

## The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Enhancing Cloud-Based Disaster Management Systems

Adam Puspabhuana <sup>✉1</sup>, Andhika <sup>2</sup>, Yudi Triyana <sup>3</sup>, Muhammad Rifky Adhani <sup>4</sup>, Agus Suryadi <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Data Science, Faculty of Computer Science, Cakrawala University, Indonesia. Zip Code. 12510

<sup>2,4</sup>Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Computer Science, Cakrawala University, Indonesia. Zip Code. 12510

<sup>3</sup>Department of Systems and Information Technology, Faculty of Computer Science, Cakrawala University, Indonesia. Zip Code. 12510

<sup>5</sup>Department of Informatics Engineering, Ibnu Sina University, Indonesia. Zip. Code. 29444

<sup>✉</sup>correspond\_author\_email: [adambhuana@cakrawala.ac.id](mailto:adambhuana@cakrawala.ac.id)

### Abstract

Disaster management systems are vital in mitigating the impacts of natural and human-induced disasters. However, traditional methods often struggle with limitations in responsiveness and efficiency, particularly as disaster events become more frequent and severe. This study investigates the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in enhancing cloud-based disaster management systems, focusing on improving predictive, analytical, and operational capabilities. The research examines key AI technologies that can be integrated into cloud platforms, including machine learning, natural language processing, and computer vision. AI substantially improves disaster response and recovery by enhancing real-time data processing, decision-making, and resource allocation. The study also highlights AI's potential in early warning and risk assessment, providing decision-makers with more accurate and timely information. Empirical analysis suggests that AI-enhanced cloud systems significantly reduce response times and improve resource distribution during disaster events, reducing loss of life and property. The research concludes with practical recommendations for implementing AI in cloud-based disaster management and identifying areas for future exploration. The findings underscore the transformative potential of AI in creating more resilient disaster management infrastructures.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Cloud Computing, Disaster Management, Machine Learning, Real-time Data Processing, Early Warning Systems.

*KomtekInfo Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License.*



### 1. Introduction

Disaster management has become an increasingly critical area of focus as the frequency and intensity of natural and artificial disasters continue to rise [1]. Traditional disaster management systems, while essential, often struggle to cope with the complexities and demands of modern disaster scenarios [2]. The advent of cloud computing has provided new avenues for enhancing these systems, offering scalable and flexible infrastructures that can support real-time data processing and decision-making during disaster events [3]. However, significant challenges remain despite these advances, particularly in responsiveness, accuracy, and resource allocation [4].

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative technology with the potential to address these challenges [5],[6]. AI's ability to analyze large volumes of data quickly and accurately, predict outcomes, and optimize processes makes it an ideal candidate for integration into cloud-based disaster management systems [7],[8]. In addition, Ozen [8] introduced a cloud-based AI framework that

demonstrated notable success in mitigating the adverse effects of disasters. By leveraging AI, these systems can enhance early warning capabilities, improve risk assessment accuracy, and optimize the allocation of resources during disaster events [9].

Numerous prior investigations have examined the application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the context of disaster management. Gupta et al. [10], for example, illustrated the effectiveness of AI-powered collaborative platforms in addressing severe disaster events. Similarly, Munawar et al. [11] discussed how disruptive technologies contribute to minimizing disaster-related risks. Feng et al. [12] stressed the critical role of integrating diverse data sources to enhance the accuracy of disaster forecasting. Barros et al. [13] investigated an urban planning strategy focused on flood risk evaluation. Collectively, these studies provide a crucial theoretical and practical foundation for the development of integrated AI-driven disaster management systems.

The research methodology involves a comprehensive literature review and empirical analysis of current AI applications in disaster management. Through this

approach, the study seeks to provide a detailed understanding of how AI can build more resilient disaster management systems capable of reducing the loss of life and property during disasters [14],[15].

Artificial Intelligence offers a range of approaches to address the key challenges in disaster management systems. Machine Learning is employed to develop predictive models based on historical and sensor data. Computer Vision is utilized to analyze satellite imagery for detecting infrastructure damage, while Natural Language Processing (NLP) extracts valuable real-time information from social media platforms. The combination of these methods enables the system to respond adaptively and efficiently to various types of disasters.

## 2. Research Method

This study is grounded in the disaster risk management cycle, which includes the phases of mitigation, preparedness, emergency response, and recovery. The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) across these stages enables the system to gather real-time data, anticipate potential hazards, and adaptively respond to emerging situations. As a result, AI is positioned not merely as an auxiliary instrument, but as a critical element in strengthening the resilience and operational efficiency of contemporary disaster management frameworks.

### 2.1 Problem Formulation

Let  $D$  present a disaster event characterized by a set of variables. The objective is to minimize the total loss function  $L(D)$ , defined as the combination of loss of life, economic impact, and time delay in response. Mathematically, this can be expressed as:

$$L(D) = w_1 \cdot L_{\text{life}} + w_2 \cdot L_{\text{economic}} + w_3 \cdot T_{\text{delay}} \quad (1)$$

$w_1$ ,  $w_2$ , and  $w_3$  are the weights assigned to each loss component, representing their relative importance. The goal is to optimize the allocation of resources  $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m\}$  such that the loss function  $L(D)$  is minimized. This requires real-time analysis and decision-making, which is challenging for traditional systems.

### 2.2 Proposed Method

The proposed research framework incorporates Artificial Intelligence (AI) within a cloud-based disaster management system, structured in accordance with the four key phases of the disaster risk management cycle: mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. The process initiates with the collection of data from diverse sources such as sensors, social media platforms, and satellite imagery. This raw data undergoes a preprocessing phase to ensure it is cleaned, normalized, and formatted for further analysis. Subsequently, predictive models are developed using machine learning and deep learning techniques, while optimization

methods—including Linear Programming and Genetic Algorithm are utilized to facilitate effective resource distribution and informed decision-making during disaster scenarios.

By leveraging scalable cloud infrastructure, the framework supports real-time system adaptability, allowing for rapid adjustments in response to evolving disaster conditions. Additionally, reinforcement learning mechanisms are integrated to enable the system to continuously refine its performance based on feedback from past disaster events. Overall, the framework is designed to improve predictive accuracy, accelerated response times, and reduce the overall impact of disasters through intelligent, data-driven operations.

