

Accelerated Article Preview

Global population profile of tropical cyclone exposure from 2002 to 2019

Received: 24 April 2023

Accepted: 12 December 2023

Accelerated Article Preview

Cite this article as: Jing, R. et al. Global population profile of tropical cyclone exposure from 2002 to 2019. *Nature* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06963-z> (2023)

Renzhi Jing, Sam Heft-Neal, Daniel R. Chavas, Max Griswold, Zetianyu Wang, Aaron Clark-Ginsberg, Debarati Guha-Sapir, Eran Bendavid & Zachary Wagner

This is a PDF file of a peer-reviewed paper that has been accepted for publication. Although unedited, the content has been subjected to preliminary formatting. Nature is providing this early version of the typeset paper as a service to our authors and readers. The text and figures will undergo copyediting and a proof review before the paper is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers apply.

Global population profile of tropical cyclone exposure from 2002 to 2019

Renzhi Jing^{1,2}, Sam Heft-Neal³, Daniel R. Chavas⁴,
Max Griswold⁵, Zetianyu Wang⁵, Aaron Clark-Ginsberg⁵,
Debarati Guha-Sapir^{6,7}, Eran Bendavid^{1,2,8*}, Zachary Wagner^{5*}

¹Department of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, 94305, CA,
USA.

²Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University, Stanford,
94305, CA, USA.

³Center on Food Security and the Environment, Stanford University,
Stanford, 94305, CA, USA.

⁴Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences, Purdue
University, West Lafayette, 47906, Indiana, USA.

⁵RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, 90401, CA, USA.

⁶Institute of Health and Society, UC Louvain, Brussels, Belgium.

⁷Johns Hopkins Center for Humanitarian Health, Department of
International Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 21205, MD,
USA.

⁸Department of Health Policy, Stanford University, Stanford, 94305,
CA, USA.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): ebd@stanford.edu;
zwagner@rand.org;

Contributing authors: rjing@stanford.edu; sheftneal@stanford.edu;
dchavas@gmail.com; griswold@pardeerand.edu;
zetwang@pardeerand.edu; aclarkgi@rand.org;
debarati.guha@uclouvain.be;

Abstract

Tropical cyclones have far-reaching impacts on livelihoods and population health that often persist years after the event [1–4]. Characterizing the demographic and socioeconomic profile and the vulnerabilities of exposed populations is essential to assess health and other risks associated with future tropical cyclone events [5]. Estimates of exposure to tropical cyclones are often regional rather than global [6] and do not consider population vulnerabilities [7]. Here, we combine spatially resolved annual demographic estimates with tropical cyclone wind fields estimates to construct a global profile of the populations exposed to tropical cyclones between 2002 and 2019. We find that approximately 560 million people are exposed yearly and that the number of people exposed has increased across all cyclone intensities over the study period. The age distribution of those exposed has shifted away from children (under-5) and towards older people (over-60) in recent years compared to the early 2000s. Populations exposed to tropical cyclones are more socioeconomically deprived than those unexposed within the same country, and this relationship is more pronounced for people exposed to higher-intensity storms. By characterizing the patterns and vulnerabilities of exposed populations, our results can help identify mitigation strategies and assess the global burden and future risks of tropical cyclones.

Health risks due to major natural hazards such as tropical cyclones are a central concern of climate science and public health [1–4, 8]. Major tropical cyclones, such as Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Maria, affect regional mortality and population health, both directly and indirectly, and for many years after the event [9, 10]. Fundamental to understanding the population-health hazards of tropical cyclones is characterizing the populations exposed to these storms: the number of people experiencing tropical cyclones over time, the populations’ demographic composition, and the vulnerabilities of those populations. As such, the United Nations “Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction” notes that understanding the current and historical distributions of population exposure to tropical cyclones is a key input for policy prioritization to protect vulnerable populations [5]. This paper aims to use the best available data and methods to characterize the populations exposed to tropical cyclones. In doing so, we address questions about the evolving risks of tropical cyclones, the vulnerabilities of exposed populations, and the relative contributions of population growth and climate in shaping tropical cyclone exposure.

When tropical cyclones pass over populated regions, the combination of high winds, low pressure systems, heavy rainfalls, and storm surges can lead to large-scale destruction and increased risk of mortality and diseases [11, 12]. There are concerns that these harmful effects could be more widespread in the future as sea temperature rises and population vulnerability increases [13, 14]. Tropical cyclone exposure may be more consequential in areas with fewer resources, which are generally less equipped to effectively mitigate the impacts of storms [10, 15]. Despite the importance of identifying populations vulnerable to tropical cyclones, the demographic structure and socioeconomic status of exposed populations remain unclear. Furthermore, the trade-offs between the economic opportunities offered by coastal access and the increased risk of destructive tropical cyclones make it ambiguous whether exposed populations are

more or less economically vulnerable than those unexposed [16]. The relative demographic composition of groups particularly susceptible to impacts from tropical cyclone exposure, such as children and the elderly, is also unknown [17, 18].

Previous studies on global population exposure to tropical cyclones have provided limited insights. First, disaster databases widely used in policy formulation and disaster research [19–21], such as EM-DAT [22], include only limited demographic information and may fail to capture the impact of frequent, smaller, yet still destructive, events. Second, traditional parametric wind models used to simulate tropical cyclone exposure did not account for asymmetry in wind speed induced by land features. Third, previous work has used relatively low resolution population data, limiting the scope for assessing demographic patterns in exposure. Studies by Peduzzi et al. (2012) [23] and Geiger et al. (2018) [7] provide the fullest available accounts of global tropical cyclone exposure, but they rely on older wind models and provide only a limited characterization of the population exposed beyond the total counts. Detailed population profile of those exposed to tropical cyclones, including vulnerable groups such as children or older adults, and socioeconomic distribution, is important for understanding risk and for future planning. However, there is no evidence to-date documenting the characteristics of the exposed populations and how this is evolving over time.

In this study, we characterize global population exposure to tropical cyclones from 2002-2019. We use a tropical cyclone parametric wind model that combines inner and outer storm dynamics [24] and employ a new wind modeling approach to explicitly consider the asymmetry of storms over land [25]. We simulate wind fields for each tropical cyclone and then rasterize global wind fields at 30-arcsecond spatial resolution ($\sim 1 \times 1 \text{ km}^2$). Then, we overlay these wind fields on gridded age- and sex-specific population estimates ($\sim 1 \times 1 \text{ km}^2$) [26] and a measure of relative deprivation [27] to analyze the global distribution of population exposure over time, across ages, and by

relative vulnerability (see Methods for more details on wind modeling and exposure analysis). We also quantify the degree to which the patterns in tropical cyclone population exposure are driven by population growth versus changing tropical cyclone frequency and intensity. Our estimates of population exposure trends and the extent to which tropical cyclones affect vulnerable demographic groups are a foundation for assessing the global burden and future risks of tropical cyclones.

