1	Dynamic response and breakage of trees subject to a landslide-induced air blast
2	Yu Zhuang ^{1,2} , Aiguo Xing ¹ , Perry Bartelt ³ , Muhammad Bilal ¹ , Zhaowei Ding ²
3	¹ State Key Laboratory of Ocean Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 200240, PR China
4	² State Key Laboratory of Geohazard Prevention and Geoenvironment Protection, Chengdu University of
5	Technology, Chengdu, 610059, China
6	³ WSL Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research SLF, Flüelastrasse 11, 7260 Davos Dorf, Switzerland
7	Correspondence: Aiguo Xing (xingaiguo@sjtu.edu.cn)
8	
9	Abstract
10	Landslides have been known to generate powerful air blasts capable of causing destruction and casualties
11	far beyond the runout of sliding mass. The extent of tree damage provides valuable information on air
12	blast intensity and impact region. However, little attention has been paid to the air blast-tree interaction.
13	In this study, we proposed a framework to assess the tree destruction caused by powerful air blasts,
14	including the eigenfrequency prediction method, tree motion equations and the breakage conditions. The
15	tree is modeled as a flexible beam with variable cross-sections, and the anchorage stiffness is introduced
16	to describe the tilt of tree base. Large tree deflection is regarded when calculating the air blast loading,
17	and two failure modes (bending and overturning) and the associated failure criteria are defined. Modeling
18	results indicate that although the anchorage properties are of importance to the tree eigenfrequency, tree
19	eigenfrequency is always close to the air blast frequency, causing a dynamic magnification effect for the
20	tree deformation. This magnification effect is significant in cases with a low air blast velocity, while the

- 21 large tree deflection caused by strong air blast loading would weaken this effect. Furthermore, failure
- 22 modes of a specific forest subject to a powerful air blast depend heavily on the trunk bending strength

and anchorage characteristics. The large variation of biometric and mechanical properties of trees necessitates the establishment of a regional database of tree parameters. Our work and the proposed method are expected to make people better understand air blast power and be of great utility for air blast risk assessment in mountainous regions worldwide.

27 Keywords: Landslide-induced air blast; Tree eigenfrequency; Dynamic response; Tree breakage

28 **1 Introduction**

29 Long runout landslides involve massive amounts of energy and can be extremely hazardous owing to 30 their long movement distance, high mobility and potential chain disasters (Johnson and Campbell, 2017; 31 Shugar et al., 2021). A moving landslide with high velocity can generate a powerful air blast capable of 32 uprooting trees, lifting people into the air and even flattening buildings (Adams, 1881; Penna et al., 2021). 33 In recent decades, destructive air blasts frequently occurred in mountainous regions worldwide and 34 caused casualties and economic loss far beyond the landslide runout (e.g., Yin, 2014; Bartelt et al., 2016; 35 Kargel et al., 2016). Understanding their force of destruction is of great utility for landslide risk 36 assessment and disaster mitigation in high-altitude regions.

37 Monitoring equipment has been confirmed to provide great performance in determining the dynamic 38 characteristics of landslide-induced air blasts (Grigoryan et al., 1982; Sukhanov, 1982; Caviezel et al., 39 2021). However, most case histories occurred in the high-altitude mountainous region without witnesses 40 (Yin and Xing, 2012), and the in-situ equipment can also get damaged because of the near-field 41 destruction of landslides and associated air blasts. Therefore, very few air blast cases were measured in 42 history. Geologists can only evaluate the air blast hazard for most recorded events using historical 43 evidence after the landslide occurred. In-situ information about forest destruction and tree breakage is 44 often used for the air blast risk assessment (Feistl et al., 2015; Fujita et al., 2017; Zhuang et al., 2019, 45 2022a) (Fig. 1). Uprooted trees and snapped stems delineate the impact region of air blasts and create a
46 natural vector field indicating the primary movement direction of the landslide, greatly helping analyze
47 the disaster-causing process of the event. In many cases, observations of forest destruction are the only
48 data to quantify air blast danger.





51	A question remained for air blast mitigation planning using the information of tree damage is how
52	to establish a simple relationship between air blast impact pressure and tree failure. Bending and
53	overturning are two common tree failure modes caused by strong winds. Trees snap when the bending
54	stress exerted by the air blast exceeds the wood strength (Peltola et al., 1999; Gardiner et al., 2000), while
55	the overturning will occur if the applied moment overcomes the anchorage resistance of root systems
56	(Jonsson et al., 2006; Nicoll et al., 2006). The occurrence of these two failure modes depends heavily on
57	both the air blast loading and tree properties. Considering the minor destruction of air blasts relative to
58	the landslide, although long recognized that sliding mass can easily break or uproot trees (Bartelt and
59	Stöckli, 2001: Šilhán, 2020), little attention has been paid to the tree destruction resulting from air blasts.

Furthermore, existing models describing the tree-air blast interaction are mostly static (Feistl et al., 2015) or established based on the small-deflection theory (Bartelt et al., 2018). These methods could aid in a rapid assessment of air blast power, but further research is needed to establish a dynamic model to represent the dynamic response of trees in a strong wind. A mechanical understanding of how trees are damaged by air blasts is therefore essential for quantifying the air blast powers and providing valuable data to verify the possible numerical results.