To overcome these challenges, this study proposes the incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) methodologies within a cloud-based disaster management framework [19], [20]. The proposed approach is designed to enhance the responsiveness, accuracy, and decision-making efficiency of the system during disaster scenarios. By using AI technologies including machine learning, optimization algorithms, and real-time data processing the framework seeks to advance both predictive accuracy and the effectiveness of resource distribution. The principal components of this approach include data acquisition and preprocessing, predictive analytics, optimization techniques, and real-time decision support mechanisms.

1. **Data Collection and Preprocessing:** Real-time data from multiple sources, such as satellite imagery, social media, and sensor networks, are collected and preprocessed using cloud computing resources [21]. The data is then transformed into a structured format suitable for AI algorithms [22].
2. **Predictive Modeling with Machine Learning:** Machine learning algorithms, such as Random Forest, Support Vector Machines (SVM), and deep learning models, are employed to predict the impact of a disaster based on historical data [23],[24]. The predictive model aims to estimate variables such as the severity of the disaster, the number of affected individuals, and the required resources.
3. The predictive model aims to estimate variables such as the severity of the disaster, the number of affected individuals, and the required resources.
4. **Optimization Algorithms:** The study employs optimization techniques such as linear programming (LP) and genetic algorithms (GA) for source allocation. These algorithms solve the resource allocation problem by minimizing the loss function  $L(D)$  under constraints such as the availability of resources and response time [26].

5. Real-time decision-making with AI: AI-driven decision-making systems are implemented to provide real-time recommendations for disaster response. This involves using reinforcement learning, where the system learns from past disaster events to improve its recommendations over time.

### 3. Results and Discussion

This section describes the results of the research and the tests that have been carried out. In addition, the discussion of the study and testing that has been carried out was also conveyed. To ensure the accuracy of the developed models, an evaluation of predictive performance using various machine learning techniques was conducted. This subsection discusses model validation and the evaluation metrics used.

#### 3.1. Data Collection and Preprocessing

The success of AI analysis depends heavily on the quality of the data used. This subsection explains the data sources and preprocessing techniques applied to prepare the data for modeling. This is an example of the second sub-chapter. The contents can be adjusted according to your needs.

##### 1. Data Sources

Multiple data sources including satellite imagery, social media platforms, and sensor networks play a critical role in disaster analysis. Satellite imagery delivers spatial and temporal information on environmental changes associated with disaster events, thereby supporting both damage assessment and strategic planning. Social media serves as a dynamic medium for acquiring real-time eyewitness accounts and situational updates, which can significantly enhance situational awareness. Meanwhile, sensor networks, such as meteorological and seismic systems, provide continuous data streams essential for early warning mechanisms and real-time monitoring efforts.

- a. Historical Disaster Data: Collected from international databases such as EM-DAT (The International Disaster Database), which includes data on natural disasters such as floods, earthquakes, and forest fires over the past 20 years [28],[29].
- b. Satellite Imagery: Satellite imagery data is taken from sources such as NASA and ESA to detect environmental changes before and after disasters [30].
- c. Social Media Data: Real-time data from platforms like Twitter and Facebook detects and verifies disaster events through user posts and reports [31].
- d. Data Sensors: Data from local weather and seismic sensors that provide real-time information regarding environmental conditions [32].

##### 2. Data Pre-processing

Raw datasets often contain errors, gaps, and irregularities that can compromise the effectiveness and precision of AI models. To mitigate these challenges, pre-processing procedures such as data cleaning, normalization, transformation, and formatting are implemented to standardize and refine the input data. This subsection details the pre-processing strategies employed to improve data integrity prior to model development and evaluation.

- a. Cleaning: Using standard statistical methods, removing incomplete, duplicate, and outlier data.
- b. Normalisation: Scaling numerical data to a consistent range ensures that certain features do not dominate the learning model [33].
- c. Feature Extraction: This uses techniques such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to reduce the dimensions of the data and extract the most relevant features.
- d. Labeling: Marking data with appropriate categories, eg, disaster severity categorized as low, medium, and high based on historical impact.

##### 3.2. Model Validation & Predictive Performance

During AI model testing, data is divided into different subsets to ensure unbiased evaluation of predictive performance. The dataset is typically split into training, validation, and test sets, where each subset serves a specific purpose in the model development lifecycle. The training set is used to build the model, the validation set helps in tuning hyperparameters, and the test set is used to assess the final model's generalization capability. This structured approach helps prevent overfitting and ensures that the model performs reliably on unseen data.

##### 1. Splitting Data

To mitigate overfitting and promote dependable model performance, the dataset is typically partitioned into three subsets: training, validation, and testing. Approximately 70% of the data is allocated for training, allowing the model to learn underlying patterns and associations. Around 15% is reserved for validation, which is employed during the tuning phase to adjust hyperparameters without directly impacting the learning process. The remaining 15% constitutes the test set, providing an objective measure of the model's predictive capability on previously unseen data. This structured division supports the robustness and generalizability of the AI system.

- a. Training Set: 70% of the dataset is used to train the model.
- b. Validation Set: 15% is used for hyperparameter tuning.

c. Test Set: The remaining 15% is used to evaluate the model's performance.

## 2. Models Implemented

This study utilizes a range of AI models namely Random Forest, Support Vector Machines (SVM), and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) to address various types of disaster-related data. Model selection is guided by task-specific suitability: Random Forest is applied for classifying structured datasets, SVM is employed for managing high-dimensional feature spaces, and CNN is utilized for processing spatial data such as satellite imagery. The methodology involves training each model on preprocessed data, fine-tuning their parameters to enhance performance, and assessing their predictive accuracy using established evaluation metrics. This strategic use of diverse models enables a thorough analysis and supports resilient decision-making in disaster management contexts.

### a. Random Forest:

Random Forest is a powerful ensemble learning algorithm that constructs multiple decision trees to improve prediction accuracy. By aggregating outputs from various trees, it reduces overfitting and enhances model stability. This makes it highly effective for disaster impact assessment and resource allocation.

- Tuning Parameters: Use Grid Search to find the optimal number of trees and maximum depth.
- Training: The model is trained on a training set with the target of predicting the severity of a disaster based on input features.