Global population exposure, 2002-2019 Tropical cyclones impacted populations in 117 countries and regions between 2002 and 2019, with a few regions accounting for the majority of exposure. We estimate that 95% of all person-days exposure (defined as the product of annual tropical cyclone days and population size; see Methods) during the study period, come from Atlantic coastal North and Central America (5%), the Caribbean (3%), the Korean peninsula and Japan (6%), coastal eastern Asia (43%), South East Asia (24%), or eastern India and Bay of Bengal (14%) (see Fig. 1, countries/regions included are listed in Extended Data Table 1). The top five countries/regions with the highest person-days exposure are coastal China (33% of total person-days), Japan (19%), the Philippines (10%), Taiwan (9%) and the United States (4%), which collectively make up over 75% of all exposed person-days. The next 5 countries/regions are all in Asia (see Supplementary Table 1).

For all storm intensities, we observe an increase in population exposure during the 18-year study period, 2002-2019 (see Fig. 2). We find similar patterns in person-days exposure (see Extended Data Fig. 2). We estimate that over this period, approximately 560 million people on average were exposed to tropical cyclones with maximum wind speed of at least 63 km/h (i.e. Tropical Storm or more intense) each year. Although our study period is not sufficiently long for inferences about long-term trends [28], we observe that population exposure increased from 408 million people in 2002 to 792 million in 2019 using smooth estimates (raw estimates range from 354 million people in 2010 to 936 million in 2019). The size of the estimated exposed population varied

based on storm intensity. Around 115 million people were exposed to tropical cyclones of at least Category 1 severity (maximum wind speed > 119 km/h; with a range of 35 million in 2010 and 215 in 2018) per year and 5.8 million people on average were exposed to high intensity tropical cyclones of at least Category 3 severity (> 178 km/h maximum wind speeds; less than 1000 in 2009 and 17 million in 2004). These estimates do not represent unique individuals, as people exposed in multiple years would be counted for each respective year of exposure.

Age and sex profile Certain groups, including young children and older populations, are thought to be particularly vulnerable to natural disasters [29, 30]. To assess the extent to which vulnerable age-groups are affected by tropical cyclones and how this is changing over time, we analyze the age composition of those exposed to the wind level of Tropical Storm or greater and compare annual exposure across two periods: 2002-2006 and 2015-2019. Fig. 3 shows an overall shift in the age distribution of those exposed away from children (under 5) to older adults (over 60). On average, around 109.4 million older adults were exposed per year in 2015-2019 (95.0 million in Asia, 8.4 million in North America and 0.3 million in Africa) compared to 52.6 million per year in 2002-2006 (44.0 million in Asia, 5.9 million in North America and 0.34 in Africa), a more than doubling of exposure. The number of children under age 5 exposed to tropical cyclones increased from 57.3 million to 87.9 million per year, a 53% increase. In total, around 197 million children and elderly were exposed to tropical cyclones annually between 2015-2019. These shifts mirror the general population aging patterns in Asia, North America, and Europe [31].

The male-to-female ratio is similar between exposed and unexposed populations in all age groups and throughout the study period (results not shown).

Poverty and deprivation profile Next, we characterize the exposed population in terms of socioeconomic vulnerability as represented by the relative deprivation index [27] (RDI, details in Methods). We assess relative deprivation by calculating the RDI

ratio as the quotient of the population-weighted RDI for the *exposed* population in a country and the population-weighted RDI for the *unexposed* population in the same country. An RDI ratio above 1 indicates the exposed population is more deprived than the unexposed population. Fig. 4 shows the result of this exercise for countries exposed to Category 1 or more intense storms between 2010 and 2019, organized by a decreasing RDI ratio. We find that, in 20 out of 29 countries/regions, exposed populations are relatively more deprived (RDI ratio > 1) and the average RDI ratio across all countries is 1.13. In other words, exposed populations, on average, have a 13% higher RDI than those unexposed in the same country.

This pattern is accentuated with increasing storm severity (see Fig. 5). While the RDI of those exposed to the wind level of Tropical Storm is similar to those unexposed (median RDI ratio: 1.02, interquartile range: 0.91-1.18), the ratio increases with higher storm intensities. In countries exposed to Category 5 or more intense tropical cyclones, those exposed live in areas with RDI measures $\sim 45\%$ greater than those unexposed (median RDI ratio 1.45, interquartile range: 1.35-1.65).

Role of population growth in tropical cyclone exposure The growth in tropical cyclone population exposure over the study period reflects a combination of population growth and changes in tropical cyclone hazards. To decompose their relative contributions, we hold population size constant at 2002 levels and re-estimate exposure over time (see Extended Data Fig. 8). Holding population fixed, the smoothed change in population exposure from 2002 to 2019 is 33% lower than our base estimates that include population growth. This implies that one-third of the change in exposure is attributable to population growth, while the other two-thirds is due to changes in tropical cyclone hazards. A similar distribution is also observed for Category 1 tropical cyclones, where changes in tropical cyclone climatology contribute 71% of the total increase. However, for Category 3 and larger storms, changes in tropical cyclone hazards contribute only 29% of the observed increase. The conclusions are similar

when we utilize person-days exposure rather than population exposure (see Extended Data Fig. 8).

Sensitivity analyses We assess the uncertainty in our primary findings in several ways. First, we use alternative wind modeling approaches (additional details in the Methods). Extended Data Fig. 3 shows the range of estimated population exposure using these different approaches. This figure indicates that, while the levels vary by modeling approach, the trends are similar across modeling approaches. We also assess the sensitivity of the age distribution and relative deprivation to modeling approaches. Those are shown in Extended Data Fig. 4 (for age distribution), Extended Data Fig. 6, Extended Data Fig. 7 and Extended Data Table 2 (for relative deprivation). Although some estimates change from one approach to another (for example, the country with the greatest RDI ratio changes based on the modeling approach), the overall patterns (of shifting age distribution from young to old, and of greater relative deprivation among the exposed in most countries) are robust to how wind fields are modeled.

Finally, Fig. 2 also displays the range in exposure estimates based on assumptions about the duration of sustained winds over land. Our main modeling approach assumes exposure stops 12 hours after landfall, and we test sensitivity by assuming 6 hours and unlimited sustained wind duration. Fig. 2 shows that most exposure occurs within the first 12 hours after landfall (i.e. assuming unlimited sustained wind does not add much exposure), especially for more intense wind levels. Estimates of exposure to larger storms (such as Category 3 or more intense storms) are more sensitive to assumptions about sustain wind speed duration than that for weaker storms, which is consistent with the greater uncertainty in modeling the tropical cyclone inner core wind field [32].

Discussion and Conclusions In the first two decades of the 21st century, approximately 560 million people per year on average were exposed to tropical cyclones. This analysis provides a detailed profile of exposed populations, and we identify five key findings: (i) the number of people exposed to tropical cyclones has increased between

2002 and 2019; (ii) these increases hold for low-intensity and high-intensity cyclones, across different measures of exposure and nearly all affected world regions (Extended Data Fig. 1); (iii) the age distribution of the exposed population has been shifting from young to old, mirroring demographic shifts in North America and Asia; (iv) exposed populations are relatively more disadvantaged than unexposed populations; and (v) this relative disadvantage of the exposed population is more pronounced for more intense tropical cyclones.

