

Supplementary Information

Harmonising geospatial indicators for flood vulnerability indices: an IPCC-aligned scoping review to support urban flood adaptation planning

Authors:

Franklin Gaspar^{1*}; Fernando B. Alves^{1 2}; Ana Monteiro³; Cecília Rocha¹.

Affiliations:

¹ CITTA—Research Centre for Territory, Transport and Environment, Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto, 4200-465 Porto, Portugal.

² Faculty of Architecture and Arts, Lusíada University of Porto, Rua de Moçambique 21 e 71, 4100-348 Porto, Portugal.

³ Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Porto, Via Panorâmica, s/n, 4150-564 Porto, Portugal.

*Corresponding author:

Franklin Gaspar (up202204098@up.pt)

Description

This Supplementary Information accompanies the article "Harmonising geospatial indicators for flood vulnerability indices: an IPCC-aligned scoping review to support urban flood adaptation planning". It provides the methodological documentation, structured databases and reference catalogues supporting the analyses presented in the manuscript.

Contents

Additional file 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist.	2
Additional file 2: FAIR-oriented workflow for harmonising geospatial indicators in Flood Vulnerability Indices.....	4
Additional file 3: Overview of FVI studies included in the scoping review (n=131).	7
Additional file 4: Structured dataset of included studies, geospatial indicators, methods, and data sources.	12
References: reviewed studies.	25

Data Availability

The structured database of geospatial indicators, methodological variables and geospatial data sources generated during this study is publicly available through the Zenodo repository under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence. The repository includes the structured Excel database compiled from the 131 studies included in this scoping review, together with the accompanying FAIR-oriented documentation and metadata supporting data reuse and interoperability. The dataset will be available at [Zenodo DOI to be inserted upon acceptance].

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at the journal website.

*SUBMISSION NOTE

In accordance with the journal's initial submission requirements, all supplementary materials are provided here as a single PDF document. Upon acceptance, Additional file 4 will be supplied in its native Microsoft Excel (.xlsx) format to enable filtering, querying and reuse of the structured database in accordance with the FAIR principles.

Harmonising geospatial indicators for flood vulnerability indices: an IPCC-aligned scoping review to support urban flood adaptation planning

Additional file 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist.

Purpose of this supplementary file

This file provides the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist, documenting the reporting compliance of this scoping review with the recommendations proposed by Tricco et al. The checklist identifies the location of each reporting item within the manuscript, facilitating transparent assessment of the review methodology and supporting the reproducibility, completeness and quality of reporting.

Note: The checklist follows the reporting recommendations of Tricco et al. (2018) for PRISMA-ScR and includes all 22 reporting items covering the Title, Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion and Funding sections.

Table AF1: PRISMA-ScR checklist based on the reporting guidelines of Tricco et al. (2018).

Section	Item	PRISMA-ScR checklist item	Page
Title			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
Abstract			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	1
Introduction			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	2
Results			
Selection of sources of evidence	5	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	3
Characteristics of sources of evidence	6	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	3
Results of individual sources of evidence	7	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relates to the review questions and objectives.	5
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence§	8	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see Methods, Critical appraisal of indiv. sources of evidence).	6
Synthesis of results	9	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	6
Discussion			
Summary of evidence	10	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	12
Limitations	11	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	12
Conclusions	12	Provide a general interpretation of results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well potential implications and/or next steps.	13
Methods			

Section	Item	PRISMA-ScR checklist item	Page
Protocol and registration	13	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	14
Eligibility criteria	14	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years, language, and publication status) and provide a rationale.	14
Information sources*	15	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	14
Search	16	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	14
Selection of sources of evidence†	17	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	14
Data charting process‡	18	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	14
Data items	19	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	14
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	20	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	14
Synthesis of results	21	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	15
Funding			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	16

JB1 = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

‡ The framework by Arksey and O'Malley (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

Citation

Users of this supplementary material should cite the associated article and refer to this file as:

Additional file 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist.

Reference

Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>

Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C.,...Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), 467–+. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>

Harmonising geospatial indicators for flood vulnerability indices: an IPCC-aligned scoping review to support urban flood adaptation planning

Additional file 2: FAIR-oriented workflow for harmonising geospatial indicators in Flood Vulnerability Indices

Purpose of this supplementary file

This supplementary file documents the structure and documentation logic of **Additional file 4**, which provides a structured database of all studies included in this scoping review (n = 131). The database compiles information on Flood Vulnerability Indices (FVI), including geospatial indicators, conceptual domains, analytical methods, and data sources, following IPCC-aligned vulnerability and risk frameworks. This file supports transparency, reproducibility, and reuse by describing how indicators and their attributes were identified, harmonised, classified, and documented in alignment with FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable; Wilkinson et al., 2016).

Scope of the structured database

The structured database includes peer-reviewed studies that:

- (i) develop or apply Flood Vulnerability Indices (FVI).
- (ii) use geospatial indicators to operationalise exposure, sensitivity, adaptive capacity, and/or hazard.
- (iii) provide sufficient methodological detail to enable indicator classification, spatial interpretation, and data-source identification.

Each record in the database corresponds to an individual geospatial indicator reported in the included studies.

FAIR principles implementation

FAIR principles were implemented through standardised column names, IPCC-aligned conceptual classifications, harmonised terminology for indicators and methods, and explicit documentation of data sources and access conditions. These principles were operationalised through four interrelated analytical steps applied during database construction:

- (i) data compilation, corresponding to the systematic organisation of indicators and attributes into a unified database; (ii) data source documentation, ensuring transparency regarding data provenance and access conditions; (iii) data comparison and harmonisation, aligning indicators with IPCC vulnerability and risk components; and (iv) data correlation, enabling cross-study synthesis and reuse of harmonised indicators.

Findability is ensured through unique study and indicator identifiers and consistent naming conventions.

Accessibility is supported by the provision of the database as an open Excel file with documented data access conditions.

Interoperability is achieved through alignment with IPCC frameworks and harmonised terminology.

Reusability is supported by explicit documentation of indicator definitions, methodological attributes, and data-source characteristics. Together, these processes ensure conceptual transparency, methodological consistency, and FAIR-aligned documentation across the structured database.

Database structure

The database is organised into structured columns grouped into five conceptual blocks reflecting their analytical and documentary roles within the parameter-oriented framework adopted in this scoping review: (I) Study and framework context; (II) Parameter and indicator core; (III) Equity and index structure; (IV) Methods and spatialisation; and (V) Data source and FAIR attributes.

(I) STUDY AND FRAMEWORK CONTEXT

Column name	Description
Indicator_ID	Unique identifier for each indicator included in the scoping review (n = 2,437).
Study_ID	Unique identifier for each study included in the scoping review (n = 131).
Conceptual_Framework	Indicates whether the Flood Vulnerability Index follows a vulnerability-based or risk-based approach, consistent with IPCC terminology.

(II) CONCEPTUAL CLASSIFICATION

Column name	Description
Original_Dimension	Dimension terminology as reported in the original publication, preserving traceability to the source literature.
Reviewed_Dimension_IPCC	Harmonised classification of each indicator according to IPCC macro-components: Exposure, Sensitivity, Adaptive Capacity, or Hazard.
Thematic_Domain	Thematic grouping of indicators within each IPCC component, representing functional groupings with similar analytical roles in FVIs.

(II) INDICATOR ATTRIBUTES

Column name	Description
Original_Indicator	Indicator name as originally reported by the authors in the reviewed study
Reviewed_Indicator	Revised and harmonised indicator name used for comparative analysis across studies.
Indicator_Description	Brief description of how the indicator is defined or characterised in the original study.
GBI_Included	Indicates whether the indicator explicitly addresses Green-Blue Infrastructure (Yes/No).

(III) METHODS AND SPATIALISATION

Column name	Description
Method	Main analytical or aggregation method used to integrate the indicator (e.g. PCA, MCA, weighted overlay).
Spatial_Data_Type	Type of spatial data used to operationalise the indicator (Raster, Vector, or Mixed).

(IV) DATA SOURCE ATTRIBUTES

Column name	Description
Data_Source	Descriptive name of the data source used to derive the indicator.
Data_Source_Category	General category of the data source (e.g. Census, Satellite Imagery, Governmental, Survey, Health, Model).

