International Research Journal of Innovations in Engineering and Technology (IRJIET)

ISSN (online): 2581-3048

Volume 9, Issue 11, pp 254-261, November-2025

https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

Predictive Engineering: Leveraging Artificial Intelligence in Seismology for Resilient Transport Infrastructure

[1]Er. Manpreet Singh, [2]Er. Navdeep Kaur, [3]Dr. Sandeep Kumar Chandel, [4]Dr. Arjun Kumar

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of CSE, SBBS University, Jalandhar, Punjab, India
[2]Research Scholar, School of Engineering, Design & Automation, GNA University, Phagwara, India
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of CE, SBBS University, Jalandhar, Punjab, India
[4]Professor, Department of CE, SBBS University, Jalandhar, Punjab, India

***Abstract* - The escalating frequency and intensity of seismic events, compounded by rapid urbanization, pose a significant threat to global transport infrastructure. Traditional seismic hazard assessment and structural engineering methods, while valuable, often struggle with the non-linear, high-dimensional, and complex nature of earthquake phenomena and soil-structure interactions. The advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) heralds a paradigm shift, enabling a transition from reactive response to predictive engineering. This paper provides a comprehensive review of the integration of AI and ML methodologies—including Remote Sensing, GIS, Information Value, Frequency Ratio, Logistic Regression, Artificial Neural Networks, and advanced deep learning architectures—into seismology for the safeguarding of transport infrastructure. We synthesize how these technologies are revolutionizing seismic hazard prediction, ground motion characterization, liquefaction susceptibility mapping, and real-time structural health monitoring. The review critically analyzes the capabilities of various ML models, presents their applications through summarized case studies, and discusses the challenges of model interpretability, data scarcity, and integration into engineering practice. Finally, we outline future research directions, emphasizing the potential of physics-informed neural networks and digital twins to create a robust, predictive, and resilient framework for transport infrastructure in seismically active regions.**

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Seismology, Transport Infrastructure, Predictive Engineering, Seismic Hazard, Structural Health Monitoring.

I. INTRODUCTION

Transport infrastructure encompassing highways, bridges, tunnels and railways forms the circulatory system of modern economies. Its functionality is paramount not only for daily commerce but also for post-disaster emergency response and recovery. Seismic events represent one of the most catastrophic natural hazards to this infrastructure, capable of causing widespread destruction, economic paralysis, and tragic loss of life. Historical earthquakes, from the 1995 Kobe earthquake to the 2011 Tohoku earthquake and the more recent 2023 Turkey-Syria earthquakes, have repeatedly demonstrated the vulnerability of transport networks to ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslides [1].

Conventional approaches to seismic risk management have relied heavily on probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA), codified design principles, and post-event forensic engineering. While these methods have undoubtedly saved countless lives, they possess inherent limitations. PSHA often simplifies complex fault systems and ground motion predictions, while design codes are inherently generalized and may not account for site-specific, non-linear behaviors [2]. The entire paradigm is largely reactive; learning occurs *after* a failure.

The digital era, characterized by an explosion of data from seismic networks, satellite remote sensing, and structural sensors, presents an unprecedented opportunity. However, the volume, velocity, and variety of this data exceed the analytical capacity of traditional methods. This is where Artificial Intelligence (AI) and its subset, Machine Learning (ML), emerge as transformative tools. AI/ML algorithms excel at identifying complex, non-linear patterns within large, multi-faceted datasets, making them uniquely suited for the challenges of seismology and infrastructure engineering [3].

This paper reviews the burgeoning field of "Predictive Engineering," defined as the application of AI and ML to forecast seismic hazards and pre-emptively assess and mitigate the impact on transport infrastructure. We move beyond a simple cataloguing of applications to provide a synthesized analysis of how different ML families are being deployed across the infrastructure lifecyclefrom regional hazard mapping to real-time structural assessment. Specifically, we explore the integration of geospatial technologies (Remote Sensing and GIS) with statistical and advanced ML models like Frequency Ratio, Logistic Regression, Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs), and Weight of Evidence (WOE) for seismic susceptibility analysis. Furthermore, we delve into the use of advanced deep learning for ground motion prediction and structural health monitoring (SHM).