Between 6% and 12% of the global population is exposed to tropical cyclones yearly. A large portion of exposure occurs at lower wind velocities. While more intense storms, characterized by high wind velocities and precipitation, have received more attention from the research and policy communities, recurrent Tropical Storm and Category 1 storms are more common and extensive, with unknown human and economic burdens [33]. This more common exposure can have a disproportionate impact on low- and middle-income countries, especially in regions where resilience is limited while vulnerability is high.

We contextualize our exposure estimates relative to three sources. First, the Emergency Event Database estimates that about 24 million people per year were affected by tropical cyclones between 2001 and 2020 [11]. These estimates are based on news sources, insurance claims, and public reports. In that sense, it underscores the point that tropical cyclones receiving media attention are an under-estimate of population exposure, especially for populations without reliable news or public reporting system and which may not have material damages collected through insurance claims.

Second, Peduzzi et al. estimate population exposure to tropical cyclones based on a decade-long average of tropical cyclone frequency and gridded total population estimates [23]. Over the period from 2002 to 2009, our estimates are, on average, 320% (4.2-fold) larger than Peduzzi's estimates for the decade 2000-2009. Third, Geiger et al., using total population counts and an older tropical cyclone wind model with

greater outer cyclone wind speeds, generate estimates that are, on average, 29% higher than ours [7]. Our study uses wind modeling approaches that have been calibrated to account for storm asymmetry and terrain features after landfall, which improves the outer cyclone wind speed estimations (see Methods for an extensive discussion).

Over the study-years considered, we observe an increase in overall population exposure across all wind intensity levels. However, there was substantial year-to-year variability in population exposure to the most intense storms, which is consistent with the findings of Wang et al. [34]. Increased exposure is attributed more to changes in tropical cyclone hazards than to population growth, and this is more pronounced for moderate intensity storms. During the study period, the main characteristic of tropical cyclones that has changed is an increase in the intensity of the storm at landfall [34]. The rate of inland decay after landfall may also change, although this remains unclear [35–37]. Storm size has not changed significantly and is not expected to change with the warming climate [38, 39]. In terms of population growth, the global population experienced not only a general increase 22% but also a more significant growth in urban and coastal populations [40], which has played a role in increased exposure. As noted, the time period of our study limits inferring about longer-term trends in tropical cyclone exposure. However, if the projections of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are correct, indicating an expected increase in the proportion of strong tropical cyclones in the future, along with an increase in the maximum wind speed of intense storms [13, 41], it is reasonable to expect a continuing upward trend in population exposure to the most intense storms.

We document a shift in the age distribution of the exposed population reflecting relatively fewer children and more elderly being exposed over time. Both young and old people are at increased risk of adverse consequences, including lack of access to essential health care, destruction of facilities and roads, power outages, and insecure access to water and food [10, 42, 43]. Older populations, more than young, may also

face mobility problems that hinder their ability to respond to disasters by evacuating landfall areas [17].

We also document that exposed populations are more socioeconomically deprived than unexposed populations, especially those exposed to high-intensity storms. One possible mechanism for this is selection: people with more means move away from regions at high risk of intense storms, leaving high-risk areas for those with lower socioeconomic status. Another mechanism is that storms, especially high-intensity storms, have a negative impact on socioeconomic development. The RDI ratio reveals substantial heterogeneities, which could reflect resilience to natural disasters (greater resilience may reduce selection of residence based on exposure risk), exposure patterns (greater exposure may increase risk, but may also increase resilience), or the capacity for population adaptation. These mechanisms may operate to different extents, and we are not able to disentangle these effects. Nevertheless, recognizing the relatively higher deprivation of those living in areas at-risk for tropical cyclones may help prioritize adaptation and mitigation resources. This may be particularly salient in countries where coastal regions at risk of tropical cyclones are more impoverished for additional reasons, such as having few economic opportunities for seafaring occupations.

This study has several limitations. First, the population estimates provided by WorldPop are annual and do not reflect intra-annual population mobility. If individuals leave high-risk areas during the tropical cyclone season, resulting in a lower population count in exposed regions at the time of the event, then the annual average we use may overestimate actual population exposure. Although we cannot quantify the extent of this effect on our population exposure estimates, existing studies estimating short-term displacement (such as seasonal migration) suggest only a minor portion of the population leave [44]. The fact that our population estimates do not capture seasonal migration could also have implications for the age and socioeconomic profiles we report. Those capable of moving away from the path of a tropical cyclone might be

younger and of higher socioeconomic status than those not displaced, further accentuating the patterns we find for the age skew and socioeconomic deprivation of those actually exposed.

Second, tropical cyclone parametric wind models use simplifying assumptions based on storm structures over the ocean. When storms move over land, their structure is disrupted by land features, resulting in uneven wind decay. The field of tropical cyclone modeling is developing better representations of overland storm behavior, but this remains an area of uncertainty. We demonstrate that all of our main results are robust to using several different modeling approaches.

Third, we represent socioeconomic vulnerability using a deprivation index, which reduces complexity to a single metric and does not include factors such as social marginalization, health care resources, critical infrastructures, and governance, among others. Our deprivation index is not longitudinally available and does not capture population displacement or socioeconomic development. We therefore present a cross-sectional view of tropical cyclones' relationship to socioeconomic deprivation and are unable to examine temporal trends. As the work on granular variation in global socioeconomic conditions evolves, its relationship with tropical cyclones would be important future work.

In this study, we describe the composition of populations that have been exposed to tropical cyclones globally from 2002-2019. Using global gridded population and wind field data, we are able to capture exposure to intense storms and storms of lesser intensity. Our analysis suggests that population exposure to tropical cyclones increased from 408 to 792 million people annually over the study period (560 million on average). The age composition within the exposed population has been transitioning from younger demographics to older ones, reflecting broader global demographic changes. We also find that populations exposed to tropical cyclones tend to be more disadvantaged compared to those not exposed, suggesting that these events can exacerbate

existing inequalities and highlighting the need for targeted interventions to support vulnerable populations.