Intended use

The structured database supports comparative analysis of FVIs construction practices, assessment of conceptual alignment across studies, and the development of more transparent, replicable, and interoperable urban flood vulnerability assessments for research and climate adaptation planning.

Limitations

The database reflects the scope and inclusion criteria of the scoping review and relies on information reported in the original studies. Indicator classification follows IPCC definitions. The database does not evaluate the empirical performance of individual indicators or indices.

Relationship to other supplementary materials

Additional file 3: Overview of FVI studies included in the scoping review (n = 131).

Additional file 4: Structured dataset of included studies, geospatial indicators, methods, and data sources.

Citation

Users of this supplementary material should cite the associated article and refer to this file as:

Additional file 2: FAIR-oriented workflow for harmonising geospatial indicators in Flood Vulnerability Indices.

Reference

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., Bourne, P. E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A. J., Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C. T., Finkers, R.,...Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR guiding principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, 3(1), 160018.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>

Harmonising geospatial indicators for flood vulnerability indices: an IPCC-aligned scoping review to support urban flood adaptation planning

Additional file 3: Overview of FVI studies included in the scoping review (n=131).

Purpose of this supplementary file

This file provides a complete overview of the 131 studies included in the scoping review, serving as the reference catalogue for all analyses presented in the manuscript and associated supplementary materials. Each study is assigned a unique Study ID, enabling consistent cross-referencing throughout the structured database (Additional file 4) and the study article. The overview documents the bibliographic identity of every included study, facilitating transparent traceability between published articles, extracted indicators, methodological characteristics and geospatial data sources.

Note: The Study ID is used consistently throughout all supplementary materials as the primary identifier linking individual studies to the structured indicator database (Additional file 4) and the catalogue of geospatial data sources in the main article.

Table AF3: Overview of studies included in the scoping review (Study ID, article title, reference and publication year).

STUDY ID	TITLE	REFERENCE	YEAR
Art. 001	Building a flood vulnerability index for urban resilience: Insights from Kelowna, British Columbia	(Kaur et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 002	A methodological approach to flood dynamics based on satellite-derived spectral indices and altimetric forecast models: a case study in Southern Brazil	(da Silva Junior et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 003	Coastal Flood Vulnerability and Spatial Risk Assessment for Small Island Urban of Cat Ba Town, Northern Vietnam	(Phi et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 004	Urbanization under extreme climate events leads to synchronized decreases in flood protection and increases in vulnerability	(Elliot et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 005	Flood risk assessment under land use dynamics during 2000–2020 in the yellow river basin, China	(T. Liu et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 006	Strategic deployment of nature-based solutions for urban flood management in high-density urban landscapes	(Wang et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 007	Flash flood risk zoning in Gomti River Basin in Eastern Bangladesh and Tripura State (India) using MCDM-GIS Tool	(Alif et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 008	Flood hazard zones prediction using machine-learning-based geospatial approach in lower Niger River basin, Nigeria	(Adeyemi & Komolafe, 2025)	2025
Art. 009	Cloud-Powered Flood Mapping and Impact Assessment: Leveraging Sentinel-1 SAR Imagery for Thailand's Disaster Response	(Anucharn et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 010	Identification of urban waterlogging risk zones using Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP): a case of Agartala city	(Das et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 011	Assessing the geographical diversity of climate change risks in Japan by overlaying climatic impacts with exposure and vulnerability indicators	(Liu & Masago, 2025)	2025
Art. 012	Compound risks of floods and droughts over multi-hazard catchments: Revealing association through hydrodynamic-cum-statistical modelling and novel bivariate risk classifier	(Tyagi et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 013	Socioeconomic impacts of flooding and its coping strategies in Nigeria: Evidence from Dagiri community, Gwagwalada area council of Abuja	(Badamosi et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 014	Assessment of multi-components and sectoral vulnerability to urban floods in Peshawar – Pakistan	(Ali et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 015	A geospatial analysis of flood risk zones in Cyprus: insights from statistical and multi-criteria decision analysis methods	(Ghanem & Zaifoglu, 2024)	2024
Art. 016	Geospatial analysis of flood risk hazard in Zambezi Region, Namibia	(Mshelia et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 017	Assessing the vulnerability of flashfloods to climate change in arid zones: Amman–Zarqa Basin, Jordan	(Saodi et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 018	Estimation of the flood vulnerability index (FVI) for Alexandria city-Egypt: A case study	(Afifi et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 019	Analysis of flood-poverty relationship in Burkina Faso using remotely sensed nighttime light	(Naba et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 020	AHP and TOPSIS based flood risk assessment- a case study of the Navsari City, Gujarat, India	(Pathan et al., 2022)	2022
Art. 021	Waterlogging risk assessment of the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei urban agglomeration in the past 60 years	(Y. Wang et al., 2021)	2021
Art. 022	Adaptive Capacity Assessment for A Flood Vulnerable Region through Land Use Modelling and Socio Economic and Physical Indicators	(Narendr et al., 2020)	2020
Art. 023	A framework for pluvial flood risk assessment in Alexandria considering the coping capacity	(Elboshy et al., 2019)	2019
Art. 024	Linking Water Infrastructure, Public Health, and Sea Level Rise: Integrated Assessment of Flood Resilience in Coastal Cities	(Allen et al., 2019)	2019