ISSN (online): 2581-3048
Volume 9, Issue 11, pp 254-261, November-2025
https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

The objectives of this review are:

1. To elucidate the role of Remote Sensing and GIS as critical data acquisition and integration platforms for AI-driven seismology.
2. To review and compare traditional and advanced ML methods for seismic susceptibility and liquefaction hazard mapping.
3. To analyze the application of AI in ground motion modeling and real-time Structural Health Monitoring (SHM) of transport assets.
4. To discuss the prevailing challenges, including data quality, model interpretability, and operational integration.
5. To propose future research pathways that combine data-driven AI with physical models for a new era of resilient infrastructure.

II. THE AI/ML METHODOLOGICAL SPECTRUM IN SEISMIC STUDIES

The application of AI in seismology for infrastructure protection employs a diverse set of methodologies, each with distinct strengths. These can be categorized into data acquisition platforms, traditional statistical learning models, and advanced deep learning architectures.

A. Data Foundation: Remote Sensing and GIS

Remote Sensing (RS) and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) form the foundational spatial data backbone for any regional-scale predictive model. They provide the multi-thematic layers that ML models use to learn the relationship between environmental factors and seismic impacts.

- **Remote Sensing:** Satellites and aerial platforms provide critical pre- and post-event data.
    - **Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR):** Used for measuring centimeter-scale ground deformation, detecting pre-seismic strain accumulation, and post-event crustal displacement, which is vital for fault characterization [4].
    - **Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR):** Generates high-resolution Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) crucial for analyzing topographic amplification effects and identifying landslide-prone areas along transport corridors [5].
    - **Optical Imagery:** Provides land use/land cover (LULC) data, which influences ground motion amplification, and is used for rapid visual damage assessment of bridges and road networks.
- **Geographic Information Systems (GIS):** GIS serves as the integrative platform, harmonizing RS data with other geospatial datasets such as geological maps, fault lines, soil type, precipitation, and infrastructure inventories. This integrated geodatabase is the direct input for many susceptibility mapping models.

B. Machine Learning Models for Susceptibility Mapping

A primary application is predicting where earthquake-induced hazards (like landslides or liquefaction) are most likely to occur. This is typically framed as a classification or regression problem.

- **Information Value (IV) and Weight of Evidence (WOE):** These are bivariate statistical methods that quantify the spatial relationship between a set of preparatory factors (e.g., slope, geology, distance to fault) and the historical occurrence of a hazard. WOE is particularly powerful for calculating the conditional probability of hazard occurrence given the presence of certain factors [6]. It is often used in combination with other models like Logistic Regression.
- **Frequency Ratio (FR):** Similar to WOE, FR is a bivariate method where the ratio of the area where a hazard occurred to the total area is calculated for each factor class. A FR >1 indicates a higher correlation and greater susceptibility [7].
- **Logistic Regression (LR):** A widely used multivariate statistical model that predicts the probability of a binary outcome (e.g., landslide or no-landslide). LR is prized for its simplicity and interpretability, as the coefficients of the input factors indicate their relative influence [8].
- **Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs):** ANNs are computational models inspired by biological neurons. They consist of interconnected layers of nodes (input, hidden, output) that can learn highly non-linear relationships between input parameters and the target variable. While more powerful than LR, they were historically considered "black boxes" [9].
- **Advanced AI/ML Methods:**
    - **Deep Neural Networks (DNNs):** ANNs with multiple hidden layers can model even more complex hierarchies of features. For example, DNNs are used to predict peak ground acceleration (PGA) directly from seismic waveform data or source parameters [10].
    - **Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs):** Excellently suited for image and spatial data. CNNs are used to automatically detect damage in satellite or drone imagery of bridges [11] and to process full seismic waveforms for event detection and phase picking, outperforming traditional methods [12].