References

- [1] Romanello, M. *et al.* The 2022 report of the lancet countdown on health and climate change: health at the mercy of fossil fuels. *The Lancet* **400**, 1619–1654 (2022).
- [2] IPCC. *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA, 2022).
- [3] Kelman, I. Climate change and the sendai framework for disaster risk reduction. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science* **6**, 117–127 (2015).
- [4] Emanuel, K. Increasing destructiveness of tropical cyclones over the past 30 years. *Nature* **436**, 686–688 (2005).
- [5] Center, A. D. R. Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015–2030. *United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction: Geneva, Switzerland* (2015).
- [6] for Emergency Management, A. C. & Security, H. The spatial hazard events and losses database for the united states, version 21.0 [online database]. *online database* (2023).
- [7] Geiger, T., Frieler, K. & Bresch, D. A global historical data set of tropical cyclone exposure (tce-dat), earth syst. sci. data, 10, 185–194 (2018).
- [8] Geiger, T., Gütschow, J., Bresch, D. N., Emanuel, K. & Frieler, K. Double benefit of limiting global warming for tropical cyclone exposure. *Nature Climate Change* **11**, 861–866 (2021).
- [9] Deryugina, T. & Molitor, D. Does when you die depend on where you live? evidence from hurricane katrina. Tech. Rep., National Bureau of Economic Research (2018).
- [10] Kishore, N. *et al.* Mortality in puerto rico after hurricane maria. *New England journal of medicine* **379**, 162–170 (2018).
- [11] CRED. Disasters in numbers 2021. *Center for the Epidemiology of Disasters.[Online]* (2022).
- [12] Emanuel, K. *et al.* Tropical cyclones. *Annual review of earth and planetary sciences* **31**, 75–104 (2003).

- [13] Pörtner, H.-O. *et al.* Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. *IPCC Sixth Assessment Report* (2022).
- [14] Knutson, T. R. *et al.* Tropical cyclones and climate change. *Nature geoscience* **3**, 157–163 (2010).
- [15] Guha-Sapir, D. & Hoyois, P. Estimating populations affected by disasters: A review of methodological issues and research gaps. *Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED)* (2015).
- [16] Hsiang, S. M. & Jina, A. S. The causal effect of environmental catastrophe on long-run economic growth: Evidence from 6,700 cyclones. Tech. Rep., National Bureau of Economic Research (2014).
- [17] Morita, T. *et al.* Excess mortality due to indirect health effects of the 2011 triple disaster in fukushima, japan: a retrospective observational study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **71**, 974–980 (2017).
- [18] Islam, M. Q. *et al.* Children’s vulnerability to natural disasters: Evidence from natural experiments in bangladesh. *World Development Perspectives* **19**, 100228 (2020).
- [19] Bhuiyan, T. R. *et al.* Disaster loss indicators for reporting to desinventar sendai and enabling rapid monetary valuation in malaysia. *Weather and Climate Extremes* 100488 (2022).
- [20] Mazhin, S. A. *et al.* Worldwide disaster loss and damage databases: A systematic review. *Journal of education and health promotion* **10** (2021).
- [21] Mavhura, E. & Aryal, K. R. Disaster mortalities and the sendai framework target a: Insights from zimbabwe. *World Development* **165**, 106196 (2023).
- [22] Guha-Sapir, D., Below, R. & Hoyois, P. Em-dat: International disaster database. *Catholic University of Louvain: Brussels, Belgium* **27**, 57–58 (2015).
- [23] Peduzzi, P. *et al.* Global trends in tropical cyclone risk. *Nature climate change* **2**, 289–294 (2012).
- [24] Chavas, D. R., Lin, N. & Emanuel, K. A model for the complete radial structure of the tropical cyclone wind field. part i: Comparison with observed structure. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* **72**, 3647–3662 (2015).
- [25] Chen, J. *et al.* A new framework for evaluating model simulated inland tropical cyclone wind fields. *Geophysical Research Letters* **50**, e2023GL104587 (2023).
- [26] Tatem, A. J. Worldpop, open data for spatial demography. *Scientific data* **4**, 1–4 (2017).

- [27] Center for international earth science information network - ciesin - columbia university. 2022. global gridded relative deprivation index (grdi), version 1. palisades, new york: Nasa socioeconomic data and applications center (sedac). <https://doi.org/10.7927/3xxe-ap97>. accessed day month year.
- [28] Organization, W. M. Wmo guidelines on the calculation of climate normals (2017).
- [29] Ngo, E. B. When disasters and age collide: Reviewing vulnerability of the elderly. *Natural Hazards Review* **2**, 80–89 (2001).
- [30] Peek, L. Children and disasters: Understanding vulnerability, developing capacities, and promoting resilience—an introduction. *Children Youth and Environments* **18**, 1–29 (2008).
- [31] Un population division. world population prospects. <https://population.un.org/wpp/Graphs/DemographicProfiles/Pyramid/900>. Accessed: 2023-03-06.
- [32] Yan, D. & Zhang, T. Research progress on tropical cyclone parametric wind field models and their application. *Regional Studies in Marine Science* **51**, 102207 (2022).
- [33] McGlade, J. *et al.* Global assessment report on disaster risk reduction 2019 (2019).
- [34] Wang, S. & Toumi, R. More tropical cyclones are striking coasts with major intensities at landfall. *Scientific reports* **12**, 5236 (2022).
- [35] Li, L. & Chakraborty, P. Slower decay of landfalling hurricanes in a warming world. *Nature* **587**, 230–234 (2020).
- [36] Chan, K. T., Zhang, K., Wu, Y. & Chan, J. C. Landfalling hurricane track modes and decay. *Nature* **606**, E7–E11 (2022).
- [37] Zhu, Y.-J., Collins, J. M. & Klotzbach, P. J. Spatial variations of north atlantic landfalling tropical cyclone wind speed decay over the continental united states. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology* **60**, 749–762 (2021).
- [38] Knutson, T. R. *et al.* Global projections of intense tropical cyclone activity for the late twenty-first century from dynamical downscaling of cmip5/rcp4. 5 scenarios. *Journal of Climate* **28**, 7203–7224 (2015).
- [39] Schenkel, B. A. *et al.* North atlantic tropical cyclone outer size and structure remain unchanged by the late twenty-first century. *Journal of Climate* **36**, 359–382 (2023).
- [40] Neumann, B., Vafeidis, A. T., Zimmermann, J. & Nicholls, R. J. Future coastal population growth and exposure to sea-level rise and coastal flooding-a global assessment. *PloS one* **10**, e0118571 (2015).

- [41] Lee, H. *et al.* Climate change 2023: synthesis report. contribution of working groups i, ii and iii to the sixth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change (2023).
- [42] Miranda, D. S. & Choonara, I. Hurricanes and child health: lessons from cuba. *Archives of disease in childhood* **96**, 328–329 (2011).
- [43] Carroll, A. E. & Frakt, A. B. Children’s health must remain a focus in the recovery from hurricane harvey. *JAMA pediatrics* **171**, 1029–1030 (2017).
- [44] Wesolowski, A. *et al.* Multinational patterns of seasonal asymmetry in human movement influence infectious disease dynamics. *Nature communications* **8**, 2069 (2017).
- [45] Areas, G. A. Gadm database of global administrative areas, version 2.0. *URL: <http://www.gadm.org> [accessed 201–03–24]* (2012).

Figure captions

Fig. 1: Global distribution of annual person-days exposure to tropical cyclones in 2002–2019. Storm tracks are shown in light blue curves. Six sub-regions with high exposures are enlarged: (A) Atlantic coastal North and Central America, (B) the Caribbeans, (C) the Korean peninsula and Japan, (D) coastal eastern Asia (E) South East Asia, (F) eastern India and Bay of Bengal. Countries/regions included in each subplots are listed in Extended Data Table 1. Country outlines were obtained from Global Administrative Areas, version 2.0 [45].