Art. 025	Towards a better understanding of the evolution of the flood risk in Mediterranean urban areas: the case of Barcelona.	(Cortès et al., 2018)	2018
Art. 026	Mainstreaming climate adaptation in spatial planning. The case of Baixa Pombalina in Lisbon	(Ribeiro et al., 2018)	2018
Art. 027	Risk analysis and visualization for detecting signs of flood disaster in Twitter	(Kwon & Kang, 2016)	2016
Art. 028	Future Climate Extremes in Bangladesh: Insights from a Multi-Model Ensemble of CMIP6 Simulations	(Nazrul et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 029	Machine Learning Enhances Flood Resilience Measurement in a Coastal Area - Case Study of Morocco	(Satour et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 030	Vulnerability of flash flooding in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia	(Rahman et al., 2016)	2016
Art. 031	Mapping social vulnerability to flood hazard in Norfolk, England	(Garbutt et al., 2015)	2015
Art. 032	Assessing Adaptive Capacity of Urban Coastal Communities to Flooding: The Case of La Paz District, Philippines	(Kirugumi & Reyes, 2025)	2025
Art. 033	Multi-Scenario Flood Susceptibility Projections in the Eastern Hindu Kush: Integrating Machine Learning, CMIP6, and Land Use Change	(K. Ullah et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 034	Multi-hazard Vulnerability Assessment Through RS-GIS and AHP: A Geo-Spatial Study of Keleghai River Basin in India	(Roy & Dhar, 2025)	2025
Art. 035	Integrating LiDAR, Sentinel-2 data and Bluespot modeling for flood risk mapping in Mihăesti, Romania	(Vizireanu et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 036	Geoinformatics-based watershed-level flood hazard analysis using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process across the Ganga-Brahmaputra basin	(Kaushik et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 037	Remote sensing and climatic data for flood impact assessment in Al-Ain (UAE)	(Bersi et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 038	GIS-based AHP approach to flood susceptibility assessment in Tangail district, Bangladesh	(Sharker et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 039	Vulnerability of Populations to Flooding and Marine Submersion in the Wouri Estuary (Cameroon), in the Context of Climate Change	(Ebodé et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 040	A semi-quantitative multi-hazard risk assessment framework for European coastal urban areas	(Figueiredo et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 041	Towards urban place-based resilience modeling: Mixed methods for a flood resilience assessment index	(Bottoms et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 042	Multi-hazard assessment of climate-related hazards for European coastal cities	(Laino & Iglesias, 2024)	2024
Art. 043	Flood risk mapping under changing climate in Lower Tapi river basin, India	(Chandole et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 044	Deep learning rapid flood risk predictions for climate resilience planning	(Yosri et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 045	Advancing Flood Risk Assessment through Integrated Hazard Mapping: A Google Earth Engine-Based Approach for Comprehensive Scientific Analysis and Decision Support	(Agrawal et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 046	Localising vulnerability assessment to urban floods: A comparative analysis of top-down and bottom-up geospatial approaches in Patna City, India	(Kumari et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 047	Climate uncertainty and vulnerability of urban flooding associated with regional risk using multi-criteria analysis in Mumbai, India	(Yadav et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 048	Rural-urban disparities in spatiotemporal pattern of vulnerability to climate change: a study of Madhya Pradesh, India	(George et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 049	Urban flood risk assessment under rapid urbanization in Zhengzhou City, China	(Li et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 050	Urban flood risk assessment using AHP and geospatial techniques in swat Pakistan	(Waseem et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 051	Climate change vulnerability hotspots in Costa Rica: constructing a sub-national index	(Nawrotzki et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 052	Towards flood risk reduction: Commonalities and differences between urban flood resilience and risk based on a case study in the Pearl River Delta	(Zheng & Huang, 2023)	2023
Art. 053	An integrated indicator-based approach for constructing an urban flood vulnerability index as an urban decision-making tool using the PCA and AHP techniques: A case study of Alexandria, Egypt	(Abdrabo et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 054	Flood vulnerability and buildings' flood exposure assessment in a densely urbanised city: comparative analysis of three scenarios using a neural network approach	(Pham et al., 2022)	2022
Art. 055	A framework for risk-based assessment of urban floods in coastal cities	(Kumar et al., 2022)	2022
Art. 056	Spatialized flood resilience measurement in rapidly urbanized coastal areas with a complex semi-arid environment in northern Morocco	(Satour et al., 2021)	2021
Art. 057	Integration of earth observation and census data for mapping a multi-temporal flood vulnerability index: a case study on Northeast Italy	(Cian et al., 2021)	2021
Art. 058	An Indicator-Based Approach for Micro-Scale Assessment of Physical Flood Vulnerability of Individual Buildings	(Kaoje et al., 2021)	2021
Art. 059	Assessing coastal vulnerability of Chittagong District, Bangladesh using geospatial techniques	(Miah et al., 2020)	2020
Art. 060	Comprehensive evaluation of urban flood-bearing risks based on combined compound fuzzy matter-element and entropy weight model	(Lv et al., 2020)	2020
Art. 061	A methodology for urban micro-scale coastal flood vulnerability and risk assessment and mapping	(Percival & Teeuw, 2019)	2019
Art. 062	Flood hazards: household vulnerability and resilience in disaster-prone districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, Pakistan	(Shah et al., 2018)	2018
Art. 063	Integration of multi-parametric fuzzy analytic hierarchy process and GIS along the UNESCO World Heritage: a flood hazard index, Mombasa County, Kenya	(Hategekimana et al., 2018)	2018
Art. 064	The KULTURisk Regional Risk Assessment methodology for water-related natural hazards - Part 1: Physical-environmental assessment	(Ronco et al., 2014)	2014

Art. 065	Enhancing flood susceptibility mapping in Sana'a, Yemen with random forest and eXtreme gradient boosting algorithms	(Alwathaf et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 066	Resilient coasts: A holistic approach to flood risk assessment and mitigation on the East Coast of Ghana	(Kwang et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 067	Understanding urban flood risk perception and its determinants across diverse hazard sources	(Waseem & Rana, 2025)	2025
Art. 068	Enhancing Urban Flood Vulnerability Mapping with Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis	(Sukri et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 069	AI-Driven GIS Modeling of Future Flood Risk and Susceptibility for Typhoon Krathon under Climate Change	(C. Liu et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 070	Mapping pluralistic future flood risk scenarios for informal settlements in the eThekweni metropolitan municipality, South Africa	(Broekman et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 071	Evaluating Yangtze River Delta Urban Agglomeration flood risk using a hybrid method of automated machine learning and analytic hierarchy process	(Gao et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 072	Integrated hydrologic-economic modeling for urban flood risk mitigation using SWMM, HEC-RAS, and HAZUS: a case study of the Bronx river watershed, NYC	(Sabbaghian et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 073	Integrated flood risk prediction and zonation in bihar: observations from climate change projection using GIS-based AHP-Multicriteria approach	(Kumar et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 074	Identification of flood vulnerability areas using analytical hierarchy process techniques in the Wuseta watershed, Upper Blue Nile Basin, Ethiopia	(Mulu et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 075	Optimizing Flood Susceptibility Detection Using Ensemble Learning Methods	(Dai et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 076	Impact of climate change on flood risk with urban resilience perspective using fuzzy logic model	(I. Ullah et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 077	Assessment of flood risk based on CMIP6 for the Northern foothills of Qinling mountain	(Ahmed et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 078	Urban flood hazard assessment using FLA-optimized boost algorithms in Ankara, Türkiye	(Gul, 2025)	2025
Art. 079	Spatial Assessment of Territorial Resilience to Floods Using Comprehensive Indicators: Application to Greater Papeete (French Polynesia)	(Bourlier et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 080	Assessment of Rainfall Forecasts and Flood Risk in a Coastal Urban Catchment Considering Different Urban Canopy Scenarios	(Ghosh et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 081	Impact of land use and climate change on urban flooding: a case study of Bhubaneswar city in India	(Das & Sahoo, 2025)	2025
Art. 082	Multi-hazard vulnerability zone identification using GIS-based fuzzy AHP and MCDM techniques	(Sood et al., 2025)	2025
Art. 083	Flood vulnerability mapping in an urban area with high levels of impermeable coverage in southern Brazil	(Alves et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 084	Climate change vulnerability assessment of Karsiyaka, Izmir	(Cangüzel & Hepcan, 2024)	2024
Art. 085	Understanding flood risk in urban environments: spatial analysis of building vulnerability and hazard areas in the Lisbon metropolitan area	(Santos et al., 2024)	2025
Art. 086	Flood vulnerability assessment in rural and urban informal settlements: case study of Karonga District and Lilongwe City in Malawi	(Mwalwimba et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 087	Long-term flood exposure assessment using satellite-based land use change detection and inundation simulation: A 30-year case study of the Bangkok Metropolitan Region	(Darnkachatarn & Kajitani, 2024)	2024
Art. 088	Urban Flood Hazard Zonation in Bengaluru Urban District, India	(Dwarakish et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 089	Urban waterlogging risk susceptibility within changing pattern of rainfall intensity in Delhi, India	(Kumar et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 090	Suitability Analysis for Resettlement Potential Sites of Flood Vulnerable Community in Kigali city, Rwanda	(Izere et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 091	Flood susceptibility assessment of the Agartala Urban Watershed, India, using Machine Learning Algorithm	(Debnath et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 092	Identifying vulnerable populations in urban society: a case study in a flood-prone district of Wuhan, China	(Xu et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 093	Mapping flood vulnerability using an analytical hierarchy process (AHP) in the Metropolis of Mumbai	(Mann & Gupta, 2023)	2023
Art. 094	Application of analytic network process (ANP), local and indigenous knowledge in mapping flood vulnerability in an informal settlement	(Membele et al., 2024)	2023
Art. 095	Flood risk assessment in Limbe (Cameroon) using a GIS weighed sum method	(Enomah et al., 2024)	2024
Art. 096	Urban flood risk assessment characterizing the relationship among hazard, exposure, and vulnerability	(Bin et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 097	Risk of Flash Floods in Urban and Rural Municipalities Triggered by Intense Precipitation in Wielkopolska of Poland	(Pinskwar et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 098	Settlement suitability analysis of a riverine floodplain in the perspective of GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis	(Alam et al., 2023)	2023
Art. 099	Measure and spatial identification of social vulnerability, exposure and risk to natural hazards in Japan using open data	(Raduszynski & Numada, 2023)	2023
Art. 100	Mainstreaming climate resilience: A GIS-based methodology to cope with cloudbursts in Turin, Italy	(Brunetta et al., 2022)	2022
Art. 101	A comparison of three multi-criteria decision-making models in mapping flood hazard areas of Northeast Penang, Malaysia	(Mudashiru et al., 2022)	2022
Art. 102	A hybridized model based on neural network and swarm intelligence-grey wolf algorithm for spatial prediction of urban flood-inundation	(Darabi et al., 2021)	2021
Art. 103	An urban system perspective on urban flood resilience using SEM: evidence from Nanjing city, China	(P. Wang et al., 2021)	2021