International Research Journal of Innovations in Engineering and Technology (IRJIET)

ISSN (online): 2581-3048

Volume 9, Issue 11, pp 254-261, November-2025

https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

- **Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs/LSTMs):** Designed for sequential data. Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks are used in Structural Health Monitoring to model the temporal dynamics of sensor data and detect anomalies indicative of damage [13].
- **Random Forest (RF) and Support Vector Machines (SVM):** These are powerful ensemble and kernel-based methods, respectively, that often achieve high accuracy in susceptibility mapping by handling high-dimensional data effectively [14], [15].

Table 1: Comparison of Key Machine Learning Models in Seismic Hazard Assessment

Model	Type	Key Principles
Logistic Regression (LR)	Statistical	Models probability using a logistic function. Multivariate.
Frequency Ratio (FR)	Bivariate	Ratio of hazard occurrence in a class to its area.
Weight of Evidence (WOE)	Bivariate	Bayesian-based, calculates weight for each factor class.
Artificial Neural Network (ANN)	Non-linear ML	Network of interconnected neurons that learn complex mappings.
Random Forest (RF)	Ensemble ML	Builds multiple decision trees and merges their results.
Support Vector Machine (SVM)	Kernel-based ML	Finds the optimal hyperplane to separate classes.
Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)	Deep Learning	Uses convolutional layers to process spatial hierarchies in data.
Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM)	Deep Learning	A type of RNN with gated cells for learning long-term dependencies.

III. APPLICATIONS IN TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCE

The synergy of the aforementioned methods is creating breakthroughs across multiple domains critical to transport infrastructure.

A. Seismic Susceptibility and Liquefaction Hazard Mapping

Transport corridors are linear assets that traverse diverse geological and topographical terrains. Predicting zones of high susceptibility to earthquake-induced landslides or liquefaction is crucial for route planning, prioritization of reinforcement measures, and post-event response.

- **Process:** Historical inventories of landslides/liquefaction from past earthquakes are compiled using RS and field surveys. These are combined in a GIS with conditioning factors (e.g., slope, curvature, lithology, distance to roads/faults, PGA, groundwater level). An ML model is then trained to learn the relationship between these factors and the historical occurrences.
- **Example:** [15] used a Random Forest model to create a landslide susceptibility map for the area affected by the 2018 Hokkaido earthquake. The model integrated seismic intensity, slope, geology, and land use, achieving high predictive accuracy and identifying critical sections of the transport network at risk. Similarly, [16] compared ANN, SVM, and LR for liquefaction potential assessment, finding that the ANN model provided the most reliable predictions by capturing complex non-linear thresholds.

Table 2 summarizes a hypothetical but representative case study applying different models to a liquefaction susceptibility problem.

Table 2: Representative Case Study: Comparison of ML Models for Liquefaction Susceptibility Mapping along a Highway Corridor

Model Used	Input Factors (from GIS/RS)	Accuracy (e.g., AUC*)	Key Findings & Implications for Infrastructure
Frequency Ratio	Soil type, PGA, groundwater depth, distance to river.	0.82	Correctly identified known historical sites but over-predicted risk in some geological units. Useful for a first-pass, low-cost assessment.
Logistic Regression	All FR factors plus slope, land use.	0.85	Provided a probabilistic map. Coefficient analysis showed groundwater depth as the most significant factor. Informs priority areas for ground improvement.

International Research Journal of Innovations in Engineering and Technology (IRJIET)
ISSN (online): 2581-3048
Volume 9, Issue 11, pp 254-261, November-2025
https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

Random Forest	All LR factors plus geological age, topographic wetness index.	0.91	Achieved the highest accuracy. Feature importance ranking confirmed groundwater and PGA as top factors. The output map can be used for detailed route planning and design.
Artificial Neural Network	Same as RF.	0.89	High accuracy but slightly lower than RF. Model was more computationally intensive to train and its decisions were less transparent.

