

Toward Equitable Recovery: A Fairness-Aware AI Framework for Prioritizing Post-Flood Aid in Bangladesh

Farjana Yesmin
Independent Researcher
Boston, USA
farjanayesmin76@gmail.com

Romana Akter
Researcher
Dhaka, Bangladesh
romanaakter8475@gmail.com

Abstract—Post-disaster aid allocation in developing nations often suffers from systematic biases that disadvantage vulnerable regions, perpetuating historical inequities. This paper presents a fairness-aware artificial intelligence framework for prioritizing post-flood aid distribution in Bangladesh, a country highly susceptible to recurring flood disasters. Using real data from the 2022 Bangladesh floods that affected 7.2 million people and caused \$405.5 million in damages, we develop an adversarial debiasing model that predicts flood vulnerability while actively removing biases against marginalized districts and rural areas. Our approach adapts fairness-aware representation learning techniques from healthcare AI to disaster management, employing a gradient reversal layer that forces the model to learn bias-invariant representations. Experimental results on 87 upazilas across 11 districts demonstrate that our framework reduces statistical parity difference by 41.6%, decreases regional fairness gaps by 43.2%, and maintains strong predictive accuracy ($R^2=0.784$ vs baseline 0.811). The model generates actionable priority rankings ensuring aid reaches the most vulnerable populations based on genuine need rather than historical allocation patterns. This work demonstrates how algorithmic fairness techniques can be effectively applied to humanitarian contexts, providing decision-makers with tools to implement more equitable disaster recovery strategies.

Index Terms—Fairness-aware AI, Disaster management, Flood vulnerability prediction, Adversarial debiasing, Equitable aid allocation, Bangladesh floods, Algorithmic fairness, Social good AI

I. INTRODUCTION

Flooding represents one of the most devastating natural disasters globally, with climate change intensifying both frequency and severity. Bangladesh, a densely populated deltaic nation, faces disproportionate vulnerability to floods, experiencing major events nearly annually. The 2022 flash floods alone affected 9 districts, inundating over 254,000 hectares of agricultural land and impacting approximately 7.2 million people, with economic damages exceeding \$405 million according to the official Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) report [1].

Effective post-flood recovery requires rapid, accurate assessment of damage and equitable distribution of limited aid resources. However, traditional aid allocation mechanisms often exhibit systematic biases, with resources disproportionately

flowing to politically visible urban centers while rural, marginalized regions remain underserved. These biases emerge from multiple sources: historical allocation patterns favoring certain regions, data collection methods inadequately capturing rural vulnerability, and decision-making influenced by political considerations rather than objective need assessments.

Recent advances in artificial intelligence offer promising tools for disaster damage assessment and resource allocation. However, standard predictive models trained on historical data risk perpetuating and amplifying existing biases, as they learn patterns reflecting past inequitable allocation decisions. This paper addresses this critical challenge by developing a fairness-aware AI framework specifically designed for equitable post-flood aid prioritization in Bangladesh.

Key Contributions:

- A comprehensive dataset integrating official PDNA flood impact data with socioeconomic indicators across 87 upazilas in 11 affected districts
- An adversarial debiasing architecture adapted from fairness-aware healthcare AI, modified for disaster management contexts
- Rigorous fairness evaluation demonstrating 41.6% reduction in statistical parity difference and 43.2% reduction in regional fairness gaps
- Actionable priority rankings validated against ground-truth damage assessments
- Evidence that algorithmic fairness techniques can effectively address humanitarian challenges

II. RELATED WORK

A. AI for Disaster Management

Machine learning has increasingly been applied to disaster prediction and impact assessment. Recent work demonstrates effectiveness of deep learning for flood prediction using satellite imagery [10]. Yuan et al. [14] developed a comprehensive framework for predictive flood risk monitoring and rapid impact assessment using community-scale big data, demonstrating how social media and sensor networks enable real-time situational awareness. However, these primarily focus

on physical flood characteristics rather than socioeconomic impacts. Economic impact assessment traditionally relies on post-event surveys [11], but these are time-consuming and often miss vulnerable populations in remote areas.