Art. 104	The socioeconomic impact of climate-related hazards: flash flood impact assessment in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	(Bhuiyan et al., 2021)	2021
Art. 105	Enhancing urban flood resilience: A holistic framework incorporating historic worst flood to Yangtze River Delta, China	(Zhu et al., 2021)	2021
Art. 106	A city-scale assessment of emergency response accessibility to vulnerable populations and facilities under normal and pluvial flood conditions for Shanghai, China	(Yin et al., 2021)	2021
Art. 107	Vulnerability assessment for flash floods using GIS spatial modeling and remotely sensed data in El-Arish City, North Sinai, Egypt	(Mohamed & El-Raey, 2020)	2020
Art. 108	Flood vulnerability assessment using MOVE framework: a case study of the northern part of district Peshawar, Pakistan	(Hamidi et al., 2020)	2020
Art. 109	Flood hazard mapping using a multi-criteria decision analysis and GIS (case study Gaza Governorate, Palestine)	(Ajjur & Mogheir, 2020)	2020
Art. 110	Assessing vulnerability for inhabitants of Dhaka City considering flood-hazard exposure	(Huq et al., 2020)	2020
Art. 111	Measuring urban vulnerability to climate change using an integrated approach, assessing climate risks in Beijing	(Zhang et al., 2019)	2019
Art. 112	Implementing a Flood Vulnerability Index in urban coastal areas with industrial activity	(Giannakidou et al., 2019)	2019
Art. 113	Multidimensional Model for Vulnerability Assessment of Urban Flooding: An Empirical Study in Pakistan	(Rana & Routray, 2018b)	2018
Art. 114	Integrated methodology for flood risk assessment and application in urban communities of Pakistan	(Rana & Routray, 2018a)	2018
Art. 115	Construction of an integrated social vulnerability index in urban areas prone to flash flooding	(Aroca-Jimenez et al., 2017)	2017
Art. 116	A catchment scale Integrated Flood Resilience Index to support decision making in urban flood control design	(Miguez & Veról, 2017)	2017
Art. 117	Predictability of state-level flood damage in the conterminous United States: the role of hazard, exposure and vulnerability	(Zhou et al., 2017)	2017
Art. 118	Integration of inland and coastal storms for flood hazard assessment using a distributed hydrologic model	(Karamouz et al., 2017)	2017
Art. 119	Assessing Urban Vulnerability in the Context of Flood and Heat Hazard: Pathways and Challenges for Indicator-Based Analysis	(Krellenberg & Welz, 2017)	2017
Art. 120	An assessment of urban vulnerability in the Amazon Delta and Estuary: a multi-criterion index of flood exposure, socio-economic conditions and infrastructure	(Mansur et al., 2016)	2016
Art. 121	Socio-economic vulnerability of the megacity of Shanghai (China) to sea-level rise and associated storm surges	(Yan et al., 2016)	2016
Art. 122	Regional Risk Assessment addressing the impacts of climate change in the coastal area of the Gulf of Gabes (Tunisia)	(Rizzi et al., 2016)	2016
Art. 123	Holistic approach to flood risk assessment in areas with cultural heritage: a practical application in Ayutthaya, Thailand	(Vojinovic et al., 2016)	2016
Art. 124	Characterizing the multi-risk with respect to plausible natural hazards in the Balasore coast, Odisha, India: a multi-criteria analysis (MCA) appraisal	(Mukhopadhyay et al., 2016)	2016
Art. 125	Social vulnerability assessment of flood risk using GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis. A case study of Vila Nova de Gaia (Portugal)	(Fernandez et al., 2016)	2016
Art. 126	An integrated approach of flood risk assessment in the eastern part of Dhaka City	(Gain et al., 2015)	2015
Art. 127	Urban flood vulnerability zoning of Cochin City, southwest coast of India, using remote sensing and GIS	(Sowmya et al., 2015)	2015
Art. 128	A study of evaluating and forecasting watersheds using the flood vulnerability assessment index in Korea	(Baek et al., 2014)	2014
Art. 129	Flood risks in a dynamic urban agglomeration: a conceptual and methodological assessment framework	(Müller, 2013)	2013
Art. 130	Exploring multicriteria flood vulnerability by integrating economic, social and ecological dimensions of flood risk and coping capacity: from a starting point view towards an end point view of vulnerability	(Scheuer et al., 2011)	2011
Art. 131	Flood risks in urbanized areas - multi-sensoral approaches using remotely sensed data for risk assessment	(Taubenböck et al., 2011)	2011

Relationship to other supplementary materials

Additional file 4: Structured dataset of included studies, geospatial indicators, methods, and data sources.

Citation

Users of this supplementary material should cite the associated article and refer to this file as:

Additional file 3: Structured dataset of included studies, geospatial indicators, methods, and data sources.

Harmonising geospatial indicators for flood vulnerability indices: an IPCC-aligned scoping review to support urban flood adaptation planning

Additional file 4: Structured dataset of included studies, geospatial indicators, methods, and data sources.

Purpose of this supplementary file

This supplementary file contains a structured dataset of 2,437 geospatial indicators extracted from 131 studies included in the scoping review. It was developed to support the transparent comparison, reuse and further development of Flood Vulnerability Indices (FVIs).

The database follows a parameter-oriented structure that enables systematic cross-study analysis of geospatial indicators, methodological approaches and associated data sources. Variables are organised into five thematic blocks covering: (i) study characteristics and conceptual framework; (ii) IPCC AR6 climate dimensions, thematic domains and indicators; (iii) population focus and FVI composition; (iv) methodological and spatial implementation; and (v) data-source metadata. Together, these components provide a consistent, interoperable and reusable framework for examining how FVIs are constructed and operationalised across different geographic contexts.

Content

Section AF4.1: Overview of the reviewed studies.

Section AF4.2: Structured dataset of included studies, geospatial indicators, methods, and data sources.

Table Legends:

	Hazard
	Exposure
	Adaptive Capacity
	Sensitivity

Note 1: A detailed description of the database structure is provided in Additional file 2, Item 5 (Database structure).

Note 2: Study ID corresponds to the unique numerical identifier assigned to each reviewed study in Additional file 3 (Overview of studies included in the scoping review), enabling direct cross-referencing throughout the supplementary materials.

Relationship to other supplementary materials

Additional file 2: Search strategy and database structure.

Additional file 3: Overview of studies included in the scoping review (n = 131).

Citation

Users of this supplementary material should cite the associated article and refer to this file as:

Additional file 4: Structured dataset of included studies, geospatial indicators, methods, and data sources.

SUBMISSION NOTE: In accordance with the journal's initial submission requirements, Additional file 4 is provided in PDF format for the initial submission. Upon acceptance, Additional file 4 will be supplied in its native Microsoft Excel (.xlsx) format to enable filtering, querying and reuse of the structured database in accordance with the FAIR principles

List of Abbreviations

AHP: Analytic Hierarchy Process

ALOS: Advanced Land Observing Satellite

AOC: Ability to Organize and Coordinate

AR4: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report

AR5: IPCC Fifth Assessment Report

AR6: IPCC Sixth Assessment Report

ASTER GDEM: Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer Global Digital Elevation Model

AW3D30: ALOS World 3D 30 m Digital Surface Model

CORINE: Coordination of Information on the Environment

DEM: Digital Elevation Model

DTR: Diurnal Temperature Range

ESA: European Space Agency

FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

FAIR: Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable

FVI: Flood Vulnerability Index

GBI: Green–Blue Infrastructure

GCMs: Global Climate Models

GDP: Gross Domestic Product

GIS: Geographic Information System

GVA: Gross Value Added

HH: Household

IDW: Inverse Distance Weighting

IMD: Index of Multiple Deprivation

IPCC: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

IRS: Indian Remote Sensing Satellite

ISRO: Indian Space Research Organisation

JAXA: Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency

LISS III: Linear Imaging Self-Scanning Sensor III

LULC: Land Use and Land Cover

MCDA: Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis

MSI: Multi Spectral Instrument

NASA: National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NSE: Nash–Sutcliffe Efficiency

ODI: Open Development Initiative

OLI/TIRS: Operational Land Imager/Thermal Infrared Sensor

OSM: OpenStreetMap

PALSAR: Phased Array L-band Synthetic Aperture Radar

PCA: Principal Component Analysis

PD: Population Density

PET: Potential Evapotranspiration

PP: Precipitation

PRISMA-ScR: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews

RQ: Research Question

SAR: Synthetic Aperture Radar

Sentinel-1: Sentinel-1 Synthetic Aperture Radar Mission

Sentinel-2: Sentinel-2 Multispectral Mission

SLT: Short Lag Time

SN: Social Networks

SRTM: Shuttle Radar Topography Mission

TAR: Third Assessment Report (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change)

TWI: Topographic Wetness Index

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

USGS: United States Geological Survey

WEF: World Economic Forum

WHO: World Health Organization

WorldPop: WorldPop Gridded Population Dataset

WRF: Weather Research and Forecasting Model

[illegible]

816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	87																																																																																																																										

[illegible]

[illegible]

References: reviewed studies.

