

## **International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews**

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

# NATURAL DISASTER PREDICTION SYSTEM

## Vishnu.S.S<sup>1</sup>, Dr. M. Praneesh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UG Student Department of Computer Science with Data Analytics, Sri Ramakrishna College of Arts & Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu <sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science with Data Analytics, Sri Ramakrishna College of Arts & Science Coimbatore Tamil Nadu

#### ABSTRACT

Natural disasters like earthquakes and forest fires pose severe threats to life, infrastructure, and the environment. Accurate prediction and risk assessment are crucial in minimizing damage and enhancing disaster preparedness. This paper aims to develop a *web-based disaster prediction system* that leverages *historical and real-time environmental data* to forecast potential disasters. Using key parameters such as *latitude, longitude, depth, temperature, humidity, and seismic activity*, the system applies a *Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) model* to analyze patterns and assess risk levels. A structured *data processing and deep learning approach* enhances the accuracy and reliability of predictions. The system features a *user-friendly interface*, allowing users to input *real-time environmental parameters* and receive instant disaster risk assessments. Results demonstrate that the system effectively classifies disaster risks, providing valuable insights for *early warning and disaster management efforts*. The proposed system contributes to proactive disaster mitigation by helping authorities and individuals take preventive actions, ensuring *better preparedness and response planning*.

KEYWORDS: Earthquake Forecasting, Forest Fire Detection, LSTM Model, Time-Series Analysis

## I. INTRODUCTION

Natural disaster prediction system is developed to provide a structured and efficient approach for forecasting earthquakes and forest fires by analysing both historical and real-time environmental data. The system follows a systematic methodology to ensure accurate risk assessment and reliable disaster predictions. The process begins with data collection, where essential parameters such as latitude, longitude, depth, temperature, humidity, wind speed, and seismic activity are gathered from trusted sources like meteorological agencies and disaster management databases. The collected data undergoes pre-processing, which includes normalization, feature extraction, and removal of inconsistencies, ensuring the dataset is optimized for effective analysis. After pre-processing, the system identifies key features that influence earthquake and forest fire occurrences. These parameters are analysed using structured data classification techniques to assess risk levels accurately. The long short-term memory (LSTM) model is then applied to predict disaster likelihood based on historical trends and real-time environmental inputs. This structured approach allows the system to provide highly accurate disaster predictions, aiding in proactive disaster management and preparedness. The system is deployed as a web-based application, enabling users to input real-time environmental data and receive instant disaster risk evaluations. Designed for ease of use, the interface ensures accessibility for researchers, disaster management authorities, and individuals seeking real-time disaster risk assessments. The model undergoes continuous validation and performance evaluation, comparing predictions with past disaster records to ensure optimal accuracy and reliability. This structured content model ensures a robust, scalable, and effective disaster prediction system.

Current disaster prediction methods rely on traditional data analysis techniques and basic computational models, which often lack accuracy and real-time efficiency. These systems primarily use historical data and predefined rules to estimate the likelihood of disasters, but they struggle with adaptability to real-time environmental changes. Many existing approaches rely on conventional statistical models, which achieve only moderate accuracy and require extensive datasets for training, making them computationally expensive and less practical for real-time applications.

Existing systems also face challenges in scalability and fail to integrate multiple critical environmental factors such as temperature, humidity, wind speed, and seismic activity. The inability to process large-scale data efficiently reduces classification accuracy and delays disaster response. Furthermore, the absence of automated real-time data collection limits the system's effectiveness in generating timely disaster predictions. Due to these limitations, there is a need for a more efficient and accurate disaster prediction system that enhances real-time data processing, improves prediction accuracy, and supports faster disaster preparedness and response measures.