B. Fairness in Machine Learning

The field of algorithmic fairness has evolved rapidly, driven by concerns about AI systems perpetuating societal biases. Multiple fairness definitions exist, including demographic parity, equalized odds, and individual fairness [9]. Adversarial debiasing, introduced by Zhang et al. [7], uses gradient reversal to learn representations informative for the primary task while uninformative about protected attributes.

In healthcare AI, fairness concerns focus on ensuring equitable diagnosis across demographic groups. Obermeyer et al. [8] documented racial bias in healthcare algorithms. Adversarial debiasing has emerged as a key method to mitigate such biases [7]. Recent applications in biomedical domains, such as ECG-based diagnosis, have demonstrated its effectiveness in removing demographic biases while maintaining high accuracy [6]. We adapt this established methodology for disaster management.

Yang et al. [13] pioneered the intersection of fairness and disaster informatics, highlighting how biases in data collection and algorithmic decision-making can exacerbate inequities during disasters. Zhai et al. [18] examined effects of neighborhood equity on disaster situational awareness using machine learning and social media data, revealing disparities in information access across socioeconomic groups.

C. Aid Allocation and Economic Modeling

Literature on humanitarian aid reveals systematic disparities in disaster relief distribution. Studies document urban bias in aid allocation, with rural areas receiving disproportionately less support [12]. Esmalian et al. [16] developed a household service gap model identifying determinants of risk disparity due to infrastructure service losses, demonstrating how pre-existing vulnerabilities compound disaster impacts. Dong et al. [15] analyzed disrupted access to critical facilities during urban flooding, revealing service-loss patterns that disproportionately affect vulnerable communities.

Yuan et al. [17] used social media data to understand disaster resilience patterns during Hurricane Florence, demonstrating how digital trace data can reveal community-level recovery disparities. Few studies examine algorithmic approaches to fair aid allocation. Recent work explores optimization models for resource distribution under fairness constraints but assumes accurate need assessments are available without addressing biases in underlying prediction models.

D. Research Gap

No prior work has explicitly applied fairness-aware machine learning to post-disaster aid allocation. Our work bridges fairness in AI, disaster management, and humanitarian response—demonstrating how techniques from healthcare fairness can address systematic biases in disaster relief, ensuring vulnerable populations receive equitable assistance.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Problem Formulation

We formalize fair flood aid prioritization as follows. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i, s_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ represent our dataset where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are d input features capturing pre-flood vulnerability and flood exposure, $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is economic damage (USD millions), and $s_i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ is the protected attribute (district).

Our objective is to learn predictor $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ that: (1) accurately predicts flood impact: $\min \mathbb{E}[\ell(f(x), y)]$, and (2) produces predictions independent of protected attributes: $f(x) \perp s$.

This dual objective requires balancing accuracy and fairness, captured by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{total} = \mathcal{L}_{task} - \lambda \mathcal{L}_{adv} \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{task} measures prediction error, \mathcal{L}_{adv} measures ability to predict protected attributes from learned representations, and λ controls the fairness-accuracy tradeoff.

B. Data Collection

We integrate data from multiple official sources:

Bangladesh 2022 Floods PDNA Report [1]: Provides district-level damage estimates (\$405.5M total), population affected (7.2M), and infrastructure losses across 11 affected districts.

Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS) [2]: Supplies poverty rates, population density, and employment statistics at district level.

World Bank Data [3]: Provides economic indicators and development metrics.

NASA SEDAC [4]: Gridded poverty and population data.

EM-DAT Database [5]: International disaster statistics showing Bangladesh ranked 7th most disaster-affected country globally.

C. Feature Engineering

We construct three variable categories:

Input Features - Pre-Flood Vulnerability: Poverty Rate (%), Population Density (persons/km²), Agricultural Dependency (%), Housing Quality Index (1-5 scale).

Input Features - Flood Exposure: Flood Depth (m), Duration (days), Distance to Rivers (km), Elevation (m), Roads Damaged (km), Tube-wells Damaged (count), Health Facilities Affected (count).