- Abdrabo, K., Kantoush, S., Esmail, A., Saber, M., Sumi, T., Almamari, M., Elboshy, B., & Ghoniem, S. (2023). An integrated indicator-based approach for constructing an urban flood vulnerability index as an urban decision-making tool using the PCA and AHP techniques: A case study of Alexandria, Egypt. *Urban Climate*, 48, 19, Article 101426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2023.101426>
- Adeyemi, A. B., & Komolafe, A. A. (2025). Flood hazard zones prediction using machine-learning-based geospatial approach in lower Niger River basin, Nigeria [Article]. *Natural Hazards Research*, 5(2), 399–412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nhres.2025.01.002>
- Afifi, M. M., Mokhtar Khalifa, A. A., Wahaab, R. A., Moukhtar, I., & Elalfy, E. (2023). Estimation of the flood vulnerability index (FVI) for Alexandria city-Egypt: A case study [Article]. *Journal of Engineering Sciences*, 51(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.21608/JESAUN.2023.189225.1201>
- Agrawal, R., Singh, S., Kanga, S., Sajan, B., Meraj, G., & Kumar, P. (2024). Advancing Flood Risk Assessment through Integrated Hazard Mapping: A Google Earth Engine-Based Approach for Comprehensive Scientific Analysis and Decision Support. *Journal of Climate Change*, 10(1), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.3233/jcc240007>
- Ahmed, A., Huo, A., Yang, L., Zhao, Z., Memon, S., Abuarab, M., & Elbeltagi, A. (2025). Assessment of flood risk based on CMIP6 for the Northern foothills of Qinling mountain. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 156(4), 16, Article 232. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-025-05464-5>
- Ajjur, S., & Mogheir, Y. (2020). Flood hazard mapping using a multi-criteria decision analysis and GIS (case study Gaza Governorate, Palestine). *Arabian Journal of Geosciences*, 13(2), 11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-019-5024-6>
- Alam, N., Saha, S., Gupta, S., & Chatterjee, A. (2023). Settlement suitability analysis of a riverine floodplain in the perspective of GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 30(24), 66002–66020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-26985-4>
- Ali, A., Waheed, W., Khan, U. A., Ullah, S., Ali, A., Jan, M. A., Bhatti, A. S., & Jan, Q. (2024). Assessment of multi-components and sectoral vulnerability to urban floods in Peshawar – Pakistan [Article]. *Natural Hazards Research*, 4(3), 507–519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nhres.2023.12.012>
- Alif, M. S. A., Marma, M. E. S., Hassan, M. N., Jahan, C. S., Howlader, R., Sarker, T., Rasel, M. I. A., Alom Mahim, M. M., Roy, R., & Mazumder, Q. H. (2025). Flash flood risk zoning in Gomti River Basin in Eastern Bangladesh and Tripura State (India) using MCDM-GIS Tool [Article]. *Safety in Extreme Environments*, 7(2), Article 7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42797-025-00120-7>
- Allen, T. R., Crawford, T., Montz, B. E., Whitehead, J., Lovelace, S., Hanks, A. D., Christensen, A. R., & Kearney, G. D. (2019). Linking Water Infrastructure, Public Health, and Sea Level Rise: Integrated Assessment of Flood Resilience in Coastal Cities [Article]. *Public Works Management and Policy*, 24(1), 110–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087724X18798380>
- Alves, R., Rudke, A., Souza, S., dos Santos, M., & Martins, J. (2024). Flood vulnerability mapping in an urban area with high levels of impermeable coverage in southern Brazil. *Regional Environmental Change*, 24(3), 16, Article 96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-024-02258-9>
- Alwathaf, Y., Al-Areeq, A., Al-Masnay, Y., Al-Aizari, A., & Al-Areeq, N. (2025). Enhancing flood susceptibility mapping in Sana'a, Yemen with random forest and eXtreme gradient boosting algorithms. *Geocarto International*, 40(1), 25, Article 2482707. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10106049.2025.2482707>
- Anucharn, T., Chaikaew, N., Sriprom, T., & Iamchuen, N. (2025). Cloud-Powered Flood Mapping and Impact Assessment: Leveraging Sentinel-1 SAR Imagery for Thailand's Disaster Response [Article]. *International Journal of Geoinformatics*, 21(5), 95–122. <https://doi.org/10.52939/ijg.v21i5.4165>
- Aroca-Jimenez, E., Bodoque, J., Garcia, J., & Diez-Herrero, A. (2017). Construction of an integrated social vulnerability index in urban areas prone to flash flooding. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 17(9), 1541–1557. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-17-1541-2017>

- Badamosi, A. P., Olutumise, A. I., Olukoya Obafemi, O. P., Adegoroye, A., & Aturamu, O. A. (2024). Socioeconomic impacts of flooding and its coping strategies in Nigeria: Evidence from Dagiri community, Gwagwalada area council of Abuja [Article]. *Natural Hazards Research*, 4(3), 374–386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nhres.2023.09.010>
- Baeck, S., Choi, S., Choi, G., & Lee, D. (2014). A study of evaluating and forecasting watersheds using the flood vulnerability assessment index in Korea. *Geomatics Natural Hazards & Risk*, 5(3), 208–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2013.803268>
- Bersi, M., Saibi, H., Abdelrahman, K., Fnais, M., & Saber, M. (2025). Remote sensing and climatic data for flood impact assessment in Al-Ain (UAE). *Scientific Reports*, 15(1), 17, Article 26182. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-12234-w>
- Bhuiyan, T., Er, A., Muhamad, N., & Pereira, J. (2021). The socioeconomic impact of climate-related hazards: flash flood impact assessment in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. *Natural Hazards*, 109(2), 1509–1538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-021-04887-3>
- Bin, L., Xu, K., Pan, H., Zhuang, Y., & Shen, R. (2023). Urban flood risk assessment characterizing the relationship among hazard, exposure, and vulnerability. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 30(36), 86463–86477. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-28578-7>
- Bottoms, B., Arbit, J., Lewis, E., & Young, A. J. (2024). Towards urban place-based resilience modeling: Mixed methods for a flood resilience assessment index. *Environment and Planning B-Urban Analytics and City Science*, 51(7), 1563–1580. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23998083241243104>
- Bourlier, B., Taillandier, F., Heinzlef, C., Serre, D., & Curt, C. (2025). Spatial Assessment of Territorial Resilience to Floods Using Comprehensive Indicators: Application to Greater Papeete (French Polynesia). *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 18(1), 20, Article e70005. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfr3.70005>
- Broekman, C., Coetzee, C., & Cilliers, D. (2025). Mapping pluralistic future flood risk scenarios for informal settlements in the eThekweni metropolitan municipality, South Africa. *Natural Hazards*, 121(18), 20949–20983. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-025-07581-w>
- Brunetta, G., Caldarice, O., & Faravelli, M. (2022). Mainstreaming climate resilience: A GIS-based methodology to cope with cloudbursts in Turin, Italy. *Environment and Planning B-Urban Analytics and City Science*, 49(5), 1431–1447, Article 23998083221076500. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23998083221076500>
- Cangüzel, A., & Hepcan, C. (2024). Climate change vulnerability assessment of Karşıyaka, İzmir. *Natural Hazards*, 120(15), 14869–14888. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-024-06798-5>
- Chandole, V., Joshi, G., & Srivastava, V. (2024). Flood risk mapping under changing climate in Lower Tapi river basin, India. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*, 38(6), 2231–2259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-024-02677-4>
- Cian, F., Giupponi, C., & Marconcini, M. (2021). Integration of earth observation and census data for mapping a multi-temporal flood vulnerability index: a case study on Northeast Italy. *Natural Hazards*, 106(3), 2163–2184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-021-04535-w>
- Cortès, M., Llasat, M. C., Gilabert, J., Llasat-Botija, M., Turco, M., Marcos-Matamoros, R., Martín-Vide, J. P., & Falcón, L. (2018). Towards a better understanding of the evolution of the flood risk in Mediterranean urban areas: the case of Barcelona [Article]. *Natural Hazards*, 93, 39–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-3014-0>
- da Silva Junior, U. J., da Pacheco, A., Ruiz-Armenteros, A. M., da Silva Junior, J. A., Wickenhäuser, J., da Silva, T. R. F., Pinto, L. B., de Paiva, A. L. R., de Oliveira, L. M. M., & Santos, S. M. (2025). A methodological approach to flood dynamics based on satellite-derived spectral indices and altimetric forecast models: a case study in Southern Brazil [Article]. *Science of the Total Environment*, 1003, Article 180686. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2025.180686>
- Dai, Z., Arabameri, A., Yariyan, P., Naqvi, H., & Nasrin, T. (2025). Optimizing Flood Susceptibility Detection Using Ensemble Learning Methods. *Water Resources Management*, 39(13), 7109–7132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-025-04288-2>