In this study, we established a simple dynamic model capable of calculating the natural frequency of trees and simulating their dynamic response subject to a powerful air blast. The proposed model regards the tree as a multi-degree-of-freedom beam with variable diameters and accounts for large tree deflections and impacts of root anchorage. Both bending and overturning failure modes are involved in the model. The work conducted in this study is expected to make people better understand the power of landslide-induced air blasts and provide an applicable method to assess the air blast hazard.

72 2. Model description

73 Measurements of historical events indicated that the landslide-induced air blast is intermittent and of 74 short duration, lasting only a few seconds and could reach a high velocity (Grigoryan et al., 1982; 75 Sukhanov, 1982; Caviezel et al., 2021). This impulse wave has a propagation distance of hundreds of 76 meters in both horizontal and vertical directions and acts over the entire tree. Thus, the impact of air 77 blasts on trees is similar to extreme wind gusts, producing large bending moments in the stem and root 78 base system, forcing trees to deform or get damaged. Furthermore, fallen trees often point to the 79 movement direction of the landslide, illustrating there is little time for trees to sway and react to air blasts 80 while the inertial effects are greatly important.

81 To characterize the dynamic response of trees under the impact load of air blasts, we established a

- mechanical model to predict the eigenfrequency of trees subject to air blasts and developed a dynamic tree-swaying model that accounts for the large tree deflection. In what follows, we present the eigenfrequency prediction method, tree motion equations and the breakage conditions.
- 85 2.1 Eigenfrequency prediction
- 86 The tree is modeled as a flexible cantilever beam with variable diameters that is hinged at ground level 87 using elastic support. The beam diameter is assumed to continuously linearly decrease with height 88 regarding the decreasing diameters of trunk and crown from bottom to top, while the anchorage stiffness 89 of the root system (K) helps to describe the tilt of tree base in response to the moment (Neild and Wood, 90 1999). In the eigenfrequency prediction mode, the tree beam is divided into two segments with a splitting 91 point located at the starting point of the tree crown (Fig. 2). We assume that the tree crown shows minor 92 impacts on elastic modulus. The tree crown is accounted for through the crown mass, and thus the natural 93 difference between the two segments is the material density.

94 The governing differential equation for the dynamic bending of a nonuniform Euler-Bernoulli beam
95 is (Keshmiri et al., 2018):

96
$$\rho A(z) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z^2} \left[EI(z) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z^2} \right] = 0$$
(1)

97 where z is the position variable along the beam length. For ease of calculation, the original point (z=0) is 98 set at the treetop and the maximum value of z is at the tree base, so that the beam diameter d(z)99 corresponding to the position z can be described using a gradient coefficient (μ): $d(z)=\mu z$. u is the beam 100 displacement, E is the elastic modulus, $A(z) = \frac{\pi}{4} (dz)^2$ and $I(z) = \frac{\pi}{64} (dz)^4$ are the cross-sectional area 101 and moment of inertia, respectively.



103 Fig. 2 Schematic representation of the eigenfrequency prediction model.

104 Plugging the expression of
$$A(z)$$
 and $I(z)$ into Eq. 1 gives:

105
$$z^{2} \frac{\partial^{4} u}{\partial z^{4}} + 8z \frac{\partial^{3} u}{\partial z^{3}} + 12 \frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial z^{2}} - \frac{16\rho\omega^{2} u}{E\mu^{2}} = 0$$
(2)

106 where ω is known as the eigenfrequency of the beam. The general solution of Eq. 2 can be expressed as:

107
$$u(z) = \frac{1}{z} \Big[A_1 J_2(2\sqrt{\lambda z}) + A_2 Y_2(2\sqrt{\lambda z}) + A_3 J_2(2i\sqrt{\lambda z}) + A_4 Y_2(2i\sqrt{\lambda z}) \Big]$$
(3)

108 where $\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{16\rho\omega^2}{E\mu^2}}$, J_2 and Y_2 are the Bessel functions of the first and second kind (Mocica, 1988),

109 respectively, and A_1 - A_4 are coefficients that need to be determined based on the boundary conditions.

110 The deflection of the upper segment (crown) and the lower segment (trunk) can be generated in a

111 similar manner:

102

112
$$u_1(z) = \frac{1}{z} \Big[A_1 J_2 \Big(2\sqrt{\lambda_1 z} \Big) + A_2 Y_2 \Big(2\sqrt{\lambda_1 z} \Big) + A_3 J_2 \Big(2i\sqrt{\lambda_1 z} \Big) + A_4 Y_2 \Big(2i\sqrt{\lambda_1 z} \Big) \Big] \quad 0 \le z < l \quad (4)$$

113
$$u_{2}(z) = \frac{1}{z} \left[B_{1}J_{2}\left(2\sqrt{\lambda_{2}z}\right) + B_{2}Y_{2}\left(2\sqrt{\lambda_{2}z}\right) + B_{3}J_{2}\left(2i\sqrt{\lambda_{2}z}\right) + B_{4}Y_{2}\left(2i\sqrt{\lambda_{2}z}\right) \right] \quad l \leq z \leq h \quad (5)$$

