A Comprehensive Survey of Smart Tourist Safety and Monitoring Systems: Technologies, Challenges, and the Road Ahead

Sai Abhiram[1], Dr. P. V. Bhaskar Reddy[2], Sreedhar[3], Thanish Seemakurthi[4], Vijay Varma[5]
[1,3,4,5]*School of Computer Science and Engineering REVA University Bengaluru, India*
[2]*Professor, School of Computer Science and Engineering REVA University Bengaluru, India*

***Abstract*—One of the major sources of global economy is tourism, but assuring the safety and security of tourists especially in new or distant destinations has been a major challenge. Conventional safety systems tend to be reactive in nature and they are based on manual observation, slow communication systems. The paper provides an overview of the state of the art in Smart Tourist Safety and Monitoring Systems (STSMS), paying attention to the implementation of the most advanced technologies, including Internet of Things (IoT), Geospatial Analytics, Artificial Intelligence (AI), and Blockchain. We are examining recent developments in real time tracking, Geo-Fencing, anomaly detection and emergency alerting, their architectural design, deployment processes, strengths and limitations. In addition, we also detect key research gaps such as the absence of unified and cross domain architecture, no persistence and audited spatial logging and the low uptake of multi-purpose wearable solutions. The survey ends by suggesting a comprehensive model such as the TourSafe system that takes advantage of a layered architecture to provide traveler protection that is proactive, scalable, and privacy-compliant, which makes a significant contribution to future trusted smart tourism infrastructure development.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Tourism industry is a dynamic business with a large geographical spread that poses special challenges to the safety and security management. The mounds and variety of traveler destinations, including the presence of high-density cultural locations as well as geographically isolated wildernesses has increased risks of modern travel. Tourists, who are not always aware of the dangers of the local area or local weather conditions, are at risk of falling out of orientation, being exposed to some sudden natural dangers, accidental illegal penetration into restricted areas, criminal activities, and healthcare crises [3]. Conventional safety management systems with their need to use fixed infrastructure, manual patrols and outdated communication systems are inherently reactive. They have a problem with a lack of real-time situational awareness, which causes the critical delays in response time and discontinuous data transmission, which is not effective in emergency situations when time matters [1]. The trend of advancing to the stage of Smart Tourism worldwide requires a technological shift of paradigm in which the anticipated reaction to the occurrences to prevent worsening of the situation is eliminated by proactively eliminating the threat at its emergence. Ubiquitous computing, the high performance cloud elasticity coupled with the breakthrough in data science (i.e. AI/ML) offer the needed basis in building intelligent end-to-end safety platforms. These systems allow real time, 24-hour monitoring, real time detection of anomalies and real time, confirmed communication between passengers and relevant emergency response organizations.

A. Motivation and Scope of the Survey

The need behind this survey is in connection to the established need of an in-depth critical analysis of integrated technological solutions that are dedicated to the investment in robust tourist safety. Our analysis moves beyond specialized systems (e.g., pure health monitoring or localized crowd control) to focus on multi faceted systems that establish a secure, traceable environment. Objectives are:

1. To offer a more rigorous and critical review of the current research, the categorization of implementations based on their major functional domain, and the assessment of their architectural resilience, constraints in terms of scalability, security posture and geographical reach.

B. Paper Structure

The rest of this paper is structured to facilitate a deep understanding of the STSMS field: Section 2 reviews the fundamental technologies enabling STSMS, detailing their implementation in a safety context. Section 3 presents a comprehensive analysis and categorization of current system implementations. Section 4 discusses the identified research gaps and proposes specific future research directions. Finally, Section 5 synthesizes the findings and concludes the paper.

II. REVIEW OF ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES

A well-developed and sustainable STSMS model is dependent on the smooth and synergistic combination of four key technological pillars.

A. Internet of Things (IoT) and Wearables

The IoT structure forms the base of data collection and edge layer of an STSMS. To the end user this will be mainly Smartphone based applications or low-power wear able trackers.

Data Acquisition and Types: This type of device is a continuous data acquisition of extremely important data streams such as high-frequency GPS positions, inertial sensors (acceleration, gyroscopes, compass in movement profiles), and physiological indicators (e.g., heart rate, body temperature measured by embedded sensors).

Heterogeneous Communication: Data relay is based on dynamic network. Where geographic isolation is a problem, the solution has to take advantage of Low-Power Wide-Area Networks, such as LoRa, NB-IoT, or special satel lite connections. In dense and urban settings,high-bandwidth cellular networks (4G/5G) and localized Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) are deployed in data offloading.

Difficulties in Safety-Critical Deployment: There still exist considerable technical obstacles, including short battery life in high-frequency tracking modes, the problem of network loss in deep remote areas, and the reliability of the network-based distress signaling system under stress [5]. One of the most important design principles is fault tolerance to ensure the transmission of data in conditions of primary communication channels failure.