- Darabi, H., Haghighi, A., Rahmati, O., Shahrood, A., Rouzbeh, S., Pradhan, B., & Bui, D. (2021). A hybridized model based on neural network and swarm intelligence-grey wolf algorithm for spatial prediction of urban flood-inundation. *Journal of Hydrology*, 603, 11, Article 126854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.126854>
- Darnkachatarn, S., & Kajitani, Y. (2024). Long-term flood exposure assessment using satellite-based land use change detection and inundation simulation: A 30-year case study of the Bangkok Metropolitan Region. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 17(3), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfr3.12997>
- Das, A., & Sahoo, S. (2025). Impact of land use and climate change on urban flooding: a case study of Bhubaneswar city in India. *Natural Hazards*, 121(7), 8655–8674. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-025-07130-5>
- Das, B., Ray, T. K., & Boral, E. (2025). Identification of urban waterlogging risk zones using Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP): a case of Agartala city [Article]. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 197(3), Article 322. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-025-13725-z>
- Debnath, J., Debbarma, J., Debnath, A., Meraj, G., Chand, K., Singh, S., Kanga, S., Kumar, P., Sahariah, D., & Saikia, A. (2024). Flood susceptibility assessment of the Agartala Urban Watershed, India, using Machine Learning Algorithm. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 196(2), 21, Article 110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-023-12240-3>
- Dwarakish, G., Pai, B., & Rajeesh, R. (2024). Urban Flood Hazard Zonation in Bengaluru Urban District, India. *Journal of Landscape Ecology*, 17(1), 89–106. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jlecol-2024-0006>
- Ebodé, V., Onguéné, R., Marie, G., Mfoumeyeng, G., Eloumala, P., Mbi, O., & Tedongmo, L. (2025). Vulnerability of Populations to Flooding and Marine Submersion in the Wouri Estuary (Cameroon), in the Context of Climate Change. *Estuaries and Coasts*, 48(1), 15, Article 28. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-024-01446-4>
- Elboshy, B., Kanae, S., GamalEldin, M., Ayad, H., Osaragi, T., & Elbarki, W. (2019). A framework for pluvial flood risk assessment in Alexandria considering the coping capacity [Article]. *Environment Systems and Decisions*, 39(1), 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-018-9684-7>
- Elliot, T., Torres-Matallana, J. A., & Teebken, J. (2025). Corrigendum to ‘urbanization under extreme climate events leads to synchronized decreases in flood protection and increases in vulnerability’ cities volume 160 (2025) 1–11/105827 (Cities (2025) 160, (S0264275125001271), (10.1016/j.cities.2025.105827)) [Erratum]. *Cities*, 165, Article 106124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2025.106124>
- Enomah, L., Downs, J., Mbaigoto, N., Fonda, B., & Umar, M. (2024). Flood risk assessment in Limbe (Cameroon) using a GIS weighed sum method. *Environment Development and Sustainability*, 26(11), 29725–29744. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-03836-3>
- Fernandez, P., Mourato, S., & Moreira, M. (2016). Social vulnerability assessment of flood risk using GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis. A case study of Vila Nova de Gaia (Portugal). *Geomatics Natural Hazards & Risk*, 7(4), 1367–1389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2015.1052021>
- Figueiredo, R., Rangel-Parra, R., Bussi, G., Ceresa, P., Coccia, G., & Martina, M. (2024). A semi-quantitative multi-hazard risk assessment framework for European coastal urban areas. *Geomatics Natural Hazards & Risk*, 15(1), 37, Article 2378994. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2024.2378994>
- Gain, A., Mojtahed, V., Biscaro, C., Balbi, S., & Giupponi, C. (2015). An integrated approach of flood risk assessment in the eastern part of Dhaka City. *Natural Hazards*, 79(3), 1499–1530. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1911-7>
- Gao, Y., Lu, H., Zhang, Y., Jin, H., Wu, S., Gao, Y., & Zhang, S. (2025). Evaluating Yangtze River Delta Urban Agglomeration flood risk using a hybrid method of automated machine learning and analytic hierarchy process. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 25(9), 3087–3108. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-25-3087-2025>
- Garbutt, K., Ellul, C., & Fujiyama, T. (2015). Mapping social vulnerability to flood hazard in Norfolk, England [Review]. *Environmental Hazards-Human and Policy Dimensions*, 14(2), 156–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17477891.2015.1028018>
- George, A., Sharma, P., & Pradhan, K. (2023). Rural-urban disparities in spatiotemporal pattern of vulnerability to climate change: a study of Madhya Pradesh, India. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 82(24), 25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-023-11274-7>