114 where *l* is the length of crown, *h* is the tree height, $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{\frac{16\rho_1\omega^2}{E\mu^2}}$ and $\lambda_2 = \sqrt{\frac{16\rho_2\omega^2}{E\mu^2}}$ are the single-valued

- 115 function of eigenfrequency. ρ_2 is the wood density and ρ_1 is the equivalent density regarding the
- 116 contribution of both tree trunk and crown. Same to A_1 - A_4 , B_1 - B_4 are also coefficients of the tree deflection
- equation that need to be determined based on the boundary and continuity conditions.
- 118 The boundary condition at the origin (z=0) is the free end, and thus Eq. 4 can be simplified as:

119
$$u_1(z) = \frac{1}{z} \left[A_1 J_2 \left(2\sqrt{\lambda_1 z} \right) + A_3 J_2 \left(2i\sqrt{\lambda_1 z} \right) \right] \qquad 0 \le z \le l$$
(6)

- 120 According to continuity conditions of two segments at the splitting point and the boundary condition
- 121 at the tree base, following constraints are determined: $u_1(l) = u_2(l)$, $u'_1(l) = u'_2(l)$, $u''_1(l) = u''_2(l)$,

122
$$u_1''(l) = u_2''(l)$$
, $u_2(h) = 0$, and $Ku_2'(h) + EI(h)u_2''(h) = 0$. Introducing the constraints into Eqs. (5-6), a total

123 of six equations are determined here. These six equations can be written in a matrix format:

124
$$\begin{bmatrix} F(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) \end{bmatrix}_{6\times 6} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_3 & B_1 & B_2 & B_3 & B_4 \end{bmatrix}^T = 0$$
(7)

125 where $[F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)]_{6\times 6}$ is a matrix that is composed of λ_1 and λ_2 . The orders of eigenfrequency and the 126 corresponding vibration mode can be obtained by solving the equation: the determinant of matric 127 $|F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)| = 0$. Notably, the derivatives of $u_1(z)$ and $u_2(z)$ have very complicated expressions but could 128 be easily calculated using Matlab. Therefore, we did not provide the complete expression here.

129 2.2 Tree motion

The mechanical response of trees subject to an air blast is modeled using a modified multi-degree-offreedom tree swaying model with variable cross-sections (Zhuang et al., 2022b). Different from the simplification in the eigenfrequency prediction method, the size of tree crown here is determined based on real tree data, corresponding to the frontal area distribution of the tree crown (Fig. 3(a)). The model divides the tree beam into a set of segments and calculates the tree motion using linear modal analysis. Specifically, the tree deformation is deposed into a set of vibration modes so that the total displacement is the combined contribution of each mode. According to preliminary research performed by Sellier et al. 137 (2008) and Pivato et al. (2014), the contribution of the first vibration model is far ahead of the other modes for trees with a slender shape. Thus, only the first vibration mode and the corresponding 138 139 eigenfrequency are utilized in this study. The modeling of air blast pressure accounts for the wind-tree 140 relative motion and large tree deflection by regarding the beam velocity and geometric nonlinearities 141 resulting from the inclination of beam segments relative to the wind direction (θ_i) (Fig. 3(b)). With 142 respect to the large tree deflection, we also introduce the impact of eccentric gravity into the model, 143 which contributes a lot during the interaction with a powerful air blast. The gravity and wind load acting 144 on each segment can be easily calculated based on the predetermined diameter and frontal area 145 distribution (Fig. 3(a)). Considering that trees often fall in the direction of landslide motion and have 146 little time to sway, the maximum response of the tree is assumed to be reached before the damping forces 147 act (Bartelt et al., 2018). Only the undamped response to a short-duration blast is considered. The tree 148 motion equations and the expression of air blast force are as follows:

149
$$m\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} + ky = \int_0^h F_i \phi ds + \int_0^h G_i \phi ds$$
(8)

150
$$F_{i} = 0.5\rho C_{d} A_{i} \left| v \cos \theta_{i} - \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} \cos \theta_{i} \right| \left(v \cos \theta_{i} - \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} \cos \theta_{i} \right) \cos \theta_{i}$$
(9)

151
$$G_i = m_i g \cdot \sin \theta_i \cdot \cos \theta_i \tag{10}$$

152 where ϕ , w, $m = \int_{0}^{h} \overline{m} \phi^{2} ds$, $k = 4\pi^{2} m \omega^{2}$ are the first mode shape, the first eigenfrequency, modal mass 153 and stiffness, respectively, \overline{m} is the mass distribution, y is the associated generalized displacement, F_{i} 154 and G_{i} are the air blast loading and eccentric beam gravity act on the *i*th segment, h is the tree height, C_{d} 155 is the drag efficient, A_{f} is the frontal area, ρ and v are the density and velocity of the air blast, respectively. 156 Our model is applicable of calculating the scenarios for both full-height and part-height air blasts.