### b. Support Vector Machine (SVM):

SVM is a supervised learning algorithm that finds the optimal hyperplane to separate data into different categories. It is effective for disaster classification due to its ability to handle high-dimensional data. The following section details its kernel selection and parameter tuning.

- Kernel Used: RBF (Radial Base Function) kernels are selected after evaluation of several kernel types.
- Parameter Tuning: Uses Grid Search to find optimal values of C and gamma parameters.

### c. Deep Learning (CNN)

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) are powerful deep learning models designed for processing spatial and image data. They are highly effective in disaster management for analyzing satellite imagery and sensor data. The following section discusses the architecture and training parameters used.

- Architecture: Convolutional Neural Network with multiple convolution and pooling layers, followed by a fully connected layer [34].

- Training Parameters: Using Adam's optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001 and an epoch of 50 [35].

## d. Performance Metrics

Evaluating model performance is crucial to ensure accuracy and reliability in disaster management. Various metrics, such as precision, recall, and F1-score, are used to measure predictive effectiveness. The following section explains these metrics and their significance in assessing AI models.

- Precision: Measures the proportion of correct optimistic predictions.

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{True Positives}}{\text{True Positives} + \text{False Positives}} \quad (2)$$

- Recall: Measures the proportion of positive cases that were successfully detected.

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{True Positives}}{\text{True Positives} + \text{False Negatives}} \quad (3)$$

- F1-Score: Harmonic mean of precision and recall.

$$\text{F1-Score} = 2 \times \frac{\text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (4)$$

### d. Calculation Example:

The performance of the Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) model was assessed on a test set consisting of 100 disaster events. The model accurately detected 45 actual disaster occurrences (True Positives), incorrectly flagged 5 non-disaster events as disasters (False Positives), and failed to identify 7 genuine disaster events (False Negatives). From these outcomes, the model achieved a precision of 90%, a recall of 86.5%, and an F1-score of 88.2%. These evaluation metrics demonstrate the CNN model's effectiveness in accurately identifying disaster events while maintaining a relatively low misclassification rate, highlighting its potential for reliable disaster prediction applications.

### e. Result Summary:

Following the completion of equivalent evaluations across all models, a comparative analysis of their predictive capabilities was carried out. The findings revealed that the Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) outperformed the other models, achieving the highest scores in precision, recall, and F1-score. While both Random Forest and Support Vector Machine (SVM) exhibited strong performance, CNN consistently delivered superior results, particularly in processing complex spatial and temporal patterns associated with disaster events. These outcomes indicate that deep learning approaches such as CNN are especially well-suited for disaster prediction tasks involving large-scale and heterogeneous datasets.

Table 1. Predictive Performance Comparison Model

Model	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	F1-Score (%)
Random Forest	85.3	82.7	83.9
Support Vector Machine (SVM)	87.1	84.5	85.8
Deep Learning (CNN)	89.5	87.0	88.2

The CNN model performs best because it can effectively capture complex patterns from multivariate data, particularly when dealing with spatial and temporal structures. This makes it highly suitable for analyzing satellite imagery and sensor data, which are critical in disaster management scenarios. Its layered architecture allows the model to extract hierarchical features, enabling more accurate predictions of disaster severity and impact. As a result, CNN demonstrates superior performance compared to traditional machine learning models.

### 3.3. System Architecture and Implementation

To assess the performance of the AI-integrated cloud-based disaster management system, a set of simulated disaster scenarios was developed to mimic real-world conditions. These simulations encompass sudden urban flooding, moderate seismic events in densely populated zones, and rapidly advancing wildfires in remote areas. Each scenario aims to evaluate the system's capacity to process real-time information, support prompt decision-making, and optimize resource deployment. This subsection presents a detailed overview of each scenario and analyzes the system's responsiveness in terms of speed, precision, and overall dependability.

#### 1. System Setup:

Setting up a cloud-based AI system for disaster management requires a robust infrastructure. This includes selecting a scalable cloud platform, integrating real-time data ingestion, and deploying AI models for analysis. The following section outlines the key components of the system architecture.

- Cloud Platform:** Uses cloud services such as Amazon Web Services (AWS) that provide high scalability and availability [36].
- Data Ingestion:** AWS Kinesis collects real-time streaming data from multiple sources.
- Processing Framework:** Leverages Apache Spark for fast and efficient real-time data processing.
- AI Models Deployment:** Pre-trained models are deployed using services such as AWS Sage Maker, enabling real-time inference.

#### 2. Testing Scenarios:

To evaluate the system's effectiveness, various disaster scenarios are simulated. These scenarios represent real-world conditions such as floods, earthquakes, and wildfires. The following section details each scenario and the system's response performance.

- Scenario 1: Sudden flooding in urban areas due to heavy rain.
- Scenario 2: Earthquake of moderate magnitude in densely populated areas.
- Scenario 3: Forest fires that spread quickly in remote areas.

#### 3. Performance Metrics:

Assessing system performance is essential to measuring its effectiveness in disaster response. Key metrics such as response time, throughput, and latency are used to evaluate real-time processing capabilities. The following section explains these metrics and their impact on system efficiency.

- Response Time:** The time it takes for the system to receive the initial data to provide a recommendation for action.
- Throughput:** The amount of data that can be processed per unit of time.
- Latency:** Delay time in data processing and decision-making.

#### 4. Data and Calculation: For example, in Scenario 1 (Flood):

Data analysis is conducted to measure the system's effectiveness in handling flood disasters. Key parameters such as response time and improvement percentage are calculated to compare AI-enhanced and traditional methods. The following section presents the data and corresponding calculations.

- Traditional System Response Time: 120 minutes.
- AI-Enhanced System Response Time: 72 minutes.

#### Percentage Improvement Calculation:

The formula shown calculates the percentage improvement in response time between a traditional disaster management system and an AI-enhanced system. Initially, the traditional system had a response time of 120 minutes, which was reduced to 72 minutes using the AI-based system. By applying the formula

$$\frac{120 - 72}{120} \times 100\% = 40\%$$

The implementation of the AI-enhanced disaster management system resulted in a 40% reduction in response time across various disaster scenarios. This improvement highlights the system's capability to process real-time data efficiently and support faster decision-making. The consistent gains across flood, earthquake, and wildfire simulations confirm the effectiveness of AI-driven models in optimizing disaster response operations.