Fig. 2: Global population exposure to tropical cyclones, 2002–2019. Top, middle and bottom curves represent exposure to Tropical Storm or larger (> 63 km/h maximum wind speed), Category 1 or more intense (> 119 km/h maximum wind speed) and Category 3 or more intense (> 178 km/h maximum wind speed), respectively. Solid lines represent population exposure assuming up to 12 hours of sustained wind over land; the dashed curves assume up to 6 hours and the dotted lines assume no limit on duration of overland sustained wind. Point estimates represent raw data, and curves represent the best fit of LOESS. Population exposures to Category 3 winds

in 2004 (15 mi), 2007 (14 mi), 2009 (<1k), 2013 (10 mi) and 2016 (11 mi) are omitted for clarity but are included in the LOESS estimation. Most exposures occur within the first 12 hours after landfall, especially for intense wind levels. For Tropical Storm, assuming 6 hours and 12 hours sustained wind over land are on average, 17% and 9% respectively lower than assuming no limit of sustained winds over land. For Category 1 and Category 3 tropical cyclones, more than 90% population exposure occurred within the first 6 hours after the storm made landfall, and almost all exposures occurred within 12 hours after landfall.

Fig. 3: Age distribution of populations exposed to Tropical Storm. An overall shift in age distribution from young to old is observed globally when comparing the periods 2002-2006 with 2015-2019. The global shift mirrors the shifts in Asia and North America, which have the most people exposed. No significant changes were observed in Africa, likely due to the rapid growth of its young population. The X axis represents age groups with a 5-year interval from 0 to 75, and the Y axis represents the probability density function of age distributions. Globally, 57 million more older people (>60) are exposed to tropical cyclones compared with the earlier study period.

Fig. 4: Population-weighted Relative Deprivation Index ratio in each country/region. The figure shows the population-weighted RDI for both exposed and unexposed populations, as well as the ratio of RDI between exposed and unexposed populations in each country/region. The results are based on 29 countries/regions that have been exposed to Category 1 or more intense storms in 2010-2019. Countries/regions with a total population less than 100,000 or an area less than 8,000 km² were omitted for clarity. Countries/regions are ordered in the RDI ratio rank in ascending order. Countries/regions above China (20/29) have RDI ratio greater than 1, where exposed populations are more deprived than unexposed populations. Figure for all countries/regions without filtering by population or area is shown in Extended Data Fig. 7c.

Fig. 5: The relative deprivation is accentuated with increasing storm severity. Populations exposed to tropical cyclones are socioeconomically more deprived than unexposed population, and this trend is accentuated with increasing storm severity. In countries/regions exposed to Category 5 tropical cyclones, exposed populations have an average deprivation index 45% higher than unexposed populations. The upper, middle, and lower boundaries of each box correspond to the 75th percentile, median and 25th percentile of the RDI ratios among all countries affected by specific tropical cyclone wind intensities. The dots in each box represent the mean RDI ratio for the corresponding wind level. Dots outside the boxes represent outliers in each wind category. In total, 70, 52, 48, 33, 20, 16 and 5 countries/regions with population size greater than 100, 000 were exposed to Tropical Storm, Category 1, Category 2, Category 3, Category 4 and Category 5 wind speeds, respectively. The 5 countries/regions exposed to Category 5 or more intense storms are the Philippines, Mexico, the Bahamas, Fiji and Cuba.

Methods

Tropical cyclone data IBTrACS Tropical cyclone tracks data used in this study is taken from IBTrACS (version v04r00) [46, 47]. This database includes 6-hourly latitude and longitude tropical cyclone positions and maximum 1-min sustained wind of storm center at 10 m above the sea surface. We use global tropical cyclone data between 2002 and 2019. We chose the start year to align with availability of data on storm extent in IBTrACS and the end year to align with gridded population estimates. Storm observation with a missing maximum wind speed or whose maximum wind speed is less than 34 knots (below the Tropical Storm threshold) is removed. Our storm dataset thus includes 1,808 tropical cyclone events in six global basins (North Atlantic, Western Pacific, Eastern Pacific, South Pacific, North Indian, South Indian).

Primary tropical cyclone wind modeling approach To estimate the extent of wind exposure associated with tropical cyclones, we use a parametric model to estimate the complete wind field of each storm. In general, parametric wind models generate complete wind speed profiles with few inputs, making them suitable for global analyses such as ours. While parametric models were originally calibrated using mature storms over the ocean, recent models account for storms' evolution during landfall, and validation with observational data indicates good over land performance [48] [25].

In this work, we use an approach developed by Chen et al. (2023) [25], based on the model introduced by Chavas et al. (2015, referred to as "C15") [24] [49]. The C15 wind field model mathematically merges an inner wind field model (Eq.36 in [50]) and a separate outer wind field (Eqs.31-33 in [51]), producing a complete azimuthal wind profile. The parameters required by C15 are: storm maximum wind velocity V_m , radius of maximum wind speed $R_{\max}$ for the inner region, radius of a specific intensity R_{fit} (eg. radius of 34-kt wind, R_{34}), Coriolis parameter f , exchange coefficients of momentum C_d and free tropospheric subsidence rate w_{cool} .

The approach we use is based on Chen et al. (2023), which explicitly considers the asymmetry of storm structure after landfall. It applies the C15 model to each earth-relative quadrant, using quadrant-specific storm and surface parameters as model inputs. We refer to this approach as "Quad-by-Quad". This approach has been validated with observational dataset of post-landfall storm wind speeds [25].

In C15, V_m and the storm latitude ϕ are taken from IBTrACS. The f is computed as a function of storm latitude. The radius of 34-kt wind R_{34} in each quadrant (NE, NW, SW, SE) are also taken from IBTrACS. The most specific parameter that accounts for the characteristics of the terrain, C_d , is calculated using surface roughness data [52] from ECMWF Reanalysis v5 (ERA5) [53]. It is averaged over a range of 0-600 km to yield a single value within each quadrant. Previous studies have shown that the wind field solution is not sensitive to the selection of w_{cool} . We set w_{cool} to be 0.002 m/s,

which is consistent with the median of the best fit value observed in storms [24] and identical to the value used elsewhere [48]. We use C15 and Quad-by-Quad jointly to simulate wind profiles in each quadrant and obtain complete tropical cyclone wind profiles.

In this approach, R_{fit} can use outer radii of any wind speed such as R_{50} (radius of 50-kt wind). We use R_{34} as it has a nonzero value for all storms in this study, it can be accurately estimated by remote sensing systems with little rain contamination, and, in more recent years, it has undergone quality control in retrospective best track reanalysis [54]. In IBTrACS, R_{34} is available since 2002 and additionally reviewed post-season, or ‘best-tracked’, since 2004 in the Atlantic/East Pacific, and since 2015 in other global basins. Thus there is less uncertainty in our wind fields during the study period’s later years.