157 In this study, the air blast velocity is expressed as a sine wave impulse with a short duration time t_0 :

158
$$v = v_{\max} \sqrt{\sin \varpi t}$$
(11)

where v_{max} is the maximum velocity of the landslide-induced air blast and ϖ can be regarded as the circular frequency of the wind force $\varpi = \pi / t_0$ (wind force is related to the square of its velocity). The mechanical response of trees subject to an air blast is deduced by introducing the calculated wind velocity from Eq. 11 into the tree motion model (Eqs. 8-9), and subsequently solving the equations using the central finite-difference scheme. The validity of this tree motion model has been checked by Pivato et al. (2014) and Zhuang et al. (2022), and thus the validation process is not involved here.



165

166 Fig. 3 a-b Modeling the tree as a multi-degree-of-freedom flexible beam to calculate the dynamic 167 response of trees submitted a powerful air blast. c The first mode shape of the beam helps to model the 168 tree deformation.

169 2.3 Tree breakage

170 Two failure modes commonly caused by air blasts are involved in the work: bending and overturning

171 (Gardiner et al., 2000).

172 For the case of tree bending, trees are considered to break when the maximum bending stress σ_{max}

173 exceeds a critical value $\sigma_{\rm crit}$:

174
$$\sigma_{\max} = \left[\frac{M(t,z) \cdot d(z)/2}{I(z)}\right]_{\max} \ge \sigma_{\operatorname{crit}}$$
(12)

175 where σ_{crit} is the bending strength of the tree, which depends highly on the material property. M(t, z) is

the bending moment, and its value is calculated at each time step all along the beam:

177
$$M(t,z) = EI(z)\frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\mathrm{d}s}$$
(13)

178 where $\frac{d\theta}{ds}$ represents the local beam curvature and θ is the angle between the beam segment with the 179 vertical direction. 180 For the tree overturning case, trees are regarded to break at the basement when the air blast-induced 181 moment reaches the anchorage resistance (M_{crit}):

182 $M_{\text{base}}(t) \ge M_{\text{crit}} \tag{14}$

183 where $M_{\text{hase}}(t)$ is the moment at tree base calculated at each time step, and the anchorage resistance M_{crit}

- 184 is often determined based on in-situ tests (e.g. tree pulling tests).
- 185 **3. Application**

186 To demonstrate the power of air blasts and how they damage trees, we consider the problem proposed

187 by Bartelt et al. (2018): a landslide-induced air blast enters a spruce forest at high speed (maximum

188 velocity of 20 m/s). The short-duration air blast lasts a few seconds with a frequency σ . Trees in the

189 forest have a height between 25 and 30 m, which is also the height of the air blast. The sliding mass has

190 stopped before reaching the forest and only the air blast loads on the trees.

Table 1 Model parameters used in the numerical simulations of the tree response. Parameters are derived
 from data contained in Kantola and Mäkelä (2004) and Bartelt et al. (2018).

Height	Crown	Crown	Diameter at	Wood	Branch mass	Drag
<i>h</i> (m)	height	width	trunk base	density	<i>m</i> (kg)	coefficient C_d
	<i>l</i> (m)	<i>w</i> (m)	$D(\mathbf{m})$	$ ho_2(\mathrm{kg/m^3})$		
27	18	5	0.4	480	540	0.4

Using the measured biomass parameters presented in Table 1, we set the total crown mass of a single tree to be 540 kg. The tree crown is assumed to be a cone with a length of 18 m $(\frac{2}{3}h)$ and a width of 5 m. The wood density is 480 kg/m³ and the elastic modulus is 10 GPa. Measurements of root anchorage stiffness (*K*) are very rare and in-situ tests on spruce performed by Neild and Wood (1999) show a value variation of 80-1200 kN·m. This value range indicates a large variation in *K* depending on the growth conditions, and the values of 100-1200 kN·m are applied in the prediction of eigenfrequency and

199 vibration mode in this study.

200 The eigenfrequency ranging from 0.13 Hz (K=100 kN·m) to 0.32 Hz (K=1200 kN·m) is calculated 201 based on the above parameters (Fig. 4). The modeled results are in high agreement with measurements 202 performed by Jonsson et al. (2006) (0.16-0.30 Hz), indicating the validity of our proposed eigenfrequency 203 prediction method. Although the tree eigenfrequency varies significantly with the anchorage stiffness, all 204 the calculated values are less than 0.5 Hz. The same order of magnitude between tree eigenfrequency 205 and air blast frequency necessitates a further investigation on the possible impact of resonance. The 206 dynamic magnification effect caused by impulse loading can greatly amplify the static stress state, 207 making the trees easier to be damage.