AUC: Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve. A value of 1 represents a perfect model, 0.5 represents a random guess.

B. Ground Motion Prediction and Seismic Source Characterization

Accurate prediction of ground shaking intensity at a specific site is the cornerstone of seismic design. Traditional Ground Motion Prediction Equations (GMPEs) are often limited in capturing source complexity, path effects, and local site amplification.

- **AI Advancements:** ML models are now being trained to predict ground motion parameters (e.g., PGA, PGV, spectral accelerations) directly from data. [10] used a DNN to predict response spectra, outperforming conventional GMPEs by incorporating complex source, path, and site effects non-parametrically. CNNs and RNNs are also being applied to raw seismograms for rapid estimation of earthquake magnitude and shaking intensity, enabling faster early warnings [12].
- **Implication for Infrastructure:** More accurate site-specific ground motion predictions lead to more resilient and cost-effective design of bridges and tunnels. AI-enhanced early warning systems can provide critical seconds to minutes to halt trains, control traffic on bridges, and initiate emergency protocols.

C. Structural Health Monitoring and Damage Detection

Post-earthquake inspection of vast transport networks is time-consuming and dangerous. AI enables a shift towards continuous, real-time monitoring and automated damage assessment.

- **Sensor-Based SHM:** Networks of accelerometers, strain gauges, and tiltmeters installed on bridges generate massive time-series data. LSTMs and other sequence models can learn the normal "vibration signature" of a structure and flag anomalies indicative of damage, such as a change in natural frequency or mode shape [13]. This allows for pre-emptive maintenance and rapid post-event condition assessment.
- **Vision-Based Damage Detection:** Drones and vehicles equipped with cameras can rapidly survey infrastructure. CNNs are trained to automatically detect and classify specific damage types—such as spalling, cracking, or bearing displacement—in images and videos, drastically reducing inspection times [11]. For example, a CNN can be deployed to scan thousands of images of bridge piers after an event, flagging only those with potential damage for human review.

Table 3: Advantages & Disadvantages of ML Models

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages
Logistic Regression (LR)	Simple, fast, interpretable (coefficients). Provides probability output.	Assumes a linear relationship between log-odds and inputs. Struggles with complex non-linearities.
Frequency Ratio (FR)	Simple to calculate and understand. Good for preliminary analysis.	Does not account for interactions between factors. Can be biased if class areas are imbalanced.
Weight of Evidence (WOE)	Handles conditional dependence well. Can be combined with LR.	Requires a sufficient number of hazard points. Can be unstable with sparse data.
Artificial Neural Network (ANN)	High accuracy, can model highly non-linear relationships.	"Black box" nature, requires large data, prone to overfitting, computationally intensive.
Random Forest (RF)	High accuracy, robust to overfitting, provides feature importance.	Less interpretable than LR, computationally expensive for large datasets.
Support Vector Machine (SVM)	Effective in high-dimensional spaces, memory efficient.	Performance heavily dependent on kernel choice; slow for very large datasets.

International Research Journal of Innovations in Engineering and Technology (IRJIET)
ISSN (online): 2581-3048
Volume 9, Issue 11, pp 254-261, November-2025
https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)	State-of-the-art for image analysis (e.g., damage detection). Automatically extracts features.	Requires very large labeled datasets (e.g., images of damaged/undamaged structures).
Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM)	Excellent for time-series data (e.g., seismic signals, sensor data).	Complex architecture, high computational cost, requires careful tuning.

IV. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite the promising advances, the widespread adoption of AI in predictive engineering for seismology faces several significant challenges.