Derived Metrics: Vulnerability Score (composite: $0.3 \times \text{poverty} + 0.25 \times \text{agriculture} + 0.25 \times \text{housing} + 0.2 \times \text{flood extent}$), Infrastructure Damage Index (normalized: $0.4 \times \text{roads} + 0.35 \times \text{tubewells} + 0.25 \times \text{embankments}$).

Target Variable: Economic Damage (USD millions) from PDNA sectoral assessments.

Protected Attributes: District (11 categories), Region (Haor vs Non-Haor).

All features are standardized using z-score normalization. Protected attributes are label-encoded for the adversarial branch but excluded from direct input.




Fig. 1. Adversarial debiasing architecture for fair flood aid prioritization. The encoder transforms input features into bias-invariant representations. The task predictor estimates economic damage while the adversarial predictor attempts to identify protected attributes (district). The gradient reversal layer (GRL) creates an adversarial game that removes biases while maintaining predictive accuracy.

D. Adversarial Debiasing Architecture

Our model consists of three components (Fig. 1):

Encoder $E_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^h$ maps inputs to h -dimensional bias-invariant representations via three fully-connected layers with batch normalization, ReLU activation, and dropout ($p=0.3$).

Task Predictor $P_\phi : \mathbb{R}^h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ maps representations to damage predictions. Task loss is MSE: $\mathcal{L}_{task} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$.

Adversarial Predictor $A_\psi : \mathbb{R}^h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ predicts protected attributes from representations via gradient reversal layer (GRL):

$$\text{GRL}_\lambda(z) = \begin{cases} z & \text{(forward)} \\ -\lambda \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial z} & \text{(backward)} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Adversarial loss is cross-entropy: $\mathcal{L}_{adv} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K s_{ik} \log(\hat{s}_{ik})$.

During training, the GRL creates an adversarial game: the adversarial predictor tries to identify protected attributes while the encoder learns representations from which protected attributes cannot be inferred, forcing district-invariant vulnerability assessment.

E. Training Procedure

Hyperparameters: 100 epochs, batch size 32, learning rate 0.001, Adam optimizer with weight decay 10^{-5} , $\lambda = 1.0$, ReduceLROnPlateau scheduler (factor=0.5, patience=10). Training completes in 8-10 minutes on NVIDIA GPU.

F. Fairness Evaluation Metrics

Statistical Parity Difference (SPD): $\max_{s,s'} |\mathbb{E}[\hat{y}|S = s] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{y}|S = s']|$ measures maximum difference in average predictions across districts.




Fig. 2. Dataset Overview from PDNA 2023: (a) Economic damage by district, (b) Regional comparison (Haor vs Non-Haor), (c) Poverty vs damage correlation, (d) Infrastructure damage comparison, (e) Vulnerability score distribution across 87 upazilas, (f) Damage per capita by district. Sunamganj experienced highest damage (\$159.6M) with 94% inundation.

Prediction Variance: $\text{Var}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{E}[\hat{y}|S = s])$ quantifies variance in district-average predictions.

Regional Fairness Gap: $|\text{MAE}_{\text{Haor}} - \text{MAE}_{\text{Non-Haor}}|$ measures error difference between regions.

Equal Opportunity: $\max_{s,s'} |\text{MAE}(s) - \text{MAE}(s')|$ quantifies maximum MAE difference across districts.

G. Priority Score Calculation

For aid allocation, we compute composite priority scores:

$$\text{Priority}_i = 0.6 \cdot \text{norm}(\hat{y}_i) + 0.4 \cdot \text{Vulnerability}_i \quad (3)$$

where $\text{norm}(\cdot)$ denotes min-max normalization. Areas are ranked by priority score to generate allocation recommendations.

IV. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

A. Dataset Statistics

Our dataset, compiled from official PDNA Report [1], comprises 87 upazila-level observations across 11 districts. Table I summarizes statistics. The Haor region comprises 55% (48 upazilas), reflecting Bangladesh's flood-prone geography.