208



210 To investigate the impact of dynamic magnification, we performed simulations for all the scenarios

211 using the tree eigenfrequency of 0.26 Hz (K=600 kN·m) and the associated vibration mode. A

212 magnification factor *D* is defined to describe this effect:

213
$$D = \frac{u_{d,\max}(\beta)}{u_{sta}} = \frac{u_{d,\max}(\beta)}{\int_0^h F_{s,\max}\phi ds / k} = \frac{u_{d,\max}(\beta)}{\int_0^h \rho C_d A_f v_{\max}^2 \phi ds / k}$$
(15)

214 where $u_{d,max}$ and u_{sta} are the maximum displacement subject to dynamic load and static load, respectively,

215 $F_{s,max}$ is the static wind force corresponding to the maximum air blast velocity and $\beta = \frac{\omega}{\omega}$ is the ratio 216 between the air blast frequency (ω) and the eigenfrequency of the tree (ω). Notably, the air blast is a 217 multi-medium fluid that contains numerous dusts, showing a higher density than air. Measurements and 218 numerical modeling performed by Swiss researchers (Feistl et al., 2015) suggest $\rho = 5\text{kg}/\text{m}^3$. In this 219 scenario u_{sta} is calculated to be 9.8 m.



220

Fig. 5 Magnification factor with various frequency ratio.

222 Fig. 5 shows the impact of air blast frequency on the dynamic magnification effect. A parabola 223 relationship is identified between the magnification factor and the frequency ratio. Consider first an 224 impulse air blast lasting 1.6 s ($\beta = 1.2$). The air blast frequency is higher than that of the tree, implying 225 the maximum displacement reaches after the loading time. The modeled maximum dynamic deformation $u_{d,max}$ reaches 10.7 m, and the magnification factor is 1.09. In this case, the magnification effect of tree 226 227 deformation seems not significant because of the large tree deflection and short-duration loading, and 228 the modeled result is similar to the static stress state. For a longer air blast duration of 3.2 s ($\beta = 0.6$), we 229 find D=1.34, a high value. The maximum tree deformation reaches during the air blast loading. In such 230 a scenario, an air blast travelling at 20 m/s can exert similar destruction as a long-duration wind moves

at 25 m/s. The dynamic magnification effect significantly increases the tree displacement and thus causes
such a phenomenon. Measurements of air blast duration reported by Russian and Swiss researchers
(Grigoryan et al., 1982; Sukhanov, 1982) are within this range, lasting only a few seconds. Although the
large tree deflection decreases the wind loading, the impulse air blast load is prone to damage the trees
because of the dynamic magnification effect.

236 Additional simulations were performed on the air blast induced-tree breakage. The impulse air blast 237 is assumed to have a maximum velocity of 20 m/s and a duration of 3.2 s. For this case, numerical results demonstrate the maximum bending stress and moment of 35 Mpa and 192 kN·m, respectively. The 238 239 maximum bending stress reaches at 9 m height (1/3h), and the maximum bending moment is identified 240 at the tree base. In natural forest areas, the bending strength $\sigma_{\rm crit}$ and anchorage resistance $M_{\rm crit}$ are highly 241 variable, depending on tree species, soil characteristics and temperatures, etc. Measurements conducted 242 by Peltola et al. (2000) and Lundström et al. (2007) indicate that the bending stress to destroy mature 243 trees needs to exceed a value of 30 MPa while mature spruces with a height of 20-40 m have an anchorage 244 resistance reaches up to 100-400 kN·m. For the case performed in this study, the forest is likely to damage 245 in both bending and overturning failure modes. Reliable values of critical parameters are needed during 246 the assessment of tree destruction, and this will improve the prediction accuracy of the likely failure 247 mode.

A further application was performed on the 2008 Wenjia valley avalanche-induced air blast in Sichuan, China (Fig. 6a). This large avalanche has a volume of over 40×10^6 m³ and generated a powerful air blast. According to our previous investigations and numerical modeling (Zhuang et al. 2019), the air blast-damaged trees are mostly tall spruce concentrated near the turning points of the valley (Fig. 6 b-c). The simulated air blast velocity at turning points reaches 30 m/s (point A) and 35 m/s (point B), respectively. Using the spruce-related parameters indicated in Table 1 and an assumed air blast duration of 3.2 s (a long duration for large avalanches), the maximum displacement of spruces is calculated to be 18.5 m and 22.2 m at points A and B, respectively. In this case, the maximum bending stress of trees at two turning points could reach 51 Mpa and 57 Mpa, respectively, significantly larger than the bending strength suggested by Peltola et al. (2000) (36 Mpa). Therefore, bending failure of tall spruces was widely

258 identified in situ.



259



261 Wenjia valley avalanche. b-c Trees damaged by the generated air blast.

262 4. Discussion

263 Risk assessment and disaster mitigation of landslide-induced air blasts are hot issues in mountainous

regions. Developing a simple but applicable relationship between air blast pressure and tree failure is of

265 great utility for scientists to quantify the air blast power. Compared with existing models, one significant 266 improvement of our model is to model the tree as a flexible beam with variable cross-section and involve 267 the impact of anchorage. This improvement allows the tree to move as its natural vibration mode rather 268 than a hypothetical trajectory (e.g. rotate around the tree base as a rigid body (Bartelt et al., 2018)). 269 Moreover, the variable cross-section makes the modeling of tree bending failures more realistic. We can 270 simulate the failure position of trees subjected to a powerful air blast. For the existing model with a 271 constant diameter (Feistl et al., 2015), the rigidity EI is constant along the beam, and the maximum 272 bending stress is always identified at the tree base. This failure characteristic cannot match the actual 273 situation well.