B. Geospatial Analytics and Geo Fencing

This pillar propels the spatial intelligence, the context awareness capability and the risk localization capability of the system.

1) Spatial Databases and Indexing

Strong spatial databases, e.g. the PostGIS, have the advantage of supporting complex geometric and spatial data types (e.g. points, polylines, complex polygons) in an efficient manner, in comparison with traditional relational databases. It is the most important feature of STSMS as it allows fast and large volume spatial queries, such as: "Find all tourists who are within 50 meters of the point of the alert" or: Check whether a given point on the GPS falls within the limits of a dynamically constrained region. Spatial indexing (such as R trees) is important in achieving low-latency performance.

2) *Geo-Fencing Implementation and Types*

Geo-Fencing refers to a virtual and adjustable boundary of a geographical field surrounding a physical location. The back-end service is running continuously with the spatial queries, which compares the current position of the tourist with these limits.

Unchanging Geo-Fencing (Permanent Risk): Areas are demarcated around fixed risky places, conservation zones, or pre specified emergency response territories (e.g. the boundaries of historical sites, rocky cliffs, national park boundaries).

Dynamic Geo-Fencing (Temporary Risk): The boundaries are created or changed on real-time depending on external factors: swiftly moving weather-fronts, new localized areas of disaster, or temporary blockages of crowds identified by external sensors.

Geo-Fencing forms the basis of active alerting where the tourist is notified when he/she is approached or the location is crossed and at the same time, the event is sent to the command center.

C. Artificial Intelligence(AI) for Anomaly Detection

Application of AI is of central importance in transforming STSMS into a predictive risk management platform rather than a reactive alert platform.

1) Movement Pattern Analysis (MPA)

MPA consists of training both supervised and unsupervised models of learning history of normal movements of tourists in various locations, and at different times of the day. Deviations that are statistically significant to the learned norms cause anomaly detection: Abrupt, non-linear acceleration or deceleration without being related to known modes of transport, and could be indicative of a fall or an abrupt threat.

Erratic Trajectory Analysis: Trajectories that are looping, very chaotic, or extremely off-course to existing trails or preferred transits.

Prolonged Stationary Duration: A user who has stayed still in a dangerous or unusual area long enough that they have surpassed a limit that may highly indicate incapacitation, injury or extreme distress. The effectiveness of AI is the fact that it creates an Unprompted Distress Signal, which is a critical warning when the tourist cannot press the panic button, which is physically impossible.

D. Blockchain for Security and Data Integrity

The non-functional requirements of trust, auditability, and data security are best handled by blockchain technology, particularly when it comes to systems that have sensitive location data that are controlled by government or private entities.

1) Decentralized Digital Identity (DID)

A distributed ledger, secured and managed by a DID system, will allow authenticating tourists and authorities in a secure manner. With this architecture, sensitive personal information (e.g., passport numbers) can be kept off-chain, but verifiable credentials are required and can be used in a case of emergency. This system is vital in dealing with the dire privacy questions involved in a continuous location tracking systems.

2) Immutable Event Logging

Cryptographic logging of all mission-critical events shall be done on to the ledger. That is raw panic alerts, automatic anomaly warnings, recordings of authorized data access by the responders, and comprehensive response schedules (e.g., ambulance dispatched, time of arrival). This unalterable history is priceless in enhancing responsibility in the chain of accountability and meeting the post incident regulatory and legal investigations mandate.

3) Cloud and Microservices Architecture

STSMS that must support millions of tourists in all regions of the world must be scalable and high available. Elasticity and Resilience: With cloud native tools (containers such as Docker, orchestration such as Kubernetes) services (e.g., the AI Scoring Module, the Geo-Fencing Service) can scale in a horizontal and automatic way depending on load. This architecture allows the failure of a non-critical component to not affect the primary safety functions (e.g. the panic alert gateway). Interoperability through API Gateway: API Gateway: A specific API Gateway deals with allinbound and outbound traffic.

outbound traffic, which offers rate control, security checks, and access to the microservices. It is this gateway through which secure data can be exchanged with authority systems (police, hospitals, tourism op erators) using standardized RESTful or GraphQL APIs.

II. ANALYSIS OF CURRENT SMART TOURIST SYSTEMS

An organized literature and commercial applications review shows that the general tendency is to specialize and that, eventually, this results in the disintegration of architecture and functional disjuncture where a comprehensive safety process is needed.

A. Sensor Network and Flow Visibility Systems

The solutions put the emphasis on monitoring the collective density and movement patterns under limited physical domains. They often use hard infrastructure such as magnetic sensors, locally localized Wi Fi or Bluetooth beacons or RFID readers to create heat maps of crowd density.