Based on this approach, we simulate tropical cyclone wind fields at 6-hour intervals for each storm. Using that information, we calculate the annual maximum wind speed for each location and rasterize it at a 30 arc-second resolution. We then categorize the intensity of the storm in each affected area based on the annual maximum gridded wind speed.

Additional wind modeling approaches for sensitivity tests There is meaningful variation in wind modeling approaches. We model and run all analyses using two additional approaches that enable global exposure estimates. The first approach is a modification of our primary Quad-by-Quad approach that takes into account possible overestimation in the storm’s outer reach. Following Chavas et al. (2022), we reduce the outer radius R_{34} in each quadrant by a factor of 0.85 [55]. Since the outer radius R_{34} in IBTrACS is operationally defined as the outermost value within each quadrant, this might lead to an overestimation of the outer reach of the storm, and this reduction has been shown to have advantages in some contexts. This approach is referred to as “Quad-by-Quad-0.85”.

Our second approach is based on C15, and we use a separate component to estimate the asymmetrical surface winds of tropical cyclones over land. In this approach, the total wind is estimated as the sum of two components: one is the axisymmetric component associated with the storm itself (modeled by C15), and the other is the asymmetric component caused by the combined effects of storm movement and ambient wind shear [56]). We label this approach as "C15+LC12" in the figures. In this approach, the axisymmetric component simulated by C15 uses radius of maximum wind speed $R_{\max}$ of a storm as model input. $R_{\max}$ plays a crucial role in representing the size of the inner region of the storm, which significantly impacts the simulation of the intense wind region of the storm. Since $R_{\max}$ is estimated with more uncertainty than the storm's outer size, we derive $R_{\max}$ from R_{34} , following Chavas and Knaff (2022) [55]. Specifically, we calculate R_{34} as the mean of all non-zero values available in each quadrant, multiplied by a factor of 0.85. Then we predict $R_{\max}$ based on R_{34} to get the radius of maximum wind speed. We use this approach to quantify the uncertainties in the strong wind region of the storms, where the Quad-by-Quad approach is incompletely validated [25].

WorldPop We obtain estimates of human population distributions from WorldPop [26]. We extract spatial distributions of total population counts using WorldPop global mosaic files and age-specific population distributions using WorldPop age and sex structure files. WorldPop estimates population counts at a resolution of 30 arc-second degree (~ 1 km) between 2000 and 2019. We merge population estimates with wind field estimates at the grid cell level.

We choose WorldPop as our primary source for gridded population estimates since it provides age- and sex-structured time series for population estimates between 2000-2019, at a sufficient resolution to match the constructed wind field estimates [57].

Tropical cyclone exposure Using gridded tropical cyclone wind fields and population estimates, we estimate tropical cyclone exposures using two metrics. The first

metric is an annual population exposure count, in which a population grid cell is counted as exposed if the maximum sustained wind exceeds certain wind threshold at least once in the year:

$$\text{exposure}_{\text{year, grid}} = \max_{\text{day} \in \text{year}} 1(V_{\text{day, grid}}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } V_{\text{day, grid}} > V_{\text{thres}} \\ 0, & \text{if } V_{\text{day, grid}} \leq V_{\text{thres}} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

In Eq. 1, the *grid* in footnote represents each 30 arc-second degree cell; $V_{\text{day, grid}}$ represents simulated maximum sustained wind speed for a specific cell on a given day, and V_{thres} represents a specific wind speed threshold. Based on the affected grids identified in Eq. 1, total population exposure in a given year is calculated as:

$$\text{annual population exposure}_{\text{year}} = \sum_{\text{grid}} \text{population}_{\text{year, grid}} \times \text{exposure}_{\text{year, grid}} \quad (2)$$

The second metric is annual person-days exposure, defined as the product of annual frequency under a specific wind speed threshold and the population size for each grid cell. Similarly, the annual days exposed to tropical cyclones for each grid is computed as follows:

$$\text{tropical cyclone days}_{\text{year, grid}} = \sum_{\text{day} \in \text{year}} 1(V_{\text{day, grid}}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } V_{\text{day, grid}} > V_{\text{thres}} \\ 0, & \text{if } V_{\text{day, grid}} \leq V_{\text{thres}} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The total person-days exposure in a given year is computed as:

$$\text{annual person-days exposure}_{\text{year}} = \sum_{\text{grid}} \text{population}_{\text{year, grid}} \times \text{tropical cyclone days}_{\text{year, grid}} \quad (4)$$

We choose thresholds for maximum sustained wind speed based on categories within the Saffir–Simpson scale [58]. We use TS, CAT1, CAT2, CAT3, CAT4 and CAT5 to denote storm winds at Tropical Storm (34–63 kt), Category 1 (64–82 kt), Category 2 (83–95 kt), Category 3 (96–112 kt), Category 4 (113–136 kt) and Category 5 (>137 kt) scales respectively.

For all three parametric wind modeling approaches, we further quantify the uncertainties in the range of population exposure by assuming sustained wind up to 6 hours (one step in IBTrACS data), 12 hours (two steps), and no limit (full tracks) of duration over land. When storms stay longer over land after landfall, the uncertainty in R_{34} data increases and the storm’s structure becomes more asymmetric, which together lead to larger uncertainty in the estimates. That is, the population exposure estimates within 12 hours after landfall are more reliable than the full tracks, and we use that duration in all our primary analyses.

Global Gridded Relative Deprivation Index We use the Global Gridded Relative Deprivation Index (RDI, hereafter) to represent the socioeconomic status of exposed and unexposed populations [27]. The RDI has a value between 0 and 100, where higher values represent higher levels of deprivation. The RDI is constructed using six major sociodemographic components: gridded child dependency ratio, infant mortality rate at the various administrative levels, human development index (derived from life expectancy, mean years of schooling and gross national income) at the first administrative level, gridded building footprint, gridded nighttime lights, and recent local deprivation trends. These six major components are harmonized and rasterized, and the resulting RDI data has a resolution of 30 arc-second degree (~ 1 km), with

global coverage. The high spatial resolution of RDI allows for capturing variations in socioeconomic profiles across different areas within the same country (see Extended Data Fig. 5).

To assess the socioeconomic profile of exposed populations, we define the RDI ratio as the quotient of the population-weighted RDI for the *exposed* population in a country and the population-weighted RDI for the *unexposed* population in the same country. Therefore, an RDI ratio exceeding 1 indicates that the exposed population is more deprived than the unexposed population.

The RDI is noted to be representative of the world in 2015. The raw data used to develop the RDI are either single-year or estimates between 2010 and 2020. We consider the RDI, then, as a single representation of the global levels of relative deprivation during the decade from 2010 to 2019. For all population exposure analyses using RDI, we limit our sample to 2010-2019 to align with the RDI time frame.

Data and code availability statement

Replication data and codes for this study have been deposited at <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.76hdr7t30>.