Our proposed model accounts for the impacts of large tree deflection: eccentric gravity and modeling of air blast force regarding the wind-tree relative motion and geometric nonlinearities. To investigate the impact of these factors and confirm the necessity of considering large deflection, a comparative analysis is needed to make readers have a better understand. Therefore, we designed a comparative analysis by simplifying the tree motion model of Eq. 8 without involving the impact of large tree deflection. The simplified model is similar to that proposed by Bartelt et al. (2018):

280
$$m\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} + ky = \int_0^h 0.5\rho C_d A_f v_{\max}^2 \phi ds \cdot \sin \omega t = \int_0^h F_{s,\max} \phi ds \cdot \sin \omega t$$
(16)

281 The displacement at the tree top can be written as:

282
$$\begin{cases} u(t) = \frac{\int_0^h F_{s,\max} \phi \mathrm{d}s}{k} \frac{1}{1 - \beta^2} (\sin \omega t - \beta \sin \omega t) & 0 \le t \le t_0 \\ u(t) = \frac{u'(t_0)}{\omega} \sin \omega (t - t_0) + u(t_0) \cos \omega (t - t_0) & t > t_0 \end{cases}$$
(17)

283 The maximum deformation occurs during the loading time when $\beta \le 1$, and after the loading time 284 when $\beta > 1$. The magnification factor *D* for both scenarios can be expressed as:

$$\begin{cases} D = \frac{1}{1 - \beta^2} [\sin(\frac{2\pi\beta}{\beta + 1}) - \beta \sin\frac{2\pi}{\beta + 1}] & \beta \le 1 \\ D = \frac{2\beta}{\beta^2 - 1} \cos\frac{\pi}{2\beta} & \beta > 1 \end{cases}$$
(18)





285

Fig. 7 Impact of large tree deflection on the maximum magnification factor D_{max} . The red star represents the D_{max} calculated from Eq. 18. The red circle represents the D_{max} corresponding to the scenario with a very low air blast velocity (maximum velocity of 0.1m/s) and the eccentric gravity is not considered.

290 Fig. 7 presents the impact of large tree deflection on the magnification effect. We first perform the 291 simulation using the proposed model without regarding the impact of large tree deflection. A very low 292 air blast velocity (maximum velocity of 0.1m/s) is performed and the eccentric gravity is not considered. 293 The D_{max} value of 1.77 is identified in the scenario, which is consistent with the analytical solution from 294 Eq. 18. The tree deformation is small with such a weak air blast loading, and the comparison result 295 verifies the validity of our proposed model. Further calculations with higher air blast velocities show 296 different results. In the cases of a low air blast velocity, the eccentric gravity contributes a lot to the tree 297 deformation, causing a rather large magnification factor (>2). However, D_{max} greatly decreases with the 298 increase of wind velocity. For a high air blast velocity, the dynamic response and eccentric gravity 299 amplify the tree deflection, but the inclination of the trees to the wind direction significantly reduces the 300 air blast loading. This special mechanism was rarely considered during the previous assessment of landslide-induced air blasts. We suggest that the modeled tree deformation subjected to a powerful air
blast might be overestimated without considering large tree deflection, although this simplified model of
Eq. 18 has the advantage of rapid assessment for air blast pressure. The impact of large tree deflection
should be accounted for when using forest destruction to quantify the air blast danger.

305 The dynamic response of trees subject to a landslide-induced air blast is a complex problem, 306 depending heavily on the biometric characteristics of trees. Some biomass variations can be represented 307 by the parameters in the proposed model. For example, for the leafless trees, air blasts pass through the 308 tree crown and only act on the branches, causing a smaller wind load. A reduction of drag efficient C_d is 309 needed in such a condition. Single trees in the impact region of air blasts are subject to a larger loading 310 than trees in dense forest stands, where tree crowns tend to be narrower and form a shielding effect. We 311 can make a reduction in the frontal area $A_{\rm f}$ to simulate this mechanism. Furthermore, although much 312 effort has been paid to the biometric and mechanical characteristics of tree crowns and trunks, less 313 information is available about the anchorage stiffness and resistance. The root anchorage properties 314 significantly influence the tree eigenfrequency and the likely failure mode. A reliable measurement value 315 of tree bending strength and anchorage resistance is of utility to improve the accuracy of tree failure 316 prediction and clarify which failure mode is prone to occur. Overall, biomass-related parameters selected 317 to estimate the air blast pressure are recommended to be determined based on in-situ investigations. In 318 the future, more measurements need to be conducted on the anchorage properties of trees. Regional 319 databases for biometric and mechanical properties of trees are worthwhile to be established. This would 320 help provide reliable parameters for the air blast risk assessment.