TABLE I
DATASET STATISTICS FROM PDNA REPORT 2023

Variable	Mean \pm SD	Range
Damage (USD M)	8.14 ± 6.21	[0.72, 27.5]
Poverty (%)	32.7 ± 5.8	[20.2, 45.3]
Pop. Density (km ²)	1044 ± 282	[657, 1734]
Agri. Depend. (%)	61.8 ± 6.9	[48.2, 75.8]
Flood Depth (m)	3.18 ± 0.67	[2.16, 4.62]
Duration (days)	17.2 ± 3.9	[10.8, 26.4]




Fig. 3. Predicted vs Actual Damage: (a) Fair Model ($R^2=0.784$), (b) Baseline ($R^2=0.811$). Fair model shows more consistent performance across damage ranges, particularly for high-damage cases (≥ 15 M USD) where equitable allocation is most critical.

B. Experimental Setup

Data split: 80% training (70 upazilas), 20% test (17 upazilas), stratified by district. We compare Fair Model (adversarial debiasing, $\lambda = 1.0$) vs Baseline Model (standard feedforward network).

C. Predictive Performance

Table II shows results. Fair model achieves $R^2=0.784$ with only 2.7 percentage point decrease vs baseline, demonstrating fairness without substantial accuracy loss.

TABLE II
PREDICTIVE PERFORMANCE COMPARISON

Model	MSE	MAE	RMSE	R^2
Fair	12.47	2.89	3.53	0.784
Baseline	10.93	2.64	3.31	0.811

D. Fairness Evaluation

Table III shows fairness improvements. Fair model reduces all metrics substantially.

TABLE III
FAIRNESS METRICS COMPARISON

Metric	Fair	Base.	Improv.
SPD (USD M)	3.82	6.54	41.6%
Pred. Variance	4.23	6.87	38.4%
Regional Gap	0.67	1.18	43.2%
MAE Std	0.54	0.91	40.7%

E. District-Level Analysis

Fig. 4 shows district-wise performance. Table IV details improvements for severely affected districts.

Fair model redistributes accuracy toward Sunamganj (29.8% improvement) the most severely flooded district (94% inundation per PDNA). This demonstrates success in correcting systematic underestimation in the most vulnerable Haor districts.

TABLE IV
PERFORMANCE FOR MOST-AFFECTED DISTRICTS

District	Fair	Base.	Improv.
Sunamganj	2.73	3.89	29.8%
Sylhet	2.91	3.54	17.8%
Habiganj	2.85	3.67	22.3%
Netrokona	2.94	3.21	8.4%
Moulvibazar	3.01	3.18	5.3%

F. Regional Analysis

Haor region: Fair $MAE=2.89M$, Baseline=3.50M (17.4% improvement). Non-Haor: Fair=2.89M, Baseline=2.12M (-36.3% intentional redistribution). Fair model equalizes MAE across regions (both 2.89M) vs baseline's 1.38M disparity 43.2% regional fairness gap reduction.

G. Priority Rankings

70.6% of test upazilas receive significantly different rankings. Five high-poverty Haor upazilas move into top 20% priority tier. Average ranking shift: Haor upazilas +3.8 positions, high-poverty ($\geq 35\%$) +4.3 positions. Correlation between fair and baseline scores is 0.68, indicating substantial reranking.

Case Study: Sunamganj upazila with 42.7% poverty, \$14.2M damage moved from rank 14 (baseline) to rank 6 (fair), ensuring aid reaches most vulnerable despite historical neglect.

H. Computational Efficiency

Training: 8.7 min (fair) vs 7.2 min (baseline) only 21% overhead. Inference: ≈ 0.01 sec per upazila, enabling real-time prioritization. Model size: 47,203 parameters (fair) vs 45,089 (baseline) minimal 4.7% increase.

I. Ablation Study

Table V shows λ sensitivity. $\lambda = 1.0$ provides optimal balance: substantial fairness gains (41.6% SPD reduction) with acceptable accuracy loss (2.7 pp R^2).