#### e. Result Summary:

The results highlight the improvements achieved by the AI-enhanced system in disaster response. Performance metrics such as response time reduction and efficiency gains are summarized. The following section presents a comparative analysis of different approaches.

Table 2. Real-time Processing Performance

Scenario	Traditional Response Time (min)	AI-Enhanced Response Time (min)	Improvement (%)
1	120	72	40
2	95	57	40
3	150	90	40

The AI-enhanced system consistently reduced response times by 40% across all simulated disaster scenarios, indicating its robust performance in various emergency contexts. This improvement stems from the parallel processing capabilities of cloud infrastructure combined with the analytical power of AI models. These technologies enable faster interpretation of complex datasets, supporting more timely and accurate disaster response decisions.

### 3.4. Problem Formulation

Efficient resource allocation plays a crucial role in determining the success of disaster management efforts, as it directly affects response time, cost, and the extent of damage mitigation. This subsection explores various optimization approaches designed to ensure that limited resources such as personnel, medical supplies, and equipment are distributed in the most effective manner. Techniques like Linear Programming (LP) and Genetic Algorithms (GA) are examined for their ability to minimize loss functions while adhering to real-world constraints. By implementing these methods, disaster response can become more strategic, timely, and impactful.

#### 1. Objective Function:

The loss function used in this study combines multiple components to reflect the impact of a disaster event. It is mathematically defined as :

$$L = w_1 \times T + w_2 \times C + w_3 \times D \quad (4)$$

where T represents the total response time, C is the operational cost, and D is the degree of damage (eg, casualties and infrastructure loss). Each component is assigned a weight ( $w_1$ ,  $w_2$ ,  $w_3$ ) to reflect its relative importance according to disaster response policies. The objective of the system is to minimize this function through optimal resource allocation and timely response.

#### 2. Constraints:

Effective disaster management is influenced by various constraints that must be considered during resource allocation. These include availability of resources, time limitations, and geographical challenges. The following

section outlines these constraints and their impact on decision-making.

- Resource Availability:** Resources such as personnel, equipment, and logistics are limited.
- Time Constraints:** Actions must be performed within a specific time frame for maximum effectiveness.
- Geographical Constraints:** The distribution of resources must consider geographical location and accessibility.

### 3.5. Optimization Methods

Ensuring efficient resource allocation during disaster events necessitates the application of advanced optimization techniques. These methods facilitate the identification of optimal strategies for deploying limited resources while minimizing response time and operational expenditures. This subsection explores approaches such as Linear Programming and Genetic Algorithms, both of which are tailored to address complex allocation challenges under multiple constraints. By integrating these techniques, disaster management systems can improve their operational responsiveness and mitigate the overall impact of emergency situations.

#### 1. Linear Programming (LP)

Linear Programming (LP) is a mathematical optimization method employed to identify the optimal solution to a problem defined by a linear objective function and a series of linear constraints. Within the context of disaster management, LP is utilized to distribute scarce resources such as personnel, equipment, and supplies across various impacted areas. The primary goal is to minimize overall losses by determining the most efficient allocation strategy, taking into account constraints related to resource availability and response time requirements.

##### a. Formulation

In the proposed optimization model, the decision variables denote the quantities of resource units such as personnel, equipment, and medical supplies allocated to each disaster-affected site. The central objective is to minimize the loss function L, which quantifies the overall disaster impact in terms of response time, operational costs, and extent of damage. The model incorporates constraints that reflect both the limited availability of resources and the minimum requirements specific to each location, ensuring that critical needs are met within feasible deployment capacities. This systematic framework supports strategic scenarios, data-driven decision-making in time-sensitive disaster response.

##### b. Solution Method

The Simplex Method is a widely used algorithm in linear programming for solving optimization problems involving resource allocation under defined constraints. It operates by systematically evaluating feasible solutions to either maximize or minimize a given objective function for instance, minimizing the total loss function in disaster management contexts. In this study, the Simplex Method is employed to identify the most efficient resource distribution strategy, ensuring that constraints such as resource availability and minimum site-specific requirements are fully met while achieving the optimal outcome [37].

2. Genetic Algorithms (GA):

The Genetic Algorithm (GA) is a heuristic optimization method inspired by the mechanisms of natural selection and evolutionary biology. Within the scope of this research, GA is employed to explore a wide range of potential resource allocation configurations and identify the solution that minimizes the loss function. The algorithm initiates by generating a population of candidate solutions, assessing their fitness based on predefined evaluation criteria, and iteratively improving them through genetic operations such as crossover and mutation across multiple generations.

a. Representation

In the framework of Genetic Algorithms, each individual within the population encodes a distinct resource allocation strategy for disaster-affected sites. These individuals serve as candidate solutions, specifying the distribution of resources such as personnel, equipment, and supplies across various impacted regions. Through evolutionary processes including selection, crossover, and mutation the algorithm progressively increases the population by promoting individuals with higher fitness scores. This iterative refinement leads to convergence toward an optimal or near-optimal allocation strategy. The GA approach offers a flexible and robust means of exploring complex solution spaces that may be difficult to navigate using conventional optimization techniques [38].

b. Fitness Function

Within the context of Genetic Algorithms, the fitness of each individual is assessed based on the negative value of the loss function  $L$ . This inverse relationship implies that solutions yielding lower loss indicating more favorable outcomes in terms of response time, cost, and damage are assigned higher fitness scores. By adopting this evaluation strategy, the algorithm inherently prioritizes individuals that contribute to more efficient and effective disaster response efforts. Consequently, the evolutionary process is guided toward resource allocation strategies that minimize the overall impact of the disaster.

c. Operations: Selection

The Genetic Algorithm process initiates by selecting the most promising individuals from the current population, based on fitness scores that indicate the effectiveness of each solution in minimizing the loss function. Subsequently, crossover operations are performed on the selected individuals, combining their attributes to produce new offspring that may inherit advantageous traits from both parents. To avoid premature convergence and to ensure comprehensive exploration of the solution space, mutation is applied by introducing random modifications to certain individuals. This mechanism preserves genetic diversity within the population and enhances the algorithm's ability to discover optimal or near-optimal resource allocation strategies in disaster response scenarios.

d. Parameters:

In the implementation of the Genetic Algorithm for resource allocation, specific parameter settings were established to facilitate effective optimization. A population size of 100 was used, meaning each generation comprised 100 distinct individual solutions representing various resource distribution strategies. The algorithm was executed over 50 generations, providing adequate iterations for the population to evolve and approach an optimal solution. A mutation rate of 0.01 was employed to introduce minor random alterations in individual solutions, thereby maintaining genetic diversity and reducing the risk of premature convergence to local optima. These parameters were selected through experimental tuning to achieve a balance between computational efficiency and solution quality.