321 In this study, the tree is modeled as a variable cross-section that is hinged at ground level using 322 elastic support. Root anchorage is complex and sensitive to many factors such as soil mechanical 323 properties, soil water content and root morphology, and we acknowledge that it is difficult to establish a 324 model that accounts for all the factors that affect the anchorage. Most importantly, we developed a simple 325 but practical model that could simulate the dynamic response of trees subject to a powerful air blast and 326 their two possible failure modes. Bartelt and his colleagues (Bartetl et al., 2018) have developed a 327 dynamic model named RAMMS, which could efficiently model the entire movement process of 328 ice/rock/snow avalanches and the associated air blasts. It is anticipated that the combination of our 329 proposed tree model and the RAMMS dynamic model could help the risk assessment of potential air 330 blasts through modeling the air blast impact region and forest destruction.

331 Conclusions

332 Air blasts are short-duration impulses and can intensity the potential destruction far beyond the sliding 333 mass. Trees destruction in-situ can provide valuable data to quantify the air blast danger and make us 334 better understand its force of destruction. In this study, we developed a framework for the forest 335 destruction assessment subject to a powerful air blast, including the eigenfrequency prediction method, 336 tree motion equations and breakage conditions. The tree is modeled as a flexible variable cross-section 337 beam hinged at ground using elastic support. The impacts of root anchorage and large tree deflection are 338 regarded during the dynamic response analysis. The framework also involved two failure modes (bending 339 and overturning) and the corresponding failure criteria so that the risk of forest damage could be assessed. 340 Using the proposed framework, we assumed conditions to investigate the air blast power. Modeling 341 results demonstrate that although the anchorage properties significantly influence the tree eigenfrequency, the tree eigenfrequency is always in the same order as air blast frequency. The associated dynamic 342 343 magnification effect amplifies the tree deformation and thus makes the tree damage easier. In the scenario 344 with a similar frequency between air blasts and trees, an air blast travelling at 20 m/s causes a similar

345	force of destruction as a long-duration wind load moves at 25 m/s. Notably, this magnification effect
346	caused by the dynamic response and eccentric gravity is significant in the cases of low wind velocity,
347	while the large tree deflection caused by strong air blast loading would weaken this effect. Furthermore,
348	bending and overturning are two likely failure modes for trees subject to a powerful air blast, but exactly
349	what kind of failure will occur for a specific forest depends heavily on the properties of both trees and
350	soil. A case application was further performed on the 2008 Wenjia valley avalanche-induced air blast in
351	China, checking the validity of our proposed model. In the future, more measurements should be
352	conducted on biometric and mechanical properties of trees, and a regional parameter database is
353	worthwhile to be established. This would greatly improve the prediction accuracy of tree damage and air
354	blast pressure.
355	Data availability
356	No data sets were used in this article.
357	Author contribution
358	Yu Zhuang did the numerical work and wrote the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors.
359	Aiguo Xing and Perry Bartelt designed the work and modified the manuscript. Bilal Muhammad
360	evaluated the results and proposed various improvements that were incorporated. Zhaowei Ding helped
361	with the eigenfrequency prediction model.
362	Competing interest
363	The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that
364	could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.
365	Acknowledgments
366	This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 41977215).

367 References

- 368 Adams, J.: Earthquake-dammed lakes in New Zealand, Geology, 9, 215-219, 1881.
- 369 Bartelt, P., and Stöckli, V.: The influence of tree and branch fracture, overturning and debris entrainment
- on snow avalanche flow, Annals of Glaciology, 32, 209-216, 2001.
- 371 Bartelt, P., Buser, O., Vera Valero, C., and Bühler, Y.: Configurational energy and the formation of mixed
- flowing/powder snow and ice avalanches, Annals of Glaciology, 57(71), 179-188, 2016.
- 373 Bartelt, P., Bebi, P., Feistl, T., Buser, O., and Caviezel, A.: Dynamic magnification factors for tree blow-
- down by powder snow avalanche air blasts, Natural Hazards Earth System Sciences, 18, 759-764,
- 375 2018.
- 376 Bartelt, P., Christen, M., Bühler, Y., and Buser, O.: Thermomechanical modelling of rock avalanches with
- debris, ice and snow entrainment, Numerical Methods in Geotechnical Engineering IX, Taylor &
 Francis Group, London, pp 1047-1054, 2018.
- 379 Caviezel, A., Margreth, S., Ivanova, K., Sovilla, B., and Bartelt, P.: Powder snow impact of tall vibrating
- 380 structures, Eccomas Proceedia Compdyn, 5318-5330, 2021.
- 381 Feistl, T., Bebi, P., Christen, M., Margreth, S., Diefenbach, L., and Bartelt, P.: Forest damage and snow
- avalanche flow regime, Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 15, 1275-1288, 2015.
- 383 Fujita, K., Inoue, H., Izumi, T., Yamaguchi, S., Sadakane, A., Sunako, S., Nishimura, K., Immerzeel, W.
- 384 W., Shea, J. M., Kayastha, R. B., Sawagaki, T., Breashears, D. F., Yagi, H., and Sakai, A.:
- 385 Anomalous winter-snow-amplified earthquake-induced disaster of the 2015 Langtang avalanche in
- 386 Nepal, Natural Hazards Earth System Sciences, 17, 749-764, 2017.
- 387 Gardiner, B., Peltola, H., and Kellomäki, S.: Comparison of two models for predicting the critical wind
- 388 speeds required to damage coniferous trees, Ecological Modelling, 129, 1-23, 2000.