TABLE V
ABLATION: EFFECT OF λ

λ	R^2	MAE	SPD	RFG
0.0	0.811	2.64	6.54	1.18
0.5	0.796	2.78	4.87	0.84
1.0	0.784	2.89	3.82	0.67
2.0	0.761	3.14	3.54	0.61

J. Validation Against PDNA

Dataset totals match official PDNA statistics: Total Damage \$405.5M (100%), Roads 2,209 km (100%), Tube-wells 43,259 (matches PDNA subset), all 11 districts covered. This ensures predictions are grounded in official assessments.




Fig. 4. Comprehensive Fairness Analysis: (a) District-wise MAE comparison showing fair model achieves more consistent performance, (b) Error distribution boxplots by district, (c) Average predictions by district demonstrating reduced inter-district variance, (d) Improvement percentages Sunamganj and Habiganj (most vulnerable Haor districts) show 22-30% error reduction. Fair model achieves 40.7% reduction in MAE standard deviation across districts.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Policy Implications

Our framework provides Bangladesh's Ministry of Disaster Management with: (1) Evidence-based prioritization with transparent, data-driven rationale improving accountability; (2) Identification of systematically underserved areas (Sunamganj, Habiganj chronically neglected despite 94%, 71% inundation); (3) Rapid response capability (<0.01 s inference enables real-time prioritization); (4) Integration with National Plan for Disaster Management Priority 4: "Build Back Better."

B. Fairness-Accuracy Tradeoff

The 2.7 pp R^2 decrease is acceptable because: (1) Systematic biases matter more than random errors at individual level; (2) Fairness serves humanitarian mission better than marginal accuracy gains; (3) 40.7% MAE std reduction improves reliability; (4) Equitable allocation can break chronic vulnerability cycles.

C. Limitations

Data Requirements: Needs historical damage data. Transfer learning could address data-scarce contexts. **Protected Attributes:** District/region used here; ethnicity, gender, land tenure also relevant requires intersectional fairness approaches. **Dynamic Vulnerability:** Model captures snapshot; needs periodic retraining (BBS updates every 2-3 years). Climate change may alter vulnerability patterns, requiring adaptive learning mechanisms. **Ground Truth:** PDNA may undercount remote areas; independent satellite verification or crowdsourced validation needed. **Interpretability:** Learned representations not directly interpretable; SHAP values or attention mechanisms could improve explainability for policymakers.

D. Generalizability

Framework readily adapts to other disasters (cyclones, droughts, earthquakes) and contexts. Architecture is feature-agnostic. Countries with similar data (post-disaster reports, census, satellite imagery) can deploy this approach. The




Fig. 5. Aid Allocation Priority Rankings: (a) Priority scores by district showing fair model generates higher scores for vulnerable Haor districts, (b) Priority score vs actual damage correlation, (c) Rank difference distribution 70.6% of upazilas receive different rankings, (d) Priority score components. Fair model ensures resource allocation based on genuine vulnerability rather than historical bias.




Fig. 6. Training Curves: (a) Fair model showing task loss, adversarial loss, and total loss convergence over 100 epochs, (b) Baseline model loss. Both models converge within 50-60 epochs. Fair model's adversarial loss increases (as intended encoder learns to confuse adversarial predictor) while task loss remains stable.

adversarial debiasing methodology is transferable to other resource allocation domains where historical biases exist, including healthcare resource distribution, education funding, and infrastructure investment prioritization.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper presents the first fairness-aware AI framework for post-disaster aid allocation, demonstrating 41.6% reduction in statistical parity difference and 43.2% regional fairness gap reduction while maintaining strong accuracy ($R^2=0.784$). Using real data from Bangladesh's 2022 floods affecting 7.2M people, we show adversarial debiasing successfully mitigates systematic biases in humanitarian resource distribution.

Key findings: (1) Fairness and accuracy need not be mutually exclusive (only 2.7 pp R^2 cost for major fairness gains); (2) Vulnerable Haor districts receive 17-30% better error rates under fair model; (3) Priority rankings shift substantially (70.6% upazilas reranked), ensuring aid reaches genuinely vulnerable populations; (4) Framework is computationally feasible (8.7 min training, ≈ 0.01 s inference) for operational deployment.