3.6. Data and Results

To assess the effectiveness of the proposed optimization techniques, this study utilizes multiple datasets and simulates various real-world disaster scenarios, including earthquakes, floods, and wildfires. These diverse scenarios serve as test environments to evaluate how effectively the optimization models allocate resources under differing constraints. This subsection details the data sources employed in the simulations, presents the outcomes generated by each optimization method, and compares their performance with respect to response time, operational costs, and overall loss function values. This comparative analysis enables a clear understanding of the relative strengths and limitations of each approach within the context of disaster management.

1. Scenario Example:

Suppose an earthquake occurs in three different locations with the following resource needs:

Table 3. Scenario Example

Location	Required Personnel	Required Equipment	Required Medical Supplies
A	50	20	100

B	30	15	50
C	40	10	70

As illustrated in Table 3, the total resource demands across all locations slightly surpass the available personnel and medical supplies. The cumulative requirements amount to 120 personnel, 45 units of equipment, and 220 medical supplies, whereas the available resources consist of only 100 personnel, 40 equipment units, and 200 medical supplies. This imbalance presents a significant resource allocation challenge, highlighting the necessity for optimization methods to strategically allocate the limited resources in a manner that minimizes overall impact while addressing the most critical needs at locations A, B, and C.

## 2. LP Solution:

By applying the Simplex Method, an optimal resource allocation strategy was determined for the disaster scenarios under study. This method systematically analyzes feasible combinations of personnel, equipment, and medical supplies to minimize the total loss function. The resulting allocation effectively addresses the specific requirements of each location while remaining within the limits of available resources. These findings demonstrate the utility of linear programming in facilitating efficient and balanced disaster response planning.

Table 4. LP Solution

Location	Allocated Personnel	Allocated Equipment	Allocated Medical Supplies
A	45	18	90
B	30	15	50
C	25	7	60

As presented in Table 4, the Linear Programming (LP) method yields an efficient allocation of resources across the three designated locations. The corresponding loss function value derived from weighted factors including response time, operational cost, and extent of damage serves as a quantitative measure of the allocation strategy's effectiveness. This result demonstrates that the LP approach effectively minimizes resource expenditure while satisfying the essential requirements of each site. The balanced distribution contributes to mitigating the overall disaster impact, thereby validating the practical applicability of linear optimization in disaster response planning.

$$L_{LP} = w_1 \times 80 + w_2 \times \$50,000 + w_3 \times 200$$

## 3. GA Solution:

Following 50 generations of the Genetic Algorithm, the optimal solution was identified by minimizing the loss function. This solution represents the most effective distribution of available resources personnel, equipment, and medical supplies across the disaster-impacted locations. Through the iterative processes of selection, crossover, and mutation, the algorithm

progressively developed more efficient resource allocation strategies. Consequently, the final solution exhibits superior resource utilization compared to both traditional methods and Linear Programming approaches.

Table 5. GA Solution

Location	Allocated Personnel	Allocated Equipment	Allocated Medical Supplies
A	50	20	100
B	30	15	50
C	20	5	50

Table 5 displays the optimal resource allocation outcome obtained using the Genetic Algorithm (GA) after 50 generations. In this solution, Location A receives the largest share of 50 personnel, 20 units of equipment, and 100 medical supplies indicating a higher level of urgency or severity. Locations B and C are also allocated resources appropriately in line with their respective needs. This outcome highlights the GA's effectiveness in prioritizing and distributing limited resources across multiple disaster sites in a balanced and strategic manner.

The loss function value resulting from the GA-based resource allocation is lower than those produced by both traditional approaches and the Linear Programming method. This reduced value indicates more efficient and impactful utilization of resources, effectively minimizing the adverse effects of the disaster in terms of response time, operational costs, and overall damage. These findings reinforce the suitability of Genetic Algorithms as a highly effective solution for addressing the dynamic and complex nature of disaster management scenarios.

The equation:

$$L_{GA} = w_1 \times 75 + w_2 \times \$45,000 + w_3 \times 180$$

represents the total loss function value derived from the Genetic Algorithm (GA) resource allocation strategy, as shown in Table 5. Here, the components include a response time of 75 minutes, operational cost of \$45,000, and a damage level quantified as 180 units. Each of these factors is weighted by coefficients  $w_1$ ,  $w_2$ ,  $w_3$ , which reflect the relative importance assigned to time, cost, and damage in the decision-making model.

The results show that the GA approach is capable of minimizing the total loss more effectively than other methods by strategically distributing resources. Compared to other optimization techniques, this solution achieves better performance across all three dimensions speed, efficiency, and impact mitigation thereby proving the value of evolutionary algorithms in real-time disaster response planning.

## 4. Comparison:

To determine the most effective approach, different resource allocation methods are compared. The analysis evaluates response time, operational costs, and overall

efficiency. The following section presents a comparative assessment of traditional, linear programming, and genetic algorithm methods

Table 5. Resource Allocation Efficiency Comparison

Method	Response Time (min)	Operational Cost (\$)	Damage Level	Loss Function Value
Traditional Method	120	60,000	250	0.35
Linear Programming	80	50,000	200	0.25
Genetic Algorithms	75	45,000	180	0.22

Table 5 provides a comparative assessment of three resource allocation approaches in disaster management: the traditional method, Linear Programming (LP), and Genetic Algorithms (GA). The findings indicate that the GA approach delivers the most favorable outcomes across all performance indicators, achieving the shortest response time (75 minutes), the lowest operational cost (\$45,000), and the minimum damage level (180). Conversely, the traditional method performs the least effectively, registering the highest values in each of these categories.

The corresponding loss function values reflect these differences in efficiency: 0.35 for the traditional method, 0.25 for linear programming, and 0.22 for genetic algorithms. These values offer a consolidated metric to assess the effectiveness of each approach. Note: The Loss Function value is normalized for easier comparison, ensuring a fair and consistent evaluation across different strategies and scenarios. This comparison highlights the clear advantages of using advanced optimization techniques like GA in improving disaster response outcomes.

Genetic Algorithms (GA) demonstrate superior performance compared to both Linear Programming (LP) and traditional methods in reducing response time, operational costs, and damage levels during disaster scenarios. This enhanced effectiveness stems from GA's capability to explore a wide solution space through evolutionary mechanisms such as selection, crossover, and mutation. In contrast to LP, which is constrained by linear assumptions, GA is well-suited to address complex, non-linear, and dynamic problem settings. As a result, GA consistently produces more efficient and adaptable resource allocation strategies, underscoring its suitability for real-time disaster management applications.

### 3.7. Case Study: Early Warning System for Flooding

To illustrate the implementation of the developed system, this section presents a case study on the application of an early warning system for flood disasters. Implementing an effective early warning

system for flooding requires integrating multiple data sources, predictive modeling, and real-time monitoring. This subsection details the system components, including data acquisition, AI-based prediction models, and system deployment strategies.

#### 1. Data Sources:

- a. Meteorological Data: National meteorological agency's rainfall, humidity, and air pressure data.
- b. River Level Sensors: Real-time data on river water levels.
- c. Topographical Data: Information regarding the elevation and slope of the soil from GIS data.
- d. Historical Flood Data: Data on previous flood events to train predictive models [39].

#### 2. Predictive Model:

- a. Model Used: LSTM (Long Short-Term Memory) Neural Network, effective for time-series data.
- b. Input Features: A combination of meteorological, sensor, and topographic data.
- c. Output: Prediction of the probability of flooding in the next 6 hours in a given area.

#### 3. Training and Validation:

- a. Training Data: Data from 100 previous flood events.
- b. Validation Data: Data from 20 recent events not included in the training set.

#### 4. Evaluation Metric: Accuracy, Precision, Recall, and AUC-ROC (Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve).

The application of the LSTM model in flood early warning systems shows significant improvements in accuracy and lead time [40]. The model's ability to process and analyze time-series data allows for more complex pattern detection and reliable predictions. This

has a direct impact on improving evacuation efficiency and reducing material losses.

a. Prediction Performance:

The evaluation metrics demonstrate that the AI model employed for disaster prediction exhibits high effectiveness. Achieving an accuracy of 92%, the model correctly classifies the majority of disaster events. A precision score of 90% indicates that most predicted disaster instances were accurate, thereby minimizing false alarms. Furthermore, a recall rate of 88% confirms the model's capability to detect the majority of actual disaster occurrences. The high AUC-ROC value of 0.95 reinforces the model's strong discriminative power between disaster and non-disaster cases, affirming its reliability for use in early warning systems and decision-making processes.

b. Lead Time:

The integration of AI into the early warning system has notably enhanced lead time, delivering an average of 4 hours of advance notice prior to flood events double the 2-hour warning provided by the previous system. This extended lead time enables more effective planning for evacuations, resource deployment, and risk mitigation measures. As a result, communities are better positioned to prepare and respond proactively, thereby reducing the overall potential impact of the disaster.

c. Impact Analysis

The deployment of the AI-enhanced early warning system led to a marked improvement in evacuation efficiency during flood events. The increased lead time facilitated by the system resulted in a 30% rise in evacuation rates, enabling more individuals to reach safety before the disaster struck. Additionally, the system contributed to a 25% reduction in estimated material losses compared to outcomes associated with traditional early warning systems. These advances underscore the value of AI-driven predictive technologies in strengthening community preparedness and mitigating disaster-related impacts.

### 3.8. Discussion on Practical Implementation and Challenges

While AI offers numerous benefits for disaster management, challenges remain in its implementation. This section explores key practical considerations and obstacles that must be addressed for widespread adoption. Adopting AI technology involves various factors, ranging from data quality to system security. This subsection elaborates on essential considerations for practical implementation.

1. Data Quality and Availability:

A major challenge in the implementation of AI-based disaster management systems lies in the limited availability of consistent, high-quality, real-time data

especially in remote or underserved regions. This constraint can compromise the accuracy of predictive models and impede timely decision-making during critical situations. To overcome this issue, expanding the sensor infrastructure to capture a broader range of environmental data is imperative. Moreover, incorporating supplementary data sources such as Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and crowdsourced information can substantially improve data coverage and reliability, thereby enhancing the overall effectiveness of disaster monitoring and response systems.

2. Scalability:

An essential challenge faced by disaster management systems is managing sudden surges in data volume and user demand during large-scale disaster events. These abrupt increases can strain conventional systems, potentially causing delays or system failures that hinder the timely delivery of critical information and services. To address this, the adoption of elastic cloud architectures is recommended, allowing resources to scale dynamically in response to real-time demand. Furthermore, leveraging containerization technologies such as Docker and Kubernetes facilitates efficient horizontal scalability, ensuring system resilience and sustained performance under high-stress conditions.

3. Privacy and Security:

The collection and processing of sensitive data within disaster management systems poses substantial privacy and security challenges, particularly when dealing with personal or geolocation-specific information. Mishandling such data can result in breaches of confidentiality, loss of public trust, or violations of legal frameworks. To mitigate these risks, it is imperative to implement comprehensive security measures, including end-to-end encryption and stringent access controls. Additionally, adherence to data protection regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is essential to ensure user data is safeguarded and the system's integrity is maintained.

### 3.9. Future Development Areas

With the ongoing advancement of technology, there exists significant potential for continued research and innovation in AI-driven disaster management. Emerging tools and methodologies promise to further improve predictive accuracy, support real-time decision-making, and optimize resource allocation efficiency. Key areas for future investigation include the integration of Internet of Things (IoT) devices, the application of advanced AI approaches such as reinforcement learning and transfer learning, and the use of blockchain technology to ensure transparent and secure resource tracking. Realizing the full benefits of these innovations will require sustained interdisciplinary collaboration to develop more resilient and adaptive disaster response systems .

1. Integration with IoT Devices:

Expanding the integration of Internet of Things (IoT) devices is crucial for enhancing real-time environmental monitoring in disaster management systems. IoT sensors can provide continuous, location-specific data on variables such as temperature, humidity, water levels, and seismic activity, allowing for earlier detection and faster response to potential threats. By enabling a more comprehensive and dynamic monitoring network, IoT technology supports more accurate predictions, timely alerts, and data-driven decision-making during all phases of a disaster event.

2. Use of Blockchain Technology:

Blockchain technology serves a crucial function in enhancing data transparency and integrity within disaster management systems. Through its decentralized and tamper-resistant ledger, blockchain enables secure and verifiable tracking of resource distribution and financial contributions, thereby mitigating the risks of fraud and mismanagement. This higher level of accountability is especially vital during disaster response operations, where the fair and timely allocation of aid is essential. Additionally, the immutable nature of blockchain records promotes increased trust among key stakeholders, including governmental agencies, humanitarian organizations, and affected populations [43].

3. Advanced AI Techniques:

Reinforcement Learning presents a valuable approach for strengthening disaster management systems by facilitating adaptive decision-making through ongoing real-time feedback from dynamic environments. This method enables the system to refine its performance progressively by learning from interactions, thereby supporting more responsive and situationally aware actions during critical events. Furthermore, Transfer Learning enhances model effectiveness by leveraging knowledge acquired from one disaster type such as flooding and applying it to others, including wildfires or earthquakes. This strategy minimizes the need for comprehensive retraining and accelerates the development of accurate predictive models across varying disaster scenarios.

4. Community Engagement Platforms:

Creating a platform that facilitates active community involvement in disaster reporting and response can greatly improve the precision and speed of information acquisition. This system would enable citizens to contribute real-time updates, images, and location-specific reports from impacted areas, thus enhancing situational awareness for emergency services and humanitarian agencies. Harnessing public input allows disaster management systems to make better-informed decisions, optimize resource deployment, and respond more rapidly to dynamic crisis conditions. Additionally,

this participatory approach empowers communities to play a proactive role in enhancing their own safety and resilience.

4. Conclusion

This research underscores the transformative role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in enhancing cloud-based disaster management systems by significantly improving accuracy, operational efficiency, and responsiveness. By incorporating advanced AI techniques including machine learning, natural language processing, and computer vision the study demonstrates substantial progress in areas such as disaster forecasting, resource allocation, and real-time decision support. The implementation of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Genetic Algorithms (GAs) has notably led to improvements including up to 40% reductions in response times, more precise early warning capabilities, and more efficient distribution of resources, contributing to lower operational costs and reduced disaster impact. Despite ongoing challenges related to data integrity, system scalability, and privacy concerns, the findings establish a solid groundwork for further exploration and practical deployment. The study also highlights the importance of continued technological innovation, integration with Internet of Things (IoT) frameworks, and fostering community engagement to enhance disaster resilience and preparedness.

Author Contributions Statement

Name of Author	C	M	So	Va	Fo	I	R	D	W
Adam Puspabhuana	✓	✓						✓	✓
Andhika				✓	✓				
Yudi Triyana		✓				✓			✓
Muhammad Rifky Adhani	✓		✓				✓		
Agus Suryadi				✓	✓				

Conflict of Interest Statement

Authors state no conflict of interest.

Informed Consent

We have obtained informed consent from all individuals included in this study.

Data Availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, [R], upon reasonable request.

## References

- [1] Akoh Atadoga, Femi Osasona, Olukunle Oladipupo Amoo, Oluwatoyin Ajoke Farayola, Benjamin Samson Ayinla, and Temitayo Oluwaseun Abrahams, "THE ROLE OF IT IN ENHANCING SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE: A GLOBAL REVIEW," *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 336–351, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.51594/ijmer.v6i2.774.
- [2] J. Yin, S. Karimi, A. Lampert, and M. Cameron, "Using social media to enhance emergency awareness," *IJCAI International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 4234–4235, 2015, doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2015/591.
- [3] M. Imran, C. Castillo, F. Diaz, and S. Vieweg, "Processing social media messages in mass emergencies: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 47, no. 4, p. 67, 2015, doi: 10.1145/2771588.
- [4] E. Bonabeau, "Agent-based modeling: Methods and techniques for simulating human systems," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 99, no. suppl\_3, pp. 7280–7287, May 2002, doi: 10.1073/pnas.082080899.
- [5] R. Shahabadkar and KR Shahabadkar, "Implications of Artificial Intelligence to Enhance the Security Aspects of Cloud-Enabled Internet of Things (IoT)," 2019, pp. 14–24. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-19807-7\_2.
- [6] C. Yang, Q. Huang, Z. Li, K. Liu, and F. Hu, "Big Data and cloud computing: innovation opportunities and challenges," *Int J Digit Earth*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 13–53, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1080/17538947.2016.1239771.
- [7] P. Raj and A. Raman, *Software-Defined Cloud Centers*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-78637-7.
- [8] F. Özen and A. Souri, "Cloud-based disaster management architecture using hybrid machine learning approach in IoT," *Multimed Tools Appl*, vol. 83, no. 29, pp. 72357–72370, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1007/s11042-024-18333-6.
- [9] D., ZL, & NJF Zhang, "A knowledge management framework for the support of decision making in humanitarian assistance/disaster relief," *Knowl Inf Syst*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 520–520, Sept. 2002, doi: 10.1007/s101150200019.
- [10] S. Gupta, S. Modgil, A. Kumar, U. Sivarajah, and Z. Irani, "Artificial intelligence and cloud-based Collaborative Platforms for Managing Disaster, extreme weather and emergency operations," *Int J Prod Econ*, vol. 254, p. 108642, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2022.108642.
- [11] HS Munawar, M. Mojtahedi, AW Hammad, A. Kouzani, and MP Mahmud, "Disruptive technologies as a solution for disaster risk management: a review," *Science of the Total Environment*, vol. 806, p. 151351, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151351.
- [12] S. Feng, M. Sester, and L. Zhang, "Integration of heterogeneous data for disaster prediction and management in a spatial data infrastructure," *ISPRS Int J Geoinf*, vol. 8, no. 6, p. 270, 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijgi8060270.
- [13] VG Barros, J. Rapaglia, MB Richter, and JF Andrighi, "Design process in the urban context - Mobility and health in Special Flood Hazard Areas," *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, vol. 59, p. 102170, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ijdr.2021.102170.
- [14] Z. Ramadhani and A. Akrimullah, "How effective is crowdsourced data during a crisis emergency? A case of the 2018 Palu-Donggala earthquake," *Jurnal Teknik Sipil dan Lingkungan*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 221–230, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.29244/jstil.9.2.221-230.
- [15] M. Şengöz, "Harnessing Artificial Intelligence and Big Data for Proactive Disaster Management: Strategies, Challenges, and Future Directions," *Haliç Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 57–91, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.46373/hafebid.1534925.
- [16] N. Kumar and S. Sharma, "Disaster management and IoT: A bibliometric analysis," *Mater Today Proc*, vol. 47, pp. 5104–5108, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.matpr.2021.05.667.
- [17] M. Ahmad, "The Role of Data Science and Volunteered Geographic Information in Enhancing Government Service Delivery," 2023, pp. 254–281. doi: 10.4018/978-1-6684-9716-6.ch009.
- [18] L. Floridi, "Distributed Morality in an Information Society," *Sci Eng Ethics*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 727–743, Sept. 2013, doi: 10.1007/s11948-012-9413-4.
- [19] M.A. Khoshkholghi, A. Abdullah, R. Latip, S. Subramaniam, and M. Othman, "Disaster Recovery in Cloud Computing: A Survey," *Computer and Information Science*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 39, Sept. 2014, doi: 10.5539/cis.v7n4p39.
- [20] RM Llácer-Iglesias, PA López-Jiménez, and M. Pérez-Sánchez, "Exploring options for energy recovery from wastewater: Evaluation of hydropower potential in a sustainability framework," *Sustain Cities Soc*, vol. 95, p. 104576, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.scs.2023.104576.
- [21] A. Sizo, A. Lino, LP Reis, and Á. Rocha, "An overview of assessing the quality of peer review reports of scientific articles," *Int J Inf Manage*, vol. 46, pp. 286–293, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.07.002.
- [22] S. Liu and X. Xu, "Cyber-physical-social systems for command and control," *IEEE Intell Syst*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 76–83, 2018, doi: 10.1109/MIS.2018.011681713.
- [23] X. Jiang and Z. Zeng, "Empowering multi-source SAR Flood mapping with unsupervised learning," *Environmental Research Letters*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 014006, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ad9491.
- [24] Z. Ma and G. Mei, "Deep learning for geological hazards analysis: Data, models, applications, and opportunities," *Earth Sci Rev*, vol. 223, p. 103858, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.earscirev.2021.103858.
- [25] A. Sutedi, H. Aulawi, E. Walujodjati, D. Destiani, and S. Fatimah, "C4.5 ALGORITHM FOR DISASTER IDENTIFIER SYSTEM," vol. 3, no. 3, 2022, doi: 10.20884/1.jutif.2022.3.3.160.
- [26] AS Albahri et al., "A systematic review of trustworthy artificial intelligence applications in natural disasters," *Computers and Electrical Engineering*, vol. 118, p. 109409, Sept. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.compeleceng.2024.109409.
- [27] G. Pang, "Artificial Intelligence for Natural Disaster Management," *IEEE Intell Syst*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 3–6, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1109/MIS.2022.3220061.
- [28] X. Fu et al., "Revolutionising agri-energy: A comprehensive survey on the applications of artificial intelligence in agricultural energy internet," *Energy Internet*, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1049/ein2.12019.
- [29] KK Kapoor, K. Tamilmani, NP Rana, P. Patil, YK Dwivedi, and S. Nerur, "Advances in Social Media Research: Past, Present and Future," *Information*

- Systems Frontiers, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 531–558, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10796-017-9810-y.
- [30] MF Goodchild, “Citizens as sensors: the world of volunteered geography,” *GeoJournal*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 211–221, Nov. 2007, doi: 10.1007/s10708-007-9111-y.
- [31] MI Jordan and TM Mitchell, “Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects,” *Science* (1979), vol. 349, no. 6245, pp. 255–260, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1126/science.aaa8415.
- [32] D. Shoji, R. Noguchi, S. Otsuki, and H. Hino, “Classification of Volcanic Ash Particles using a Convolutional Neural Network and Probability,” *Sci Rep*, vol. 8, p. 8111, 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-26445-9.
- [33] J. Schmidhuber, “Deep learning in neural networks: An overview,” *Neural Networks*, vol. 61, pp. 85–117, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.neunet.2014.09.003.
- [34] P. Meel and DK Vishwakarma, “A temporal ensemble based semi-supervised ConvNet for the detection of fake news articles,” *Expert Syst Appl*, vol. 177, p. 115002, Sept. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2021.115002.
- [35] Z. Sun, X. Cheng, R. Zhang, and B. Yang, “Factors Influencing Rumor Re-Spreading in a Public Health Crisis by the Middle-Aged and Elderly Populations,” *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, vol. 17, no. 18, p. 6542, Sept. 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17186542.
- [36] Q. Wu, Y. Chen, J.P. Wilson, X. Liu, and H. Li, “An effective parallelization algorithm for DEM generalization based on CUDA,” *Environmental Modeling & Software*, vol. 114, pp. 64–74, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.envsoft.2019.01.002.
- [37] L. Zhou, W. Liu, C. (Victor) Shi, and G. Hua, “Service Supply Chain Management Platform: Challenges and solutions,” *Int J Prod Econ*, vol. 247, p. 108480, May 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2022.108480.
- [38] S. Pearson and A. Benameur, “Privacy, Security and Trust Issues Arising from Cloud Computing,” in *2010 IEEE Second International Conference on Cloud Computing Technology and Science*, IEEE, Nov. 2010, pp. 693–702. doi: 10.1109/CloudCom.2010.66.
- [39] R. Mishra, M. Singh, M. Sharma, and S. Kumar, “Disaster Management Using Blockchain,” *International Journal of Blockchains and Cryptocurrencies*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2023, doi: 10.1504/IJBC.2023.10060314.
- [40] B. Meskó, G. Hetényi, and Z. Györfly, “Will artificial intelligence solve the human resource crisis in healthcare?” *BMC Health Serv Res*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 545, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12913-018-3359-4.