- Ghanem, M. A. A. N., & Zaifoglu, H. (2024). A geospatial analysis of flood risk zones in Cyprus: insights from statistical and multi-criteria decision analysis methods [Article]. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 31(22), 32875–32900. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-024-33391-x>
- Ghosh, M., Paul, S., Ghosh, S., & Karmakar, S. (2025). Assessment of Rainfall Forecasts and Flood Risk in a Coastal Urban Catchment Considering Different Urban Canopy Scenarios. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 18(1), 16, Article e70028. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfr3.70028>
- Giannakidou, C., Diakoulaki, D., & Memos, C. (2019). Implementing a Flood Vulnerability Index in urban coastal areas with industrial activity. *Natural Hazards*, 97(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-019-03629-w>
- Gul, E. (2025). Urban flood hazard assessment using FLA-optimized boost algorithms in Ankara, Türkiye. *Applied Water Science*, 15(4), 21, Article 78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13201-025-02424-2>
- Hamidi, A., Wang, J., Guo, S., & Zeng, Z. (2020). Flood vulnerability assessment using MOVE framework: a case study of the northern part of district Peshawar, Pakistan. *Natural Hazards*, 101(2), 385–408. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-020-03878-0>
- Hategekimana, Y., Yu, L., Nie, Y., Zhu, J., Liu, F., & Guo, F. (2018). Integration of multi-parametric fuzzy analytic hierarchy process and GIS along the UNESCO World Heritage: a flood hazard index, Mombasa County, Kenya. *Natural Hazards*, 92(2), 1137–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3244-9>
- Huq, M., Cheng, Q., Altan, O., Shueb, A., Hossain, M., Sarker, M., Saleem, N., Javed, A., Longg, X., Al Dughairi, A., Rana, M., Al Mamun, A., & Rahman, M. (2020). Assessing vulnerability for inhabitants of Dhaka City considering flood-hazard exposure. *Geofizika*, 37(2), 97–130. <https://doi.org/10.15233/gfz.2020.37.5>
- Izere, D., Li, L., Mind'je, R., Kayiranga, A., Umwali, E., Nzabarinda, V., Muhirwa, F., Maniraho, A., Niyomugabo, P., Mupenzi, C., Nizigiyimana, D., & Rugaba, Y. (2024). Suitability Analysis for Resettlement Potential Sites of Flood Vulnerable Community in Kigali city, Rwanda. *Earth Systems and Environment*, 8(2), 521–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41748-024-00387-z>
- Kaoje, I., Rahman, M., Tam, T., Salleh, M., Idris, N., & Omar, A. (2021). An Indicator-Based Approach for Micro-Scale Assessment of Physical Flood Vulnerability of Individual Buildings. *International Journal of Built Environment and Sustainability*, 8(2), 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.11113/ijbes.v8.n2.700>
- Karamouz, M., Razmi, A., Nazif, S., & Zahmatkesh, Z. (2017). Integration of inland and coastal storms for flood hazard assessment using a distributed hydrologic model. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 76(11), 17, Article 395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-017-6722-6>
- Kaur, M., Sultana, S., Ishaq, S., Saleem, S., Nahiduzzaman, K. M., Hewage, K., & Sadiq, R. (2025). Building a flood vulnerability index for urban resilience: Insights from Kelowna, British Columbia [Article]. *Journal of Urban Management*, 14(4), 1034–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jum.2025.04.002>
- Kaushik, K., Pandey, A., Parida, B., & Dwivedi, C. (2025). Geoinformatics-based watershed-level flood hazard analysis using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process across the Ganga-Brahmaputra basin. *Journal of Earth System Science*, 134(3), 22, Article 169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-025-02612-3>
- Kirugumi, G., & Reyes, M. (2025). Assessing Adaptive Capacity of Urban Coastal Communities to Flooding: The Case of La Paz District, Philippines. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA*, 16(2), 205–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09754253251397216>
- Krellenberg, K., & Welz, J. (2017). Assessing Urban Vulnerability in the Context of Flood and Flood Hazard: Pathways and Challenges for Indicator-Based Analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, 132(2), 709–731. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1324-3>
- Kumar, M., Tandon, S., Bassi, N., Mohanty, P., Kumar, S., & Mohandas, M. (2022). A framework for risk-based assessment of urban floods in coastal cities. *Natural Hazards*, 110(3), 2035–2057. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-021-05024-w>
- Kumar, P., Thakur, S., Ashwani, Ambrish, Rai, A., & Sandylya, U. (2024). Urban waterlogging risk susceptibility within changing pattern of rainfall intensity in Delhi, India. *Acta Geophysica*, 72(6), 4525–4543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11600-024-01336-0>

- Kumar, V., Rashiq, A., & Prakash, O. (2025). Integrated flood risk prediction and zonation in bihar: observations from climate change projection using GIS-based AHP-Multicriteria approach. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 156(9), 19, Article 468. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-025-05669-8>
- Kumari, N., Dhiman, R., Krishnankutty, M., & Kalbar, P. (2024). Localising vulnerability assessment to urban floods: A comparative analysis of top-down and bottom-up geospatial approaches in Patna City, India. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 100, 19, Article 104230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2023.104230>
- Kwang, C., Yeboah, E., Mensah, A., Sarfo, I., Nikoi, E., Batame, M., Okrah, A., Anaba, C., Antwi, A., & Amoako, J. (2025). Resilient coasts: A holistic approach to flood risk assessment and mitigation on the East Coast of Ghana. *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 29(6), 21, Article 66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-025-01147-5>
- Kwon, H. Y., & Kang, Y. O. (2016). Risk analysis and visualization for detecting signs of flood disaster in Twitter [Article]. *Spatial Information Research*, 24(2), 127–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41324-016-0014-1>
- Laino, E., & Iglesias, G. (2024). Multi-hazard assessment of climate-related hazards for European coastal cities. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 357, 18, Article 120787. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.120787>
- Li, G., Liu, J., & Shao, W. (2023). Urban flood risk assessment under rapid urbanization in Zhengzhou City, China. *Regional Sustainability*, 4(3), 332–348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsus.2023.08.004>
- Liu, C., Ku, C., Tsai, M., & You, J. (2025). AI-Driven GIS Modeling of Future Flood Risk and Susceptibility for Typhoon Krathon under Climate Change. *Cmes-Computer Modeling in Engineering & Sciences*, 144(3), 2969–2990. <https://doi.org/10.32604/cmes.2025.070663>
- Liu, F., & Masago, Y. (2025). Assessing the geographical diversity of climate change risks in Japan by overlaying climatic impacts with exposure and vulnerability indicators [Article]. *Science of the Total Environment*, 959, Article 178076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.178076>
- Liu, T., Sun, S., Wang, N., Wang, R., Zheng, P., & Wang, H. (2025). Flood risk assessment under land use dynamics during 2000–2020 in the yellow river basin, China [Article]. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 84(18), Article 513. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-025-12526-4>
- Lv, H., Guan, X., & Meng, Y. (2020). Comprehensive evaluation of urban flood-bearing risks based on combined compound fuzzy matter-element and entropy weight model. *Natural Hazards*, 103(2), 1823–1841. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-020-04056-y>
- Mann, R., & Gupta, A. (2023). Mapping flood vulnerability using an analytical hierarchy process (AHP) in the Metropolis of Mumbai. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 195(12), 25, Article 1534. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-023-12141-5>
- Mansur, A., Brondízio, E., Roy, S., Hetrick, S., Vogt, N., & Newton, A. (2016). An assessment of urban vulnerability in the Amazon Delta and Estuary: a multi-criterion index of flood exposure, socio-economic conditions and infrastructure. *Sustainability Science*, 11(4), 625–643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-016-0355-7>
- Membele, G., Naidu, M., & Mutanga, O. (2024). Application of analytic network process (ANP), local and indigenous knowledge in mapping flood vulnerability in an informal settlement. *Natural Hazards*, 120(3), 2929–2951. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-023-06313-2>
- Miah, J., Hossain, K., Hossain, M., & Najia, S. (2020). Assessing coastal vulnerability of Chittagong District, Bangladesh using geospatial techniques. *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 24(6), 18, Article 66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-020-00784-2>
- Miguez, M., & Veról, A. (2017). A catchment scale Integrated Flood Resilience Index to support decision making in urban flood control design. *Environment and Planning B-Urban Analytics and City Science*, 44(5), 925–946. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265813516655799>
- Mohamed, S., & El-Raey, M. (2020). Vulnerability assessment for flash floods using GIS spatial modeling and remotely sensed data in El-Arish City, North Sinai, Egypt. *Natural Hazards*, 102(2), 707–728. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-019-03571-x>