Additional references

- [46] Knapp, K. R., Diamond, H. J., Kossin, J. P., Kruk, M. C. & Schreck, C. J. International best track archive for climate stewardship (ibtracs) project, version 4.v04r00 (2018).
- [47] Knapp, K. R., Kruk, M. C., Levinson, D. H., Diamond, H. J. & Neumann, C. J. The international best track archive for climate stewardship (ibtracs) unifying tropical cyclone data. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **91**, 363–376 (2010).
- [48] Chen, J. & Chavas, D. R. A model for the tropical cyclone wind field response to idealized landfall. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* **80**, 1163–1176 (2023).
- [49] Chavas, D. R. & Lin, N. A model for the complete radial structure of the tropical cyclone wind field. part ii: Wind field variability. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* **73**, 3093–3113 (2016).

- [50] Emanuel, K. & Rotunno, R. Self-stratification of tropical cyclone outflow. part i: Implications for storm structure. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* **68**, 2236–2249 (2011).
- [51] Emanuel, K. Tropical cyclone energetics and structure. *Atmospheric turbulence and mesoscale meteorology* **165**, 192 (2004).
- [52] Hersbach, H. Sea surface roughness and drag coefficient as functions of neutral wind speed. *Journal of Physical Oceanography* **41**, 247–251 (2011).
- [53] Hersbach, H. *et al.* The era5 global reanalysis. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **146**, 1999–2049 (2020).
- [54] Francis, A. & Strahl, B. Joint typhoon warning center annual tropical cyclone report 2020. <https://www.metoc.navy.mil/jtwc/products/atcr/2020atcr.pdf>. Last accessed 8, 2022 (2021).
- [55] Chavas, D. R. & Knaff, J. A. A simple model for predicting the tropical cyclone radius of maximum wind from outer size. *Weather and Forecasting* **37**, 563–579 (2022).
- [56] Lin, N. & Chavas, D. On hurricane parametric wind and applications in storm surge modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **117** (2012).
- [57] Leyk, S. *et al.* The spatial allocation of population: a review of large-scale gridded population data products and their fitness for use. *Earth System Science Data* **11**, 1385–1409 (2019).
- [58] Williams, J. Hurricane scale invented to communicate storm danger. *USA Today*. Retrieved 02–25 (2007).
- [59] Holland, G. A revised hurricane pressure–wind model. *Monthly Weather Review* **136**, 3432–3445 (2008).

Acknowledgments

EB, RJ, SHN, ACG, DGS, ZeW and ZaW disclose support for the research and publication of this work from the NIH grant R01HD104835.

Author Contributions

EB, ZW and RJ conceived the idea. RJ generated tropical cyclone wind data. MG processed population data. RJ designed the study, performed the analysis and interpreted the results. RJ, SH, DC, MG, ZeW, AC, DG, EB, and ZaW drafted and revised the manuscript.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare no competing interests.

Extended Data Figures

Extended Data Fig. 1 Population exposure to tropical cyclones in 2002–2019, by continent. Curves represent exposure to Tropical Storm or higher winds (> 63 km/h maximum wind speed), assuming 12 hours on duration of sustained wind overland. The overall increase in global exposure to tropical cyclones is primarily driven by Asia.

Extended Data Fig. 2 Global person-days exposure to tropical cyclones in 2002–2019. Similar to Fig. 2, the person-days exposure has increased between 2002 and 2019. The top, middle and bottom curves represent person-days exposure to Tropical Storm, Category 1 or more intense, and Category 3 or more intense storms, respectively. The solid, dashed and dotted lines represent exposure assuming up to 12 hours, 6 hours, and no limit on duration of sustained wind overland. Point estimates represent raw data, and the curves represent LOESS best fit. Increasing trends in person-days exposure are observed for all wind levels.

Extended Data Fig. 3 Comparison of population exposure levels with different wind modeling approaches. The figure compares the population exposure estimates calculated using three different wind modeling approaches (the primary

approach Quad-by-Quad with two additional approaches Quad-by-Quad-85 and C15+LC12). Similarly to the solid curves in Fig. 2, the colorful curves represent exposures to Tropical Storm or higher winds (> 63 km/h maximum wind speed), assuming a 12-hour duration of sustained wind overland. The estimates are further compared with population exposure estimates in previous studies, i.e. Geiger et al. (2018) and Peduzzi et al. (2012). Peduzzi et al. estimate population exposure based on a decade-long average with the two red triangles representing estimates for the two decades of 2000 - 2020. This comparison suggests that: 1) the increasing trend from 2002 to 2019 is robust to model choice, and we observe this pattern with all three modeling approaches; 2) by correcting the outer radius through a reduction factor of 0.85, the population exposure reduces approximately 15%, indicating that the impact of the reduce factor on estimated population exposure is approximately linear; 3) the uncertainty in population exposure to stronger storms is greater than that to weaker storms, and the disparities in the estimates of exposure to Category 3 or more intense storms can be as much as threefold in certain years; 4) despite the uncertainties in the exposure estimates obtained from the three different approaches, the difference is very small compared to previous studies. The discrepancy between our estimates and Geiger et al. (2018) [7] can be partially attributed to differences in the wind parametric method. Geiger et al. (2018) employed a parametric wind model from Holland et al. (2008) [59], which may potentially overestimate tropical cyclone surface winds.

Extended Data Fig. 4 Sensitivity analysis for age profile, as in Fig. 3. Subplot (a) shows the age profile of unexposed population, indicating that the overall shift in the age distribution of exposed population is largely driven by the general population aging patterns in Asia, North America, and Europe. Subplots (b-c) display age profiles for the exposed population identified by (a) Quad-by-Quad-85 and (b) C15+LC12, suggesting that the overall change in the age distribution of the exposed population is robust to model choice.

Extended Data Fig. 5 Variations in RDI of exposed countries/regions.

The RDI is suitable for this analysis as it captures the variations in the socioeconomic profiles across different regions within the same country. Here, we show the RDI distribution for the most heavily exposed 9 countries/regions in (a) as an example. In Fig. 4, we exclude countries/regions with populations less than 100,000 or areas less than 8,000 km² for clarity. There are two reasons for removing these areas: first, in regions with small areas or low populations, everyone is affected by tropical cyclones, making the RDI ratio meaningless; second, in regions with small areas, there is insufficient variation in RDI. In the aforementioned two circumstances, RDI is not a suitable indicator, as we show in (b). With this criterion, countries/regions removed in the RDI analyses are: Turks and Caicos Is., St. Kitts and Nevis, Virgin Is., Samoa, Vanuatu, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Guadeloupe, British Virgin Is., Martinique, Micronesia, Mayotte, Wallis and Futuna, Reunion, American Samoa (Eastern Samoa), French Polynesia, Fiji, Macau (China), Hong Kong (China), New Caledonia, Northern Mariana Is. We show the RDI ratio of these countries/regions in Extended Data Fig. 6. In Fig. 5, we only exclude countries/regions with populations less than 100,000, so that the most intense wind category (Category 5) still has five countries/regions remaining. In Extended Data Fig. 7, we also confirm that the primary findings on the socioeconomic characteristics of the exposed population in this study remain valid, regardless of whether the countries/regions are included or excluded.

