

Information Gain (*IG*) is also referred to as mutual information, representing the expected reduction in H (where entropy, H , is the measure of disorder) produced by partitioning the dataset according to a given attribute. The *IG* for an outcome Y from an attribute X represents the expected decrease in entropy of Y conditioned on X . The more information the factor provides regarding the landslide distribution, the higher the *IG* value [1]. The specific formula is as follows:

$$IG(Y, X) = H(Y) - H(Y|X) \quad (S1)$$

where $H(Y)$ represents the entropy of Y , and $H(Y|X)$ represents the entropy of Y given X .

$H(Y)$ can be written as:

$$H(Y) = -\sum_{i \in 1}^k p_i \log_2 p_i \quad (S2)$$

where p_i represents the proportion of instances belonging to class i in the data.

$H(Y|X)$ can be written as:

$$H(Y|X) = \sum_{j \in X} p_j H(Y|X = j) \quad (S3)$$

where p_j represents the probability that attribute X takes on value j in the data, thus:

$$H(Y|X = j) = \sum_{i \in 1}^k p_{(ij)} \log_2 p_{(ij)} \quad (S4)$$

We take the distance to fault of all landslides as an example to calculate the *IG*.

$$IG(\text{landslide, distance to fault}) = H(\text{landslides}) - H(\text{landslide, distance to fault})$$

| | | Probability | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | | Total area | Landslide area | Nonlandslide area |
| Distance to fault | 0-10 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | 10-20 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| | 20-30 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| | >30 | 16 | 12 | 4 |
| Total | | 32 | | |

$$H(\text{landslides}) = -\left(\frac{18}{32} \log_2 \frac{18}{32}\right) - \left(\frac{14}{32} \log_2 \frac{14}{32}\right) = 0.99 \quad (S5)$$

$$H(\text{landslides, distance to fault})$$

$$= p(0-10) * H\left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}\right) + p(10-20) * H\left(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right) + p(20-30) * H\left(\frac{2}{8}, \frac{6}{8}\right) + p(>30) * H\left(\frac{12}{16}, \frac{4}{16}\right)$$

$$= \left(\frac{4}{32}\right) * \left(-\left(\frac{1}{4} \log_2 \frac{1}{4}\right) - \left(\frac{3}{4} \log_2 \frac{3}{4}\right)\right) + \left(\frac{4}{32}\right) * \left(-\left(\frac{3}{4} \log_2 \frac{3}{4}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{4} \log_2 \frac{1}{4}\right)\right) + \left(\frac{8}{32}\right) * \left(-\left(\frac{2}{8} \log_2 \frac{2}{8}\right) - \left(\frac{6}{8} \log_2 \frac{6}{8}\right)\right) + \left(\frac{16}{32}\right) * \left(-\left(\frac{12}{16} \log_2 \frac{12}{16}\right) - \left(\frac{4}{16} \log_2 \frac{4}{16}\right)\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{8} * 0.81 + \frac{1}{8} * 0.81 + \frac{1}{4} * 0.81 + \frac{1}{2} * 0.81 = 0.81 \quad (S6)$$

$$IG(\text{landslide, distance to fault}) = H(\text{landslides}) - H(\text{landslide, distance to fault}) = 0.99 - 0.81 = 0.18 \quad (S7)$$

Therefore, the IG for the distance to fault as a predictor for landslide occurrence in the above example is 0.18.

Reference

1. Fan, X.M.; Yunus, A.P.; Scaringi, G.; Catani, F.; Subramanian, S.S.; Xu, Q.; Huang, R.Q. Rapidly evolving controls of landslides after a strong earthquake and implications for hazard assessments. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **2020**, doi:10.1029/2020GL090509.