- Mshelia, Z. H., Nyam, Y. S., Jose Moisés, D. J., & Belle, J. A. (2024). Geospatial analysis of flood risk hazard in Zambezi Region, Namibia [Article]. *Environmental Challenges*, 15, Article 100915. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2024.100915>
- Mudashiru, R., Sabtu, N., Abdullah, R., Saleh, A., & Abustan, I. (2022). A comparison of three multi-criteria decision-making models in mapping flood hazard areas of Northeast Penang, Malaysia. *Natural Hazards*, 112(3), 1903–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-022-05250-w>
- Mukhopadhyay, A., Hazra, S., Mitra, D., Hutton, C., Chanda, A., & Mukherjee, S. (2016). Characterizing the multi-risk with respect to plausible natural hazards in the Balasore coast, Odisha, India: a multi-criteria analysis (MCA) appraisal. *Natural Hazards*, 80(3), 1495–1513. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-2035-9>
- Müller, A. (2013). Flood risks in a dynamic urban agglomeration: a conceptual and methodological assessment framework. *Natural Hazards*, 65(3), 1931–1950. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-012-0453-5>
- Mulu, A., Kassa, S., Wossene, M., Adefris, S., & Meshesha, T. (2025). Identification of flood vulnerability areas using analytical hierarchy process techniques in the Wuseta watershed, Upper Blue Nile Basin, Ethiopia. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1), 20, Article 28680. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-13822-6>
- Mwalwimba, I., Manda, M., & Ngongondo, C. (2024). Flood vulnerability assessment in rural and urban informal settlements: case study of Karonga District and Lilongwe City in Malawi. *Natural Hazards*, 120(11), 10141–10184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-024-06601-5>
- Naba, C., Ishidaira, H., Magome, J., & Souma, K. (2023). ANALYSIS OF FLOOD-POVERTY RELATIONSHIP IN BURKINA FASO USING REMOTELY SENSED NIGHTTIME LIGHT [Article]. *Journal of Japan Society of Civil Engineers*, 11(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.2208/JOURNALOFJSCE.23-27035>
- Narendr, A., Das, S., Shivamurthy, V., & Aithal, B. H. (2020). Adaptive Capacity Assessment for A Flood Vulnerable Region through Land Use Modelling and Socio Economic and Physical Indicators [Article]. *Journal of Environmental Informatics Letters*, 3(2), 107–119. <https://doi.org/10.3808/jeil.202000031>
- Nawrotzki, R., Tebeck, M., Harten, S., & Blankenagel, V. (2023). Climate change vulnerability hotspots in Costa Rica: constructing a sub-national index. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, 13(3), 473–499. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-023-00831-y>
- Nazrul, F., Karim, M., Pavan, W., & Kamruzzaman, M. (2025). Future Climate Extremes in Bangladesh: Insights from a Multi-Model Ensemble of CMIP6 Simulations [; Early Access]. *Earth Systems and Environment*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41748-025-00681-4>
- Pathan, A. I., Agnihotri, P., Said, S., & Patel, D. (2022). AHP and TOPSIS based flood risk assessment- a case study of the Navsari City, Gujarat, India [Article]. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 194(7), Article 509. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-022-10111-x>
- Percival, S., & Teeuw, R. (2019). A methodology for urban micro-scale coastal flood vulnerability and risk assessment and mapping. *Natural Hazards*, 97(1), 355–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-019-03648-7>
- Pham, Q., Ali, S., Bielecka, E., Calka, B., Orych, A., Parvin, F., & Lupikasza, E. (2022). Flood vulnerability and buildings' flood exposure assessment in a densely urbanised city: comparative analysis of three scenarios using a neural network approach. *Natural Hazards*, 113(2), 1043–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-022-05336-5>
- Phi, N. Q., Hoa, P. T. M., Tuan, T. A., & Cúc, N. T. (2025). Coastal Flood Vulnerability and Spatial Risk Assessment for Small Island Urban of Cat Ba Town, Northern Vietnam [Article]. *International Journal of Geoinformatics*, 21(10), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.52939/ijg.v21i10.4537>
- Pinskwar, I., Chorynski, A., & Graczyk, D. (2023). Risk of Flash Floods in Urban and Rural Municipalities Triggered by Intense Precipitation in Wielkopolska of Poland. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, 14(3), 440–457. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-023-00493-y>
- Raduszynski, T., & Numada, M. (2023). Measure and spatial identification of social vulnerability, exposure and risk to natural hazards in Japan using open data. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 13, Article 664. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-27831-w>

- Rahman, M., Aldosary, A., Nahiduzzaman, K., & Reza, I. (2016). Vulnerability of flash flooding in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Natural Hazards*, 84(3), 1807–1830. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-016-2521-8>
- Rana, I., & Routray, J. (2018a). Integrated methodology for flood risk assessment and application in urban communities of Pakistan. *Natural Hazards*, 91(1), 239–266. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-3124-8>
- Rana, I., & Routray, J. (2018b). Multidimensional Model for Vulnerability Assessment of Urban Flooding: An Empirical Study in Pakistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, 9(3), 359–375. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-018-0179-4>
- Ribeiro, P., Ferrão, J., & Seixas, J. (2018). Mainstreaming climate adaptation in spatial planning. The case of Baixa Pombalina in Lisbon [Article]. *Finisterra*, 53(108), 15–38. <https://doi.org/10.18055/finis13457>
- Rizzi, J., Gallina, V., Torresan, S., Critto, A., Gana, S., & Marcomini, A. (2016). Regional Risk Assessment addressing the impacts of climate change in the coastal area of the Gulf of Gabes (Tunisia). *Sustainability Science*, 11(3), 455–476. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-015-0344-2>
- Ronco, P., Gallina, V., Torresan, S., Zabeo, A., Semenzin, E., Critto, A., & Marcomini, A. (2014). The KULTURisk Regional Risk Assessment methodology for water-related natural hazards - Part 1: Physical-environmental assessment. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 18(12), 5399–5414. <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-18-5399-2014>
- Roy, A., & Dhar, S. (2025). Multi-hazard Vulnerability Assessment Through RS-GIS and AHP: A Geo-Spatial Study of Keleghai River Basin in India. *International Journal of Environmental Research*, 19(5), 18, Article 199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41742-025-00867-8>
- Sabbaghian, R., Fereshtehpour, M., & Hosseinabad, M. (2025). Integrated hydrologic-economic modeling for urban flood risk mitigation using SWMM, HEC-RAS, and HAZUS: a case study of the Bronx river watershed, NYC. *Sustainable Water Resources Management*, 11(5), 22, Article 97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40899-025-01263-y>
- Santos, P., Pereira, S., Zezere, J., Reis, E., Oliveira, S., Garcia, R., & Ferreira, T. (2024). Understanding flood risk in urban environments: spatial analysis of building vulnerability and hazard areas in the Lisbon metropolitan area [; Early Access]. *Natural Hazards*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-024-06731-w>
- Saodi, R. A., Al Kuisi, M. A., & Salaymeh, A. A. (2023). Assessing the vulnerability of flash floods to climate change in arid zones: Amman–Zarqa Basin, Jordan [Article]. *Journal of Water and Climate Change*, 14(12), 4376–4403. <https://doi.org/10.2166/wcc.2023.237>
- Satour, N., Benyacoub, B., El Moçayd, N., Ennaimani, Z., Niazi, S., Kassou, N., & Kacimi, I. (2023). Machine Learning Enhances Flood Resilience Measurement in a Coastal Area - Case Study of Morocco. *Journal of Environmental Informatics*, 42(1), 53–64. <https://doi.org/10.3808/jei.202300497>
- Satour, N., Raji, O., El Moçayd, N., Kacimi, I., & Kassou, N. (2021). Spatialized flood resilience measurement in rapidly urbanized coastal areas with a complex semi-arid environment in northern Morocco. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 21(3), 1101–1118. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-21-1101-2021>
- Scheuer, S., Haase, D., & Meyer, V. (2011). Exploring multicriteria flood vulnerability by integrating economic, social and ecological dimensions of flood risk and coping capacity: from a starting point view towards an end point view of vulnerability. *Natural Hazards*, 58(2), 731–751. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-010-9666-7>
- Shah, A., Ye, J., Abid, M., Khan, J., & Amir, S. (2018). Flood hazards: household vulnerability and resilience in disaster-prone districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, Pakistan. *Natural Hazards*, 93(1), 147–165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3293-0>
- Sharker, R., Islam, M., Hosen, M., Kader, Z., Aziz, M., Tahera-Tun-Humayra, U., Hossain, M., Pervin, R., Hasan, M., & Roy, A. (2025). GIS-based AHP approach to flood susceptibility assessment in Tangail district, Bangladesh. *Journal of Earth System Science*, 134(1), 15, Article 26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-024-02480-3>
- Sood, A., Vignesh, K., & Prapanchan, V. (2025). Multi-hazard vulnerability zone identification using GIS-based fuzzy AHP and MCDM techniques. *Natural Hazards*, 121(7), 8501–8539. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-025-07125-2>
- Sowmya, K., John, C., & Shrivasthava, N. (2015). Urban flood vulnerability zoning of Cochin City, southwest coast of India, using remote sensing and GIS. *Natural Hazards*, 75(2), 1271–1286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-014-1372-4>

- Sukri, N., Maulud, K., Rahman, S., Jaafar, W., Mohtar, W., Khalid, R., Saudi, A., & Khan, M. (2025). Enhancing Urban Flood Vulnerability Mapping with Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis