

Supplement of Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 22, 373–390, 2018
<https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-373-2018-supplement>
© Author(s) 2018. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Supplement of

Participatory flood vulnerability assessment: a multi-criteria approach

Mariana Madruga de Brito et al.

Correspondence to: Mariana Madruga de Brito (mariana.brito@uni-bonn.de)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.

Table S1: Characteristics of experts

Characteristic	Delphi 1 st round n (%)	Delphi 2 nd round n (%)	1 st focus group n (%)	2 nd focus group n (%)	Workshops n (%)
<i>Work affiliation*</i>					
Academy	57 (56.4)	43 (44.3)	6 (60.0)	4 (66.7)	13 (48.1)
Government organizations	32 (31.7)	27 (27.8)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (29.6)
Research institutes	21 (20.8)	19 (19.6)	1 (10.0)	1 (16.7)	4 (14.8)
Business/industry	9 (8.9)	6 (6.2)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.7)
NGO	3 (3.0)	2 (2.1)	1 (10.0)	1 (16.7)	1 (3.7)
<i>Gender identity</i>					
Male	54 (53.6)	44 (55.0)	2 (22.3)	2 (40.0)	8 (36.4)
Female	47 (46.5)	36 (45.0)	7 (77.7)	3 (60.0)	14 (63.6)
<i>Education level</i>					
Ph.D.	56 (55.4)	44 (55.0)	3 (20.0)	4 (80.0)	11 (50.0)
Master	35 (34.6)	28 (35.0)	4 (26.7)	1 (20.0)	8 (36.4)
Bachelor	4 (4.0)	3 (3.7)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (9.1)
M.B.A.	4 (4.0)	4 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
High school	2 (2.0)	1 (1.3)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.5)
<i>Profession*</i>					
Geography	27 (26.5)	21 (25.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (21.7)
Engineering	25 (24.5)	20 (24.7)	3 (18.8)	4 (66.7)	5 (21.7)
Geology	20 (19.6)	16 (19.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)
Others	8 (7.8)	8 (9.9)	3 (18.8)	0 (0.0)	5 (21.7)
Architecture	5 (4.9)	4 (4.9)	2 (12.5)	1 (16.7)	3 (13.0)
Law	5 (4.9)	2 (2.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Social sciences and service	4 (3.9)	2 (2.5)	1 (6.3)	1 (16.7)	3 (13.0)
Biology	3 (2.9)	3 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Economy	3 (2.9)	3 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Meteorology	2 (2.0)	2 (2.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
<i>Self-reported knowledge of flood vulnerability analysis</i>					
Limited	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Reasonable	43 (42.6)	31 (38.8)	3 (33.3)	2 (40.0)	11 (50.0)
Very good	58 (57.4)	49 (61.3)	6 (66.7)	3 (60.0)	11 (50.0)
Total no. of participants	101	80	9	5	22

*The participants could select more than one work affiliation and profession. Only the professions that were mentioned twice are shown here. The remaining was grouped in the 'others' category.

Figure S1: Individual vulnerability maps