Extended Data Fig. 6 Sensitivity analysis for RDI ratio of exposed countries/regions, as in Fig. 4. Subplots (a-b) suggest that the main conclusion regarding the RDI ratio of exposed countries/regions is not sensitive to model choice. Here, we present the RDI ratios of each affected country/region, identified by (a) the Quad-by-Quad-85 modeling approach and (b) the C15+LC12 modeling approach. The raw results are listed in the Extended Data Table 2. Our results show that 70% and 73% of the countries/regions have RDI ratios greater than 1, respectively. It is

important to note that the RDI ratio for Portugal experiences significant fluctuations when different wind modeling approaches are used. This is primarily due to Portugal's location in a higher latitude region, where tropical cyclones have already undergone extratropical transition, which greatly affected the storm's symmetric structure. In this scenario, the C15+LC12 approach is less suitable, and only the Quad-by-Quad method can capture this substantial asymmetry. When comparing the Quad-by-Quad-85 and Quad-by-Quad, the change in RDI ratio for Portugal is minimal. Subplot (c) shows the RDI ratio for all countries/regions exposed to Category 1 or more intense storms, including those with population less than 100,000 or area less than 8000 km².



Extended Data Fig. 7 Sensitivity analysis for the trends in RDI ratio with increasing storm severity, as in Fig. 5. Subplots (a-b) suggest that the main conclusion regarding the socioeconomic profiles of the exposed population is not sensitive to model choice. Here, we show results of the analysis similar to those shown in Fig. 5, but with exposed population identified with (a) the Quad-by-Quad-85 modeling approach and (b) the C15+LC12 modeling approach. They both show similar patterns and the conclusion is robust. Subplot (c) shows a sensitivity test based on our primary modeling approach Quad-by-Quad, but using three different countries/regions subsets. The top figure includes the raw 93 countries/regions that were exposed to tropical cyclones between 2010 and 2019. The middle figure removes areas with populations less than 100,000, and the bottom figure removes countries/regions with populations less than 100,000 or areas smaller than 8,000 km². In all three sub figures we show that the exposed populations are more socioeconomically deprived than unexposed populations within the same country, and this relationship is more pronounced for higher intensity storms. Our results suggest that this conclusion is robust and unaffected by the removal of small countries/regions.

Extended Data Fig. 8 Relative contributions of population growth and changes in tropical cyclone climatology to the change in tropical cyclone

exposure. For each tropical cyclone wind intensity, we hold population size constant at the 2002 level and re-estimate population exposure over time, as shown by the light-colored curve in each panel. We do this exercise for both (a) population exposure and (b) person-days exposure. We show that around 67%, 71% and 29% of the change in total population exposure is attributable to the changes in tropical cyclone climatology, at the wind level at Tropical Storm, Category 1 and Category 3, respectively. Similarly, 72%, 74% and 27% of the change in person-day exposure is attributable to changes in tropical cyclone climatology, at the wind level of Tropical Storm, Category 1, and Category 3. The reasons behind the differences in the distribution between weak and intense storms remain uncertain and require further study.


Extended Data Table 1 List of countries/regions in six most heavily exposed sub-regions shown in Fig. 1 Legend: The table lists specific countries included in each of the six panels of Fig. 1. Only countries/regions with populations exposed to tropical cyclones are noted in the table.

Extended Data Table 2 Sensitivity tests of RDI ratio using different wind modeling approaches. Legend: The population-weighted Relative Deprivation Index (RDI) ratio (RDI among those exposed to tropical cyclones divided by the RDI among those unexposed) calculated using three different wind modeling approaches in all affected country/regions. Quad-by-Quad is our primary approach used in Fig. 4, while the RDI ratio estimated using the Quad-by-Quad-85 and C15+LC12 approaches are shown for comparison (additional details in "Additional wind modeling approaches for sensitivity tests"). This table is used to generate Fig. 4 and panel a-b of Extended Data Fig. 6.




Person-Days Exposure






Continent


Oceania




Europe




Africa




North America



Asia



ALL



2002-2006


2015-2019

Age

Population-averaged RDI

-100 more deprived -50 0 50 100 more deprived

Country/Region



RDI ratio < 1

0

RDI Ratio

1


2


RDI ratio > 1

exposed


unexposed

RDI Ratio







Extended Data Fig. 1



Extended Data Fig. 2




Extended Data Fig. 3




Extended Data Fig. 4


a



b




Extended Data Fig. 5




Extended Data Fig. 6


a Quad-by-Quad-85




b C15 + LC12



c Sensitivity Test



Extended Data Fig. 7



Extended Data Fig. 8

Subplot	Sub-Regions	Countries/Regions
A	North and Central America	Canada, United States; Bermuda; Mexico; Guatemala; Belize; Honduras; El Salvador; Costa Rica
B	Caribbeans	Anguilla; Aruba; Barbados; British Virgin Islands; Cayman Islands; Cuba; Dominican Republic; Grenada; Guadeloupe; Haiti; Jamaica; Martinique; Montserrat; Puerto Rico; Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Trinidad and Tobago; Turks and Caicos Islands; Virgin Islands, U.S. Grenadines;
C	East Asia	Japan; North Korea; South Korea
D	East Asia	China Mainland; Taiwan
E	South East Asia	Cambodia; Indonesia; Laos; Malaysia; Myanmar; Philippines; Singapore; Thailand; Timor-Leste; Vietnam
F	South Asia	Bangladesh; India; Sri Lanka

Extended Data Table 1

Country / Region	Quad-by-Quad	Quad-by-Quad-85	C15+LC12
Portugal	2.01	2.01	0.90
Costa Rica	1.80	1.78	1.78
Canada	1.47	1.43	1.50
South Korea	1.45	1.43	0.87
Nicaragua	1.42	1.43	1.44
Cuba	1.34	1.31	1.29
Australia	1.32	1.44	1.31
Guatemala	1.25	1.27	1.28
Mexico	1.24	1.19	1.21
Ireland	1.20	1.22	1.08
Laos	1.17	1.15	1.15
Honduras	1.16	1.33	1.33
Haiti	1.14	1.13	1.12
Puerto Rico	1.13	1.13	1.13
Myanmar	1.13	1.11	1.15
Vietnam	1.12	1.23	1.24
North Korea	1.11	1.11	0.99
Somalia	1.09	1.08	NA
Oman	1.09	1.06	1.07
Bangladesh	1.04	1.02	1.10
China	1.01	1.00	0.97
Mozambique	0.95	0.93	0.93
India	0.91	0.89	1.01
Madagascar	0.88	0.88	0.87
United States	0.79	0.76	0.81
Jamaica	0.75	0.73	0.80
Philippines	0.74	0.87	0.80
Japan	0.65	0.62	0.57
Taiwan	0.49	0.49	0.49

Extended Data Table 2