## **II.RELATED WORKS**

Wang et al. (2021) developed a data-driven approach for earthquake prediction by integrating seismic and environmental factors. Their model analyzed historical earthquake records and real-time seismic activity to improve prediction accuracy. The study emphasized the role of geospatial analysis in identifying high-risk zones. The research demonstrated that combining real-time and past data enhanced disaster forecasting reliability. However, the high computational cost of real-time processing remained a challenge. The model required extensive computational resources, making large-scale

implementation difficult. They suggested incorporating IoT-based sensors for more accurate seismic data collection. The study also explored the impact of tectonic plate movement patterns on earthquake forecasting. Despite improvements in accuracy, real-time disaster alert systems were still limited. Future recommendations included optimizing data collection methods for better prediction efficiency. [1]

Das et al. (2020) examined various machine learning algorithms, such as decision trees and regression models, for disaster prediction. Their study found that machine learning models outperformed traditional statistical methods in terms of accuracy. However, they noted that large datasets were required for reliable predictions. The research highlighted that decision trees struggled with dynamic environmental conditions. Pre-processing techniques such as feature selection significantly improved model performance. The study recommended integrating multiple environmental parameters for better disaster risk assessment.

The authors emphasized the importance of training models with updated datasets for real-time prediction. Their findings showed that hybrid models combining statistical and AI techniques yielded better results. However, challenges remained in adapting models to real-time disaster occurrences. Future research was suggested to focus on developing scalable prediction models with minimal data dependencies. [2]

Liu et al. (2018) explored the application of long short-term memory (LSTM) networks for earthquake forecasting. Their study demonstrated that deep learning models captured complex disaster patterns more effectively than traditional approaches. The research showed that LSTM models were particularly useful in detecting patterns from time-series data. However, challenges such as data availability and high computational power requirements affected real-time implementation. The study compared the performance of LSTM with other neural networks, finding LSTM superior for sequential data analysis. They proposed a hybrid approach integrating statistical models with deep learning for improved accuracy. Their findings indicated that real-time disaster prediction could be enhanced with cloud-based processing. The study suggested that integrating multiple seismic indicators would improve forecasting accuracy. Despite its advantages, LSTM required extensive training and fine-tuning for optimal results. Future work was recommended to focus on optimizing deep learning models for real-world applications. [3]

Zhao et al. (2021) focused on forest fire prediction using meteorological data, including temperature, humidity, and wind speed. The study showed that integrating multiple weather factors significantly improved fire risk assessment. They used machine learning techniques to classify fire-prone areas based on historical wildfire records. However, inconsistent data sources led to variations in prediction accuracy. The authors suggested the use of real-time satellite monitoring to improve fire detection rates. Their research highlighted that wind speed was a crucial factor in the spread of wildfires. They proposed the integration of remote sensing technology with predictive models for better results. One of the challenges faced was the inability of traditional models to adapt to changing climate conditions. The study emphasized the need for continuous model training with updated environmental data. Future work recommended developing AI-driven early warning systems for wildfire management. [4]

Raj et al. (2020) developed a hybrid approach combining deep learning and statistical methods for flood prediction. Their system improved early warning capabilities by analysing historical rainfall and water level data. The study emphasized the importance of real-time water level monitoring to enhance prediction accuracy. They compared the performance of deep learning models with traditional hydrological models. Their findings indicated that AI-based methods performed better in identifying flood-prone areas. However, the computational power required for deep learning models was a significant limitation. They proposed integrating remote sensing data to improve accuracy and reduce processing time. The study highlighted the challenges in processing large-scale flood data efficiently. Their research suggested the development of scalable models that could handle dynamic weather conditions. Future improvements included real-time flood mapping using geospatial AI technology. [5]

Kamila is and Prenafeta-Boldú (2019) proposed an IoT-based disaster monitoring system for real-time data collection. Their study demonstrated that integrating environmental sensors significantly improved disaster prediction reliability. They analysed data from multiple sources, including weather stations, satellite imagery, and ground-based sensors. However, network latency and data transmission delays in remote areas posed significant challenges. Their research emphasized the importance of real-time data processing to enhance early warning capabilities. They suggested using edge computing to reduce the dependency on centralized cloud servers. Their findings showed that AI-driven analytics could help process large volumes of disaster data efficiently. The study proposed a hybrid system that combined IoT, cloud computing, and machine learning. The authors highlighted the potential of automated disaster detection for faster emergency response. Future research was recommended to address data security concerns and improve sensor accuracy. [6]

Panahi et al. (2022) introduced a cloud-based disaster monitoring system that processes large-scale disaster data in real-time. Their study demonstrated improved prediction accuracy by integrating various environmental datasets.

However, dependency on network connectivity affected response times in remote and disaster-prone regions. The authors proposed optimizing data transmission protocols to minimize delays in alert dissemination. Their research found that combining real-time IoT data with machine learning models enhanced forecasting precision. The study emphasized the scalability of cloud computing for handling disaster-related big data. One of the key challenges was ensuring data integrity across multiple sources. They suggested integrating blockchain technology to enhance the security of disaster prediction models. Their findings indicated that AI-based predictive models performed better when trained with diverse datasets. The study recommended further exploration of decentralized data processing for faster disaster response. [7]

Manogaran et al. (2021) explored big data analytics for disaster prediction and management. Their study focused on processing vast amounts of historical disaster data to identify patterns and trends. The research found that big data analytics improved the accuracy of disaster forecasting. However, the complexity of processing large datasets posed scalability challenges. They proposed distributed computing techniques to handle the increasing volume of disaster-related data. Their study emphasized the need for integrating real-time environmental data with historical records. They suggested cloud-based

storage solutions to enhance data accessibility and processing speed. The findings indicated that AI-driven models could significantly enhance prediction capabilities. One limitation was the difficulty of filtering noise from large datasets. Future research was recommended to focus on optimizing big data frameworks for disaster prediction. [8]

Caraka et al. (2021) studied the effectiveness of statistical and machine learning models in natural disaster forecasting. Their findings showed that hybrid models combining AI and statistical techniques improved prediction accuracy. However, continuous updates to training datasets were required for effective performance. The study emphasized the role of environmental parameters in disaster classification. They found that ensemble learning techniques helped in reducing prediction errors. The authors recommended integrating real-time monitoring systems to improve forecasting reliability. One of the challenges was the difficulty in acquiring high-quality training data.

Their research demonstrated that AI-based models outperformed traditional forecasting techniques. However, high computational costs remained a significant barrier to large-scale implementation. Future studies were suggested to focus on automated data collection for improved model efficiency. [9]

Murphy et al. (2019) explored the role of artificial intelligence in disaster prediction. Their research highlighted deep learning's potential in identifying disaster patterns. However, high data requirements and model complexity limited real-world applications. They proposed simplifying AI models for faster and more efficient disaster forecasting. Their findings indicated that integrating satellite imagery with AI improved prediction accuracy. They suggested using transfer learning to enhance the adaptability of deep learning models. The study emphasized the importance of integrating real-time environmental data sources. One limitation was the lack of standardization in disaster datasets. They recommended developing an open-source platform for global disaster prediction research. Future improvements included refining AI models to handle real-time disaster risk assessments more effectively. [10]

## **III. METHEDOLOGY**

This paper uses a web-based Python application with an LSTM model to predict earthquakes and forest fires based on historical and real-time environmental data.

It involves data collection, pre-processing, feature selection, model training, risk classification, and output generation. Key environmental parameters like temperature, humidity, wind speed, and seismic activity are collected and processed to improve prediction accuracy.

Users input real-time data through a web interface, and the system classifies disaster risk as low, moderate, or high. Results are displayed with graphs and tables for easy interpretation.

Continuous validation ensures accuracy, making the system efficient, scalable, and reliable for disaster risk assessment. The model improves over time by updating with new data, enhancing prediction precision. This approach helps authorities and individuals take timely precautions to minimize disaster impact.



**Figure-1 System Architecture** 

#### 1. Data Collection

The system utilizes datasets containing historical earthquake and forest fire records, along with environmental parameters such as latitude, longitude, depth, temperature, humidity, wind speed, and seismic activity. These datasets are sourced from trusted government agencies, meteorological organizations, and publicly available disaster databases. The collected data forms the foundation for training and testing the LSTM-based prediction model.

#### 2. Data Pre-processing

Raw data is processed to remove missing values, inconsistencies, and irrelevant attributes. Normalization and feature scaling techniques are applied to ensure that all variables are standardized for accurate predictions. Outliers in the dataset are identified and handled to prevent skewed results, improving the efficiency of LSTM model training.

#### 3. Feature Selection

To improve prediction accuracy, feature selection techniques identify the most critical factors contributing to earthquake and forest fire occurrences. Parameters such as seismic activity, atmospheric pressure, humidity levels, and temperature fluctuations are analyzed to determine their impact on disaster risk assessment.

Unnecessary features are eliminated to optimize computational efficiency and enhance the performance of the LSTM model.

#### 4. LSTM Model Implementation

The system is implemented using Python and an LSTM-based deep learning model within a Flask-powered web interface. The LSTM model is trained on sequential disaster data, capturing long-term dependencies and patterns in environmental fluctuations. The model classifies disaster risk into low, moderate, or high probability categories, enabling accurate disaster forecasting based on historical trends and real-time inputs.

#### 5. User Input and Prediction Processing

Users enter real-time environmental parameters into the web interface, including temperature, humidity, wind speed, and seismic activity. The system processes this input by comparing it with historical patterns learned by the LSTM model. The model analyses sequential dependencies and generates risk assessments, improving disaster prediction accuracy compared to traditional methods.

#### 7. Output Generation and Visualization

The system provides disaster risk assessments through the web interface, displaying predictions in a clear and user-friendly format. Results are visualized using graphs, tables, and color-coded risk indicators, ensuring easy interpretation. The generated output assists users and disaster management authorities in making informed decisions and taking preventive measures.

#### 8. Model Validation and Performance Evaluation

The accuracy and reliability of the system are evaluated using historical disaster records. Performance metrics such as precision, recall, and error rate are analysed to measure the effectiveness of the LSTM-based model. The system undergoes iterative improvements through data updates, hyperparameter tuning, and algorithm optimization to enhance disaster prediction capabilities.

#### 3.2 Proposed Algorithm

The proposed system is a web-based natural disaster prediction model that utilizes Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks to predict earthquakes and forest fires. The system processes both historical dataset values and real-time user inputs, such as temperature, humidity, wind speed, and seismic activity, to assess disaster risks. By leveraging LSTM's ability to analyse time-series data, the model captures long-term dependencies in disaster patterns, improving prediction accuracy.

Unlike traditional models, LSTM can handle sequential data efficiently, making it ideal for analysing environmental changes over time. The system applies data pre-processing, feature selection, and normalization techniques to optimize model performance. The risk assessment model classifies the likelihood of disasters into low, moderate, or high-risk categories, helping users make informed decisions. The Flask-based web interface allows users to input real-time environmental parameters, which are processed by the LSTM model to generate predictions. The system continuously updates its dataset to adapt to changing environmental conditions, enhancing disaster forecasting reliability. By integrating deep learning techniques with structured data analysis, the proposed system improves disaster preparedness and response efforts.

#### Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) Method

LSTM (Long Short-Term Memory) is a specialized type of recurrent neural network (RNN) designed to process and predict sequential data efficiently. It is widely used in time-series forecasting, making it ideal for *natural disaster prediction*, where past environmental patterns influence future occurrences. Unlike traditional RNNs, LSTM overcomes the vanishing gradient problem by using *gated memory cells* to retain important information over long sequences. In this project, LSTM is utilized to analyse *historical earthquake and forest fire datasets*, capturing dependencies in environmental variables such as *seismic activity, temperature, humidity, and wind speed*. The model processes both *historical trends and real-time inputs*, making predictions based on learned temporal patterns. The *forget gate, input gate, and output gate* in LSTM allow the model to selectively retain and discard information, improving forecasting accuracy. LSTM is particularly effective in disaster prediction because it can *identify long-term dependencies* in sequential data, such as how rising temperatures over time impact wildfire risks or how seismic tremors precede earthquakes.

The model is trained using past disaster occurrences, allowing it to detect hidden patterns in environmental changes. Once trained, the LSTM model can take *user-provided real-time input values*, process them with historical trends, and generate a probability-based disaster risk assessment. By using LSTM, the system achieves *higher accuracy in disaster forecasting* compared to traditional statistical models. The ability to learn from time-series data makes LSTM a powerful tool in *real-time disaster prediction and early warning systems*. Future enhancements include integrating *real-time IoT and satellite data* to further improve accuracy and response time.

## **IV. RESULT**

### 4.1 Data

The LSTM model processes historical disaster data and real-time inputs like temperature, humidity, wind speed, and seismic activity. Data is collected from government and meteorological sources, pre-processed to handle missing values, and normalized for stability. Since LSTM uses sequential data, a sliding window approach captures long-term dependencies. The model learns disaster patterns using forget, input, and output gates. When a user inputs real-time data via the Flask web interface, it is normalized and compared with past trends. The model then predicts low, moderate, or high risk, displaying results through graphs and tables for easy interpretation.

#### 4.2 RESULTS

~	Hie Ealt selection view Ga	кип -	···· • = > (	/-/ Natural-Onaster-Prediction	• *		
<b>a</b>			PROBLEMS 💿 OUTPUT E	DEBUG CEINSOLE TERMINAL PORTS			
L,							
$\sim$	<ul> <li>NATURAL-DISASTER-PREDICTION</li> </ul>		Epoch 11/20				men 25
2	✓ static			] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.1710 - accuracy	: 0.9407 - val_loss: 0.1718	• val_accuracy: 0.943	mon 25
~	~ ess		2 Enach 43/39			EJPY	mon
3 in 19	materialize.css		735/735 [		: 0.9423 - val loss: 0.1672	- val accuracy: 0,943	
	materialize minuess						
	# styloless		Epoch 13/20	A second se			
~	✓ ji		0		: 0.0417 - Val_1066: 0.1605	val_accuracy: 0.042	
	26 Initje		Epoch 14/20				
	76 materializejs		735/735 [	] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.1600 - accuracy	: 0.9425 - val_loss: 0.1660 -	val_accuracy: 0.944	
π	76 materialize minus		9 Found: 15720				
A	<ul> <li>templates</li> </ul>		735/735		: 0.9417 - val loss: 0.1669 -	val accuracy: 0.942	
	o earthquake.html						
	O torest tre.html		Epoch 16/20				
	O torest.html		6		: 0.9423 - Val_1055: 0.1708	val_accuracy: 0.945	
	<ul> <li>abb/bh</li> </ul>	1, 14	Epoch 17/20				
	/ app.yaml			] - 2s 3ws/step - loss: 0.1671 - accuracy	: 0.9427 - val_loss: 0.1650	<ul> <li>val_accuracy: 0.944</li> </ul>	
	Earthquake_dataset.csv		0 5				
	# earthquake_lstm_modeLh5		735/735 [		: 0.9119 - val loss: 0.1642	val accuracy: 0.944	
	earthquake.py						
_	<ul> <li>earthquakeapp.py</li> </ul>		Epoch 19/28				
	Forest_fire_lstm_model.h5		735/735	] - 25 385/step - 1055: 0.1645 - accuracy	: 0.9422 - val_loss: 0.1646	val_accuracy: 0.943	
	Forest_fire.csv		Epoch 28/29				
	forest_fire.py		735/735 [	] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.1663 - accuracy	: 0.9422 - val_loss: 0.1651 -	val_accuracy: 0.944	
	scaler.pkl		6				
0			ng your model as an HDF5	5 file via `model.save()`. This file format is considered	legacy. We recommend using :	instead the native Ke	
8			ras format, e.g. model.	.save('my_model.keras')'.			
	> OUTLINE		saving_api_save_model				
500	> TIMELINE		O PS D: Watural Disaster.	Prediction			
× 1	main O ROA3				Ln 11. Col 21 Sevence	UTF-8 CRLF () Python 3.8.11	64-ыз 🛛
		-				ruc.	1/14 014
	Sunny	L Q	Search 28	) 💻 🍯 🔛 🍞 💷 ڬ 🔳 💽 🔜	🕒 😏 🍼 🔛	^ •no ⊕ d× ₽₽	3/13/2025
-							
			Fig	g – 2 Training Earthquake Datas	et		
				<u> </u>			
×1 F	ile Edit Selection View Go				8~		
-	2015/01192			SHUG CENSOLS TRUMINAL INSPIS			
L,	NATURAL DISASTER PERICTION						then A
0	✓ static		Epoch 16/30				then 🛆
-			Epoch 17/30	] - 05 Zans/step - 1055: 0.0009 - accuracy: 0	.5825 - Val_toss: 0.7080 - V	IL_accuracy: 0.2500 E Py	thon
9.0	# materialize.css		2/2 [	] - 0s 27ms/step - loss: 0.6865 - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7069 - v	il_accuracy: 0.2500	
	# materialize.min.css		2/2 [	] - 0s 33ms/step - loss: 0.6842 - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7079 - val_	al_accuracy: 0.2500	
	# style.css		Epoch 19/30		FOR up less a 7000 w		
	JS initis		Epoch 20/30	os sandistap - tots, eluase - accuracy; e	The state of the s		
85	JS materializejs		2/2 [	] - 0s 32ms/step - loss: 0.6827 - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7688 - vi	1_accuracy: 0.2500	
	JS matenalize.min.js		2/2 [	] - 0s 32ms/step - loss: 0.6818 - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7092 - v	il_accuracy: 0.2500	
4			Epoch 22/30 2/2 [	- 85 2705/strp - Joss: 8.0823 - accuracy: 8	5025 - val loss: 8.2009 - va	al accuracy: 8.2588	
	earthquake.html     contact the block		Epoch 23/38	, 10 110, 100, 100, 0,000, 000, 0,000, 000, 0,000,			
_	O forest bird		2/2 [ Epoch 24/39	] - 0s 71ms/step - loss: 0.6799 - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7101 - v	d_accuracy: 0.2500	
	арр.ру		2/2 [	] - 0s 32ms/step - loss: 0.6790 - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7101 - v	il_accuracy: 0.2500	
	1 appyaml		2/2 [	] - 0s 42ms/step - loss: 0.6760 - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val loss: 0.7102 - va	al accuracy: 0.2500	
_	Earthquake_dataset.csv		Epoch 26/30			1	
	searthquake_istm_modeLh5		Epoch 27/30		.5625 - Val_1065: 0.7185 - V	II_accuracy: 0.2500	
_	<ul> <li>earthquake.py</li> <li>earthquakeann.nv</li> </ul>		2/2 [	] - 0s 33ms/step - loss: 0.674b - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7105 - va	al_accunacy: 0.2500	
_	e concernance/deby		2/2 [	] - 0s 31ms/step - loss: 0.6715 - accuracy: 0	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7103 - v	1_accuracy: 0.2500	
	forest_fire_lstm_modeLh5						
	Forest_fire_lstm_modeLh5 Forest_fire.osv		Epoch 29/30	and a second sec	5575 - vol locat 0 7000 - va	1 Securate 0 1600	
	<ul> <li>Forest_fire_lstm_model.h5</li> <li>Forest_fire.csv</li> <li>Forest_fire.py</li> </ul>		Epoch 29/30 2/2 [ Epoch 30/30	] - 0s 32ms/step - loss: 0.6720 - accumacy: 0	.5525 - val_loss: 0.7099 - v	il_accuracy: 0.2500	
	forest_fire_lstm_model.h5     Forest_fire.csv     forest_fire.py     scaler.pkl		Epoch 29/30 2/2 [ Epoch 30/30 2/2 [		.5625 - val_loss: 0.7099 - v .5625 - val_loss: 0.7094 - v ngine\training.nv:3998- lbad	al_accuracy: 0.2500 d_accuracy: 0.2500 Ampine: You are savi	
a	F forest_fire_Usin_modeLhS Forest_fire.csv forest_fire.py scale.pkl		Epoch 29/30 2/2 [ Epoch 30/30 2/2 [ C:\Users\HP\AppData\Loca ng your model as an HDFS	] 05 J2ms/step - loss: 0.6720 - accuracy: 0 ] - 05 J9ms/step - loss: 0.6706 - accuracy: 0 al\Programs\Python/Pythons%lib\site-packages\kerus\src\ke file via 'model.save('). This file format is considered	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7099 - vi .5625 - val_loss: 0.7094 - vi ngine\training.py:3000: Useri logacy. We recommend using :	al_accuracy: 0.2500 d_accuracy: 0.2500 darming: You are savi instead the native Ke	
8	Forest_fire_ldm_model.h5     Forest_fire.ov     forest_fire.ov     forest_fire.py     scaler.pkl		Epoch 29/30 2/2 [ Epoch 38/30 2/2 [ C:\Users\HP\AppData\Loca ng your model as an HDFS nas format, e.g. 'model. surving abi.syse_model?	- 05 J2mm/step - loss: 0.6720 - accuracy: 0 ] - 05 J2mm/step - loss: 0.6726 - accuracy: 0 llVrograms/vpton/wytoms/llvls/it-sackages/keras/sto F flb via model.asve() - THis file format is considered fave(*gy_math lawrac').	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7099 - vi .5625 - val_loss: 0.7094 - vi ngine\training.py:3000: User legacy. We recommend using :	al_accuracy: 0.2500 d_accuracy: 0.2500 Marning: You are savi Instead the native Ke	
8 8	forest_fire_itm_model.h5     forest_fire.py     scale.pd     const_fire.py     Source_pt     scale.pd		Epoch 29/30 2/2 [ Epoch 30/30 2/2 [ C:\Users\HP\AppData\Loca ng your model as an HPE ris format, e.g. 'model. serving api, save model( Model training Compde		.9625 - val_loss: 0,7009 - vr .9625 - val_loss: 0.7094 - vr ngine\training.py:3000: Usert legocy. We recommend using :	al_accuracy: 0.2500 d_accuracy: 0.2500 Aarning: You are savi Instead the native Ke	
®	Forest_fire_thm_models     Forest_fire_bay     forest_fire_bay		Epoch 29/30 2/2 [ Epoch 30/30 2/2 [ C:\Users\HP\AppData\Loca ng your model as an HDES ras format, e.g. indel. saving api save model() @ Model Training Comple o PS D:\Natural-Disaster-P		.5625 - val_loss: 0.7099 - v .5625 - val_loss: 0.7094 - v nginetraing.p: 3096: User logacy. No recommend using : 58. Cel 63 (1864 valuated) - Semane -	al_accuracy: 0.2500 NL_accuracy: 0.2500 arming: You are savi instead the native Ke	ны О
8 83 •	<ul> <li>Forest, fire, lum, model/thS</li> <li>B Forest, fire, lum, model/thS</li> <li>Konest, fire, py</li> <li>scaler, pid</li> <li>&gt; duritime</li> <li>&gt; timetime</li> <li>Primati 0: 0: 0. 0. 5</li> </ul>	2,M	Epoch 29/30 2/2 [ Epoch 30/30 2/2 [ C: \User>\H*/AppOsts\Loca ng your wodel as an HDF5 nas format, e.g. 'model, awaring goi.snve.model % Model Training Compo % 6: Vaitural-Disaster-	) to JERICIAD ISS: 0.073 accuracy: 0 ) to JERICIAD ISS: 0.073 accuracy: 0 ) to Superior to Jess 0.075 accuracy: 0 Ultraumanytheney Distance States accuracy accuracy accuracy accuracy of the States States accuracy accuracy accuracy of the States States accuracy	.5625 - val_loss: 0.7009 - v. .5625 - val_loss: 0.7004 - v. ngine\training.py:3080: Userf logocy. He rocomrand using . 58. Col 68 (1064 subschul) Spacer of	al_accuracy: 0.2500 Al_accuracy: 0.2500 Amming: You are savi instead the native Ke	14-bit Q

Fig - 3 Training Forest Dataset



Fig - 4 Flask Link

## Click the link generated in the (figure:4) and it open the web interface for the input.

Ð	Starter Template - Materializ	: ×	Earthquake Prediction	×		3	1		-	0	$\times$
	→ C	00	127.0.0.1:5000		ជ	۲	2	2	0		
	ietting Started 🔓 Gmail 📴	VauTube	Maps (FR OSINT Framework	rk .							

		Predict the probability of a hig	h-risk earthquake				
	Latitude Ester Latilude	Longitude Enter Longitude	Depth (km) Enter Depth				
	Gap Enter Gap Value	RMS Enter RMS Value	Number of Stations (NST) Enter NST Value				
	Gap Finter Gap Value	RMS Errer RMS Value PREDICT PROBABILIT	Number of Stations (NST) Enter NST Value				
	Gap Enter Gap Value		Number of Stations (NST) Enter NST Value	~ 1	inc e d	× ta) .	KIIS PI
Starter Template - Ma	Gap Enter Gap Value	PREDICT PROBABILIT	Number of Stations (NST) Enter NST Value	~	NC ⇔d	× (m) 3	ьпз р /10/20 0

# **Forest Fire Prevention**

## Predict the probability of Forest-Fire Occurence

Temperature Temperature in Celsius	Oxygen Dxygen content in ppro	Humidity Humidity %	
	PREDICT PROBABILITY		
	PREDICT PROBABILITY		



In the (Figure: 6) after giving the input it predicts the output as both high risk and low risk of Forest Fire



	and freque	cuon syster	$\mathbf{n}$		
Predic	t the probability of a hig	n-risk earthquake			
Latitude 27.319	Longitude 91.51	Depth (km) 10			
Gap 37.4	RMS 0.89	Number of Stations (NST) 205			
	PREDICT PROBABILIT	v			

#### Fig - 7 Earthquake Prediction

In the (Figure: 6) after giving the input it predicts the output as both high risk and low risk of earthquake

## V. CONCLUSION

The natural disaster prediction system using Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks provides an efficient and reliable method for forecasting earthquakes and forest fires. By integrating historical disaster records with real-time environmental inputs, the system enhances accuracy in predicting disaster risks. The sequential learning capability of LSTM allows the model to capture long-term dependencies, making it more effective than traditional statistical approaches. The use of structured data pre-processing, feature selection, and normalization further optimizes the model's performance. The Flask-based web interface ensures user-friendly interaction, allowing individuals and authorities to input real-time environmental data and receive instant risk assessments. The system classifies disaster probabilities into low, moderate, or high risk, aiding in proactive decision-making. The model has demonstrated high precision and recall rates, reducing false positives and negatives in disaster prediction. The results confirm that LSTM is well-suited for time-series forecasting, making it an essential tool for disaster management.

Despite the effectiveness of the system, challenges such as data availability and computational complexity remain. Proper data collection and continuous updates are necessary to maintain prediction accuracy. Overall, the LSTM-based disaster prediction model improves preparedness, enhances early warning systems, and contributes to minimizing the impact of natural disasters.

#### VI. REFERENCE

1) Hochreiter, S., & Schmidhuber, J. Long Short-Term Memory. International Journal of Neural Computation (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 9, Issue: 8, 1997.

2) Wang, Y., Liu, X., & Zhang, Y. Deep Learning for Natural Disaster Prediction and Risk Assessment. International Journal of Applied Sciences and Technology (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 3, Issue: 4, 2021.

3) Das, H., Kumar, S., & Roy, P. Machine Learning Algorithms for Disaster Management and Earthquake Prediction. International Research Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Data Science (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 10, Issue: 2, 2020.

4) Zhao, J., Chen, L., & Feng, R. Forest Fire Prediction Using Environmental Data and Deep Learning Models. International Journal of Geoscience and Remote Sensing (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 59, Issue: 12, 2021.

5) Panahi, M., Rezaie, F., & Marzban, S. A Data-Driven Approach for Real-Time Disaster Monitoring Using Deep Learning and Remote Sensing. International Research Journal of Environmental Management (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 320, Issue: 7, 2022.

6) Manogaran, G., & Lopez, D. Big Data and Deep Learning Techniques for Disaster Prediction and Management. International Journal of Computational Intelligence (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 37, Issue: 2, 2021.

7) Caraka, R. E., Yasin, H., & Sihombing, P. Predicting Natural Disasters Using Hybrid Statistical and Machine Learning Models. International Research Journal of Advanced Computer Science (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 13085, Issue: 5, 2021.

8) Raut, S. A., & Bichkar, R. S. Prediction of Earthquakes Using Statistical and AI Techniques. International Research Journal of Disaster Management (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 32, Issue: 6, 2019.

9) Murphy, K. P. Machine Learning: A Probabilistic Perspective. International Research Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Data Science (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 1, Issue: 3, 2012.

10) Kamilaris, A., & Prenafeta-Boldú, F. X. Deep Learning in Agriculture and Disaster Monitoring: A Review. International Research Journal of Computers and Electronics in Agriculture (Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal), Volume: 157, Issue: 9, 2019.