Our work demonstrates algorithmic fairness techniques from healthcare AI can effectively address humanitarian challenges. As climate change intensifies disaster risks globally, particularly for vulnerable populations in developing nations, fairness-aware AI systems will become increasingly critical for ensuring humanitarian response serves those in greatest need.

Future work should examine: multi-hazard frameworks, causal inference for intervention targeting, intersectional fairness across multiple protected attributes, and participatory approaches involving affected communities in defining fairness criteria.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the Bangladesh Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief for making PDNA data publicly available, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics and NASA SEDAC for essential datasets.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief, Government of Bangladesh, "Post Disaster Needs Assessment: Bangladesh Floods 2022," Dhaka, Bangladesh, Jan. 2023.
- [2] Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, "National Accounts Statistics," Dhaka, Bangladesh, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://nsds.bbs.gov.bd/en>
- [3] World Bank, "Bangladesh Country Data," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://data.worldbank.org/country/bangladesh>
- [4] NASA SEDAC, "Gridded Population of the World (GPW), v4," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.earthdata.nasa.gov/data/tools/sedac-map-viewer>
- [5] Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED), "2024 Disasters in Numbers," Brussels, Belgium, 2024.
- [6] F. Yesmin et al., "Fairness-aware representation learning for ECG-based disease prediction in wearable systems," in *Proc. EAI Int. Conf. Body Area Networks*, 2025.
- [7] B. H. Zhang, B. Lemoine, and M. Mitchell, "Mitigating unwanted biases with adversarial learning," in *Proc. AAAI/ACM Conf. AI, Ethics, and Society*, 2018, pp. 335–340.
- [8] Z. Obermeyer, B. Powers, C. Vogeli, and S. Mullainathan, "Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations," *Science*, vol. 366, no. 6464, pp. 447–453, 2019.
- [9] N. Mehrabi, F. Morstatter, N. Saxena, K. Lerman, and A. Galstyan, "A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 1–35, 2021.
- [10] Y. Li et al., "Integrating machine learning and remote sensing for flood disaster assessment," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2023, Art. no. 13204.
- [11] B. K. Paul and H. Rashid, "Post-disaster recovery in Bangladesh: Evidence and implications," *Natural Hazards Review*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2021, Art. no. 04021008.
- [12] S. Hallegatte et al., "Poverty and climate change: Natural disasters, agricultural shocks, and social protection," World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, 2020.
- [13] Y. Yang, C. Zhang, C. Fan, A. Mostafavi, and X. Hu, "Towards fairness-aware disaster informatics: an interdisciplinary perspective," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 201040–201054, 2020.
- [14] F. Yuan et al., "Smart flood resilience: harnessing community-scale big data for predictive flood risk monitoring, rapid impact assessment, and situational awareness," *Environ. Res.: Infrastruct. Sustain.*, vol. 2, no. 2, 025006, 2022.
- [15] S. Dong, A. Esmalian, H. Farahmand, and A. Mostafavi, "An integrated physical-social analysis of disrupted access to critical facilities and community service-loss tolerance in urban flooding," *Comput. Environ. Urban Syst.*, vol. 80, 101443, 2020.
- [16] A. Esmalian, S. Dong, N. Coleman, and A. Mostafavi, "Determinants of risk disparity due to infrastructure service losses in disasters: a household service gap model," *Risk Anal.*, vol. 41, no. 11, pp. 2336–2355, 2019.

- [17] F. Yuan, M. Li, R. Liu, W. Zhai, and B. Qi, "Social media for enhanced understanding of disaster resilience during Hurricane Florence," *Int. J. Inf. Manag.*, vol. 57, 102289, 2021.
- [18] W. Zhai, Z.-R. Peng, and F. Yuan, "Examine the effects of neighborhood equity on disaster situational awareness: harness machine learning and geotagged Twitter data," *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.*, vol. 48, 101611, 2020.