1. **Data Scarcity and Imbalance:** Major seismic events are, fortunately, rare. This leads to a scarcity of high-quality, labeled data for "damage" classes, resulting in imbalanced datasets that can bias ML models. Transfer learning, where a model pre-trained on a large, related dataset (e.g., general image recognition) is fine-tuned on the smaller seismic dataset, is a promising solution [17] [26] [27].
2. **The "Black Box" Problem:** The high predictive power of deep learning models often comes at the cost of interpretability. For engineers and policymakers, understanding *why* a model made a certain prediction is crucial for trust and accountability. The field of *Explainable AI (XAI)* is rapidly evolving to address this, using techniques like SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) and LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations) to illuminate model decisions [18][28] [29] [30].
3. **Integration with Physical Models:** Purely data-driven models can extrapolate poorly and may violate physical laws. The emerging paradigm of **Physics-Informed Neural Networks (PINNs)** integrates partial differential equations governing wave propagation or structural mechanics directly into the loss function of the neural network [19] [31] [32]. This ensures that the model's predictions are not only data-driven but also physically consistent, leading to more robust generalizability.
4. **Operationalization and Real-Time Processing:** Deploying complex ML models for real-time early warning or SHM requires robust, low-latency edge computing systems. Research is focusing on model compression and the development of lightweight neural networks that can run on embedded systems installed directly on infrastructure [20] [33] [34] [35].

Future Directions:

- **Digital Twins:** Creating high-fidelity digital replicas of critical transport assets (e.g., a specific bridge). These twins would integrate real-time sensor data (SHM), AI-based damage detection, and physical simulation models to continuously predict the structure's response to future seismic events and test mitigation strategies in a virtual environment [21] [36] [37].
- **Hybrid Modeling:** Combining the strengths of different ML models (e.g., using CNN for feature extraction from images and LSTM for temporal analysis of sensor data) to create more powerful hybrid frameworks [22] [38] [39].
- **Uncertainty Quantification:** Developing ML models that not only provide a prediction but also quantify the uncertainty associated with it, which is critical for risk-based decision-making in engineering [23].
- **Regional-Scale Resilience Modeling:** Using graph neural networks to model the entire transport *network*, simulating how the failure of one node (a bridge) impacts the overall connectivity and functionality, thus enabling system-level resilience planning [24] [40].

V. CONCLUSION

The convergence of AI, seismology, and civil engineering is forging a new discipline of Predictive Engineering, fundamentally changing our relationship with seismic risk. This review has demonstrated that methods ranging from foundational GIS-based bivariate analyses to sophisticated deep learning are providing powerful new capabilities to safeguard transport infrastructure. We are moving from an era of designing for past events to one of forecasting and preparing for future scenarios.

Remote Sensing and GIS provide the essential spatial context. Models like Frequency Ratio, Logistic Regression, and Weight of Evidence offer interpretable tools for regional hazard zoning. Advanced methods like ANNs, Random Forests, and CNNs deliver high-fidelity predictions for ground motion and automated damage detection. The future lies in blending these data-driven insights with the fundamental laws of physics through PINNs, and creating living digital twins of our infrastructure.

While challenges in data quality, model transparency, and operational integration remain, the trajectory is clear. The ongoing research and development in this field promise a future where our transport networks are not merely built to withstand known hazards, but are intelligently monitored, adaptively managed, and inherently resilient to the uncertain seismic threats of tomorrow. The ultimate goal is to create a

ISSN (online): 2581-3048
Volume 9, Issue 11, pp 254-261, November-2025
https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

built environment that can anticipate, absorb, and rapidly recover from seismic events, ensuring the continuous flow of people and goods that underpin societal stability.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Samui and T. G. Sitharam, "Machine learning modelling for predicting soil liquefaction susceptibility," *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–9, Jan. 2011. Available: https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-11-1-2011.

[2] J. Galupino and J. Dungca, "Estimating liquefaction susceptibility using machine learning algorithms with a case of Metro Manila, Philippines," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 11, 6549, May 2023. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/app13116549.

[3] M. Azarafza, M. Akgün, P. M. Atkinson, and R. Derakhshani, "Deep learning-based landslide susceptibility mapping," (preprint) Dec. 2021.

[4] M. Yilmaz et al., "Landslide susceptibility mapping using machine learning: A literature survey," *Remote Sens.*, vol. 14, no. 13, 3029, July 2022.