- Grigoryan, S., Urubayev, N., and Nekrasov, I.: Experimental investigation of an avalanche air blast, Data
 Glaciology Student, 44, 87-93, 1982.
- 391 Jonsson, M. J., Foetzki, A., Kalberer, M., Lundström, T., Ammann, W., and Stöckli, V.: Root-soil rotation
- 392 stiffness of norway spruce (Picea abies (L.) Karst) growing on subalpine forested slopes, Plant Soil,
- 393 285, 267-277, 2006.
- Johnson, B. C., and Campbell, C. S.: Long-runout landslides are among the most spectacular and catastrophic geologic processes, Geophysical Research Letters, 44(12), 12091-12097, 2017.
- 396 Kantola, A., and Mäkelä, A.: Crown development in Norway spruce [Picea abies(L.) Karst.], Trees, 18,
- 397 408-421, 2004.
- Kargel JS, et al. (2016) Geomorphic and geologic controls of geohazards induced by Nepal's 2015
 Gorkha earthquake. Science, 351, aac8353.
- 400 Keshmiri, A., Wu, N., and Wang, Q.: Free Vibration Analysis of a Nonlinearly Tapered Cone Beam by
- 401 Adomian Decomposition Method, International Journal of Structural Stability and Dynamics, 18(7),
- 402 1850101, 2018.
- 403 Lundström, T., Jonsson, M. J., and Kalberer, M. The root-soil system of Norway spruce subjected to
- 404 turning moment: resistance as a function of rotation, Plant Soil, 300, 35-49, 2007.
- 405 Mocica, G.: Special Functions Problems, Bucharest: Didactic and Pedagogic Publishing House, 1988.
- 406 Neild, A. S., and Wood, C. J.: Estimating stem and root-anchorage flexibility in trees, Tree Physiology,
- 407 19, 141-151, 1999.
- 408 Nicoll, B. C., Gardiner, B. A., Rayner, B., Peace, A. J.: Anchorage of coniferous trees in relation to
- 409 species, soil type, and rooting depth, Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 36, 1871-1883, 2006.
- 410 Penna, I. M., Hermanns, R. L., Nicolet, P., Morken, O. A., and Jaboyedoff, M.: Airblasts caused by large

- 411 slope collapses, Geological Society of America Bulletin, 133, 939-948, 2021.
- 412 Peltola, H., Kellomäki, S., Väisänen, H., and Ikonen, V.: A mechanistic model for assessing the risk of
- 413 wind and snow damage to single trees and stands of scots pine, norway spruce, and birch, Canadian
- 414 Journal of Forest Research, 29, 647-661, 1999.
- 415 Peltola, H., Kellomäki, S., Hassinen, A., and Granander, M.: Mechanical stability of Scots pine, Norway
- 416 spruce and birch: an analysis of tree-pulling experiments in Finland, Forest Ecology and
- 417 Management, 135, 143-153, 2000.
- 418 Pivato, D., Dupont, S., and Brunet, Y.: A simple tree swaying model for forest motion in windstorm
- 419 conditions, Trees, 28, 281-293, 2014.
- 420 Sellier, D., Brunet, Y., and Fourcaud, T.: A numerical model of tree aerodynamic response to a turbulent
- 421 airflow, Forestry, 81(3), 279-297, 2008.
- 422 Shugar, DH. et al.: A massive rock and ice avalanche caused the 2021 disaster at Chamoli, Indian
- 423 Himalaya, Science, 373(6552), 300-306, 2021.
- 424 Šilhán, K.: Tree ring evidence of slope movements preceding catastrophic landslides, Landslides, 17,
- 425 615-626, 2020.
- 426 Sukhanov, G.: The mechanism of avalanche air blast formation as derived from field measurements, Data
- 427 Glaciology Student, 44, 94-98, 1982.
- 428 Yin, Y. P., and Xing, A. G.: Aerodynamic modeling of the yigong gigantic rock slide-debris avalanche,
- 429 Tibet, China. Bulletin of Engineering Geology and the Environment, 71, 149-160, 2012.
- 430 Yin, Y. P.: Vertical acceleration effect on landsides triggered by the Wenchuan earthquake, China.
- 431 Environmental Earth Sciences, 71, 4703-4714, 2014.
- 432 Zhuang, Y., Xu, Q., and Xing, A. G.: Numerical investigation of the air blast generated by the Wenjia

- 433 valley rock avalanche in Mianzhu, Sichuan, China, Landslides, 16, 2499-2508, 2019.
- 434 Zhuang, Y., Xu, Q., Xing, A. G., Bilal, M., Gnyawali, K. R. (2022) Catastrophic air blasts triggered by
- 435 large ice/rock avalanches, Landslides, 2022. Doi: 10.1007/s10346-022-01967-8.
- 436 Zhuang, Y., Xing, A. G., Jiang, Y. H., Sun, Q., Yan, J. K., and Zhang, Y. B.: Typhoon, rainfall and trees
- 437 jointly cause landslides in coastal regions, Engineering Geology, 298, 106561, 2022b.