Application: Distributions of resources, crowd management at the queues, and prior notifications of crowds at tourist locations that have high traffic.

Weaknesses: They are not intended to be used on a personal level. They do not have personalized, one to one emergency communication mechanisms and are unable to offer the provision of spatial awareness (Geo-Fencing) and trajectory analysis of a singular individual within a large and open area. They are strong in visibility and poor in security [1].

B. Integrated Health and Vital Monitoring Systems

This category will use the rapidly growing market of commercial wearables to exclusively track the physiological state of the traveler. Use: Heart rate variability, blood pressure, sleep cycles, creation of alerts of sharp physiological distress (e.g. cardiac events, extreme dehydration) monitoring. This proves useful especially in health tourism or high altitude traveling [5]. Weaknesses: They are more medically oriented and fail miserably in incorporating space and security context. They do not have the required middle ground of AI-guided anomaly identification specific to a natural threat (e.g. a panicked run) or a security one and lack the appropriate direct, validated, and prioritized communication line to the law enforcement or search-and-rescuers.

C. Crowd Management and Hazard Mapping Systems

The goal of these systems is to achieve the public safety on a large scale with the combination of the environmental sensing (weather, air quality) and the state-of-art video analytics. Application: Scenic or urban systems take fixed camera feeds, on which a deep learning model is applied to analyze crowd movements, find dropped items, or match environmental conditions (e.g. high wind alerts) to visitor count [3, 4]. Coercions: They can only be applied in non-portable, fixed infrastructure since they can never be useful in dynamic or broad geographical locations (e.g. multi-day hiking trails, deserts, unguarded coastline). They are not the best suited to identifying and responding to threats to specific travelers since they consider safety metrics at an area level.

D. The Architectural Imperative: A Unified Framework

The analysis shows that there is an evident architectural imperative: there is no reviewed system that effectively provides the needed synthesis of the safety functions. An effective STSMS should be able to combine:

- Mobility and Context: Real time geo fencing, very granular GPS tracking and panic alerts which are activated by the user.
- Smart Forecasting: machine learning-based anomaly identification and combined risk rating.
- Trust and Accountability: Blockchain offers secure and tamper proof logging and identity management.

This synthesis, as conceived in the TourSafe system, is needed to build up a solution that is commercially implementable and widely trusted by all.

III. IDENTIFIED RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Resolving the research gaps below will characterize the future of STSMS platforms.

A. Research Gap 1 Unified, Interop erable Safety Architecture. The existing solutions are technologically disjointed. A national park emergency responder should not be expected to use three distinct systems to monitor lo cation, health and environmental risk.

Issue: How to create a genuinely modular, vendor-neutral architecture, with data ingestion protocols being standardised (i.e. data sent by any certified BLE/LoRa/4G wearable can be processed) and data output formats (risk events) read immediately by any certified authority dashboard.

Future Direction: Emphasize on establishing.

APIs to STSMS that are standardized across the industry (e.g., by the use of low-latency event streams such as MQTT or gRPC) The required decoupling of the architecture is enabled by the architectural layer of UI, Service, AI/Blockchain, and Data to support this industry-wide interoper capability.

B. Research Gap 2: Persistent and Audited Spatial Logging

Location information is very sensitive, and to hold any person accountable and trace the legal person, inimitable evidence is needed.

Challenge: It is essential to find an effective approach to interrelation between the high volume, constantly generated spatial data (which is best stored in PostGIS) and the low-volume requirements of a Blockchain (audit trail). It is computationally and economically infeasible to store the raw GPS data on-chain. Research into hybrid data models is required in the future. Metadata (e.g. event ID, time, responder ID) and critical event indicators (panic alert status, response accepted) that can be cryptographically hashed only ought to be stored in the Blockchain as immutable metadata. The sensitive and large-volume GPS coordinates are required to be kept off-chain in a secure location, and only by using a verifiable Digital ID can the access to such data be ensured, thereby protecting privacy and keeping a trail of it.

C. Research Gap 3: Proactive Multi Modal Anomaly Fusion

The real power of AI in safety is that it can predict risk through the integration of different data, rather than respond to individual-variable notifications.

- Problem: Coming up with strong, weighted fusion models capable of integrating asynchronous data streams (e.g., a person standing still in a high wind hazard area, with an increased heart rate by a small margin). This involves the resolving of such challenges as data synchronization, sensor drift, and feature engineering across heterogeneous inputs.
- Weighted Fusion Model: The optimal solution is one high-fidelity risk score R represented in terms of multiple indicators: movement anomaly (Am), physiological distress (Dp), proximity to environmental hazards (He) and historical crime rate (Hc). This can be modeled as:

$$R = w1Am + w2Dp + w3He + w4Hc$$

where wi are learned weights.

