regions. Boca Raton: CRC PRESS, 2014.
[12] BMKG, “Press Release No.UM.505/10/D3/IV/2018,” Jakarta, 2018.
[13] BPBD Banjarnegara, “REKAPITULASI DATA KERUSAKAN INFRASTRUKTUR BANGUNA RUMAH BENCANA GEMPA BUMI KECAMATAN KALIBENING KABUPATEN BANJARNEGARA TAHUN 2018,” BANJARNEGARA, 2018.
[14] J. P. Jiawei Han, Micheline Kamber, Data Mining Concepts and Techniques Third Edition, Third edit. USA: Elsevier Inc., 2012.
[15] X. Wang, Y. He, S. Member, D. D. Wang, and S. Member, “Non-Naive Bayesian Classifiers for Classification Problems With Continuous Attributes,” vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 21–39, 2014.
[16] S. Kusumadewi, “Ketidakpastian dalam Sistem Pakar,” 2019.
[17] P. KEMENPU, BALITBANG, “Panduan Praktis Pemeriksaan Kerusakan Bangunan akibat Gempa Bumi,” 2013.
[18] D. Departemen Pekerjaan Umum, “Laporan penanganan bencana gempa bumi yogyakarta dan jawa tengah STATUS, MINGGU 4 JUNI 2006,” 2006.

Acknowledgement
The support provided in the preliminary survey for getting information/data about the preliminary study of seismic risk assessment in Banjarnegara Earthquake 18th April 2018 on 21st April 2018, between Universitas Teknologi Yogyakarta and Magister Teknik Sipil Universitas Islam Indonesia for this study is highly appreciated.