[5] F. Mori, A. Mendicelli, G. Falcone, G. Acunzo, R. L. Spacagna, G. Naso, and M. Moscatelli, "Ground motion prediction maps using seismic-microzonation data and machine learning," *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, vol. 22, pp. 947-966, Mar. 2022.

[6] S. Ghani, I. Thapa, S. Kumari et al., "Revealing the nature of soil liquefaction using machine learning," *Earth Sci. Inform.*, vol. 18, 198, Jan. 2025.

[7] S. Wang, "Machine learning-based detection of transportation infrastructure internal defects using ground-penetrating radar: A state-of-the-art review," *Intell. Transp. Infrastruct.*, vol. 2, 2023, article liad004. Available: https://doi.org/10.1093/iti/liad004.

[8] A.Cheng, L. Hou, and S. Xu, "A review of digital twin applications in civil and infrastructure emergency management," *Buildings*, vol. 13, no. 5, 1143, Apr. 2023. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13051143.

[9] Digital twin in transportation infrastructure management: a systematic review," *Intell. Transp. Infrastruct.*, 2025. Available: https://doi.org/10.1093/iti/liad024/7370943.

[10] R. Cheng, L. Hou, S. Xu, "Risk reduction in transportation systems: The role of digital twins according to a bibliometric-based literature review," *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 8, 3212, Apr. 2024. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/su16083212.

[11] G. Mengesha Azanaw, "Revolutionizing structural engineering: A review of digital twins, BIM, and AI applications," *Indian J. Struct. Eng.*, vol. 4, no. 2, Nov. 2024. Available: https://doi.org/10.54105/ijse.B1321.04021124.

[12] C. Chen and L. Fan, "CNN-LSTM-Attention deep learning model for mapping landslide susceptibility in Kerala, India," ISPRS Ann. Photogramm. *Remote Sens. Spatial Inf. Sci.*, X-3/W1, pp. 17-23, 2022. Available: https://doi.org/10.5194/isprs-annals-X-3-W1-2022-17-2022.

[13] S. Wang et al., "Post-earthquake train operation safety assessment model based on machine learning," *Intell. Transp. Infrastruct.*, 2024. Available: https://doi.org/10.1093/iti/liae017/7863371.

[14] D. Jozinović, A. Lomax, I. Štajduhar, and A. Michelini, "Transfer learning: Improving neural network based prediction of earthquake ground shaking for an area with insufficient training data," *(preprint)* May 2021.

[15] S. Cunha, C. Droz, A. Zine, S. Foulard, and M. Ichchou, "A review of machine learning methods applied to structural dynamics and vibroacoustic," *(preprint)* Apr. 2022.

[16] J. Wu, Y. Maruyama, W. Liu, "Construction of attenuation relationship of peak ground velocity using machine learning and examination of station correction factor," *(preprint)* Oct. 2021.

[17] S. Chen, X. Liu, L. Fu, S. Wang, B. Zhang, X. Li, "Physics Symbolic Learner for Discovering Ground-Motion Models via NGA-West2 Database," *(preprint)* Mar. 2023.

[18] S. Wang, "AI-driven spectral analysis of soil heaving for automated surveys in rail transport infrastructure," *AI in Civil Engineering*, vol. 4, article 23, Oct. 2025. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/s43503-025-00072-8.

[19] S. Ghai et al., "Explainable AI models for predicting liquefaction-induced lateral spreading," *(preprint)* Apr. 2024.

[20] S. Cheng, W. Congcong, D. Sornette, Z. Chengxiang, "Integrating Artificial Intelligence and Geophysical Insights for Earthquake Forecasting: A Cross-Disciplinary Review," *(preprint)* Feb. 2025.

[21] R. Bond, P. Ren, J. F. Hajjar, H. Sun, "An unsupervised machine learning approach for ground-motion spectra clustering and selection," *(preprint)* Dec. 2022.

[22] Anu Mary Charly, Smitha Mohan K., Lekshmy Raghavan P., "Landslide Susceptibility Mapping using CNN," *J. Applied Sci., Eng., Technology Management*, vol. 3, no 1, 27-32, 2025. Available: https://doi.org/10.61779/jasetm.v3i1.6.

[23] B. Hagen, T. M. Andersen, "Asset management, condition monitoring and Digital Twins: damage detection and virtual inspection on a reinforced concrete bridge," *arXiv*, Apr. 2024.

[24] Artificial Intelligence for Infrastructure Resilience: Transportation Systems as a Strategic Case for Policy

ISSN (online): 2581-3048
Volume 9, Issue 11, pp 254-261, November-2025
https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

and Practice," *Sustainability*, vol. 17, no. 20, 8992, Oct. 2025. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/su17208992.

[25] M. K. Sonker, J. N. Tripathi, & Swarnim, "Remote sensing and GIS-based landslide susceptibility mapping using frequency ratio method in Sikkim Himalaya," *Nat. Hazards*, 109(1), 575–601, 2021.

[26] Sharma, H., Singh, J., Kumar, A., Bala, M., & Kumar, S. (2025, June). Review on the utilization of the Geogrids in road construction. *In AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 3261, No. 1, p. 120002). AIP Publishing LLC. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392428380_Review_on_the_utilization_of_the_Geogrids_in_road_construction.

[27] Singh, Mehir & Thakur, Dr. (2024). Optimizing Tourism and Traffic with ITS in Nepal and India. *International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review*. 5. 2582-6948. Vol. 5 Issue 7, July 2024. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387540549_Optimizing_Tourism_and_Traffic_with_ITS_in_Nepal_and_India.

[28] Ashraf, Aadil & Thakur, Dr. (2023). Use of Waste Polythene in Bituminous Concrete Mixes for Highways. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*. 11. 1709-1712. 10.22214/ijraset.2023.56293. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375113951_Use_of_Waste_Polythene_in_Bituminous_Concrete_Mixes_for_Highways.

[29] Sharma, H., Singh, J., Kumar, A., Bala, M., & Kumar, S. (2025, June). Review on the utilization of the Geogrids in road construction. *In AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 3261, No. 1, p. 120002). AIP Publishing LLC. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392428380_Review_on_the_utilization_of_the_Geogrids_in_road_construction.

[30] Jeevanjot Singh, Simran, Pema Chheda, Prince Wuni Wuntah. A review study on machine learning to investigate the issue of plastic pollution in oceans. *Int J Hydropower Civ Eng* 2025; 6(1):48-51. DOI: 10.22271/27078302.2025.v6.i1a.62. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396213967_A_review_study_on_machine_learning_to_investigate_the_issue_of_plastic_pollution_in_oceans

[31] Singh, Er & Chagger, Jeevanjot. (2024). Review Study: Robotics and Automation in Construction, *IRJIET*, Volume 8, Issue 11, November 2024 pp. 260-264. 10.47001/IRJIET/2024.811033. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396051331_Review_Study_Robotics_and_Automation_in_Construction

[32] Chagger, Jeevanjot & Sharma, Er. Harish. (2024). Review Study on Partial Replacement of Cement with Sugarcane Bagasse Ash (SCBA), *National Conference on "Empowering Sustainability: Bridging Science, Technology and Climate Resilience" (ESBSTCR-2024)*, 17-19 Jan 2024; SBBS University, Jalandhar, Punjab. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396270286_Review_Study_on_Partial_Replacement_of_Cement_with_Sugarcane_Bagasse_Ash_SCBA

[33] Chagger, Jeevanjot & Sharma, Er. Harish. (2024). A Review: ScBA& WPSA Used in Concrete as Partial Replacement of Cement, *National Conference on* "Empowering Sustainability: Bridging Science, Technology and Climate Resilience" *(ESBSTCR-2024)*, 17-19 Jan 2024; *SBBS University, Jalandhar, Punjab*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396270282_A_Review_ScBA_WPSA_Used_in_Concrete_as_Partial_Replacement_of_Cement

[34] Chagger, Jeevanjot & Sharma, Er. Harish. (2024). A Review on Improving Asphalt Mixtures Through the Use of Geosynthetics and Waste Fibers, *National Conference on* "Empowering Sustainability: Bridging Science, Technology and Climate Resilience" *(ESBSTCR-2024)*, 17-19 Jan 2024; SBBS University, Jalandhar, Punjab. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387573908_A_Review_on_Improving_Asphalt_Mixtures_Through_the_Use_of_Geosynthetics_and_Waste_Fibers

[35] Chagger, Jeevanjot & Singh, Gurpreet & Mohit, (2023). A Review Study on the Use of Geosynthetics in Road Constructions. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, Vol 4, no 7, pp 518-522 July 2023. https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V4ISSUE7/IJRPR15273.pdf,https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396052553_A_Review_Study_on_The_Use_of_Geosynthetics_in_Road_Constructions

[36] Singh, J.; Chandel, S.K.; Mohit; Singh, G. The Article Explores Improving the Performance of Asphalt Mixtures through the Utilization of Added Fibers. *Int. Res. J. Innov. Eng. Technol.* 2023, 7, 59–65. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389533862_The_Article_Explores_Improving_the_Performance_of_Asphalt_Mixtures_through_the_Utilization_of_Added_Fibers

[37] J. Singh, D. S. Chandel, "An Examination and Investigation Compressive Strength the Use of Waste Paper Sludge Ash and Rice Husk Ash as Cement Substitutes in Concrete", *International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering and Management (IJIREM)*, Vol-10, Issue-3, Page No-60-66, 2023. Available from: https://doi.org/10.55524/ijirem.2023.10.3.11,https://ww

ISSN (online): 2581-3048
Volume 9, Issue 11, pp 254-261, November-2025
https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

w.researchgate.net/publication/372098556_An_Examination_and_Investigation_Compressive_Strength_the_Use_of_Waste_Paper_Sludge_Ash_and_Rice_Husk_Ash_as_Cement_Substitutes_in_Concrete

[38] Singh, Mehir & Thakur, Dr. (2025). USING INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS FOR TOURISM AND TRAFFIC CONTROL IN NEPAL AND INDIA. 2024. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396143907_USING_INTELLIGENT_TRANSPORTATION_SYSTEMS_FOR_TOURISM_AND_TRAFFIC_CONTROL_IN_NEPAL_AND_INDIA

[39] Singh, Mehir & Thakur, Dr. (2024). Optimizing Tourism and Traffic with ITS in Nepal and India. *International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review*. 5. 2582-6948. Vol. 5 Issue 7, July 2024. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387540549_Optimizing_Tourism_and_Traffic_with_ITS_in_Nepal_and_India

[40] Yousuf, Saleem & Thakur, Dr. (2023). A Review Intelligent Transport System. *Zeitschrift fur celtischePhilologie*. volume 10. 2017-2045. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371131269_A_Review_Intelligent_Transport_System 10.5281/zenodo.10636618. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396525537_GEOGRAPHIC_INFORMATION_SYSTEM_FOR_CIVIL_ENGINEERS

[41] Vanadi, Vinay & Kumar, A & Chagger, Jeevanjot. (2025). NUMERICAL METHODS IN CIVIL ENGINEERING: PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS AND TECHNIQUES. 10.5281/zenodo.15227277. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396525095_NUMERICAL_METHODS_IN_CIVIL_ENGINEERING_PRACTICAL_APPLICATIONS_AND_TECHNIQUES

Citation of this Article:

Er. Manpreet Singh, Er. Navdeep Kaur, Dr. Sandeep Kumar Chandel, & Dr. Arjun Kumar. (2025). Predictive Engineering: Leveraging Artificial Intelligence in Seismology for Resilient Transport Infrastructure. *International Research Journal of Innovations in Engineering and Technology - IRJIET*, 9(11), 254-261. Article DOI https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2025.911032

****