- Future Direction: Advanced AI methods, which may include Temporal Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) or Attention-based Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) that can capture the sequential and relational relationships between movement and health data and spatial data to predict a severe distress condition can be explored several minutes before it occurs.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Smart Tourist Safety System Approaches

System Type	Primary Focus	Key Technology	Architectural Limitation	Integration Gap
Flow Visibility Systems [1]	Crowd Control & Resource Allocation	RFID, Wi-Fi, Sensor Networks	Requires fixed infrastructure, low scalability for indi vidual tracking.	Lacks individual emergency and personalized spatial alerting.
Health Monito ring Systems [5]	Traveler Physiological Status	Commercial Wearables, BLE	Single-domain focus (medical only), limited authority integration.	Excludes security threats, Geo Fencing, and move ment anomaly detection.
Crowd/Hazard Management [3, 4]	Area-Level Safety, Environmental Sensing	Fixed Cameras, Deep Learning Ana lytics	Lacks device flexibility, non-portable, requires heavy setup investment.	No direct individual security/panic alert channel or private identity manage ment.
TourSafe System	Individual Proac-tive Safety & Auditability	IoT, AI, Blockchain, PostGIS	Layered Microservices (Complexity in deployment and integration).	Requires strong communication re silience in deep re mote areas without cellular coverage.

D. Research Gap 4: Edge Computing for Immediate Alerts

When cloud connectivity is high-speed and continuous, the unacceptable latency and vulnerability in remote locations where tourists are frequently at the greatest risk arise.

Challenge: Having the first, mission-critical processing, i.e. Geo-Fencing boundary checks and basic movement anomaly de tection, be on the wearable device itself (the "edge"). This necessitates a lot of optimization of the algorithms that are resource-intensive.

Future Direction: Studies should be conducted to design AI models that are highly lightweight and optimized (e.g. TinyML frameworks) that can be deployed on low-power microcontrollers in smart wearables. This allows the device to autonomously set off a local pre-alert, verify that it may be in distress, and enter into network connection retries via alternative low-power protocols, such that even a very grossly degraded signal will result in the device responding.

IV. CONCLUSION

This general review has configured that Smart Tourist Safety and Monitoring is a very vital, but disjointed area. Although there are foundational tech nologies, which include IoT, AI, Geospatial Analytics, and Blockchain, the recent application of these technologies tends to be either domain specialization (resulting in visible but insecure systems), or medi cally capable (but spatially blind) systems.

Principles of integrity and proactive prediction are the main drivers that make the next generation of STSMS require the architectural unification core. The offered framework, such as the one proposed by the Tour Safe system, manages to encompass this architec tural synthesis, including real-time tracking, AI-based risk assessment, Blockchain-guaranteed iden tity, and Geo-Fencing into a reliable microservices architecture.

The future studies need to effectively address the gaps identified with strict emphasis to fill in the gaps of the study like the field testing of multi-modal anomaly fusion models and the implementation of open and standardized APIs to enhance greater interoperability between safety agen cies across the world. By shifting towards reactive monitoring into wards proactive, responsible and integrated safety systems, the industry will be able to provide a safer, more intelligent and confidence-driven global traveling environment.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Tang, C. Huang, X. Zhao, and Y. Tang, ”Research on Smart Tourism Oriented Sensor Network Construction and Information Service Mode,” *Sensors (Basel)*, vol. 22, no. 24, Art. 10008, 2022.

[2] Y.-Y. Yap, S.-H. Tan, B.-C. Tan, and S.-K. Tan, ”Smart tourism technologies and tourist satis faction: A systematic literature review and re search agenda,” *Asia Pacific J. Tourism Res.*, vol. 27, no. 12, pp. 1234-1256, 2022.

[3] A. T. Arzadon, V. J. S. Corporal, K. J. P. Daquioag, J. F. B. Moreno, A. M. Roxas, and J. F. M. Ramirez, ”The role of technology in enhancing tourist safety and security: Challenges and opportunities,” *Int. J. Res. Innov. Social Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 14, pp. 1235-1262, 2025.

[4] C. Xie, M. Wang, J. Zhang, S. S. S. Huang, and J. Yu, ”The tourist metasafety framework (TMF): Toward a holistic understanding of tourist safety,” *Smart Environ. Syst.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 97 113, 2024.

[5] K. N. Rajanikanth, S. Badagi, S. S. Shetty, S. Hegde, and S. S. Sushanth, ”Smart health mon itoring system for tourists in remote areas,” *J. Emerg. Technol. Innov. Res. (JETIR)*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. e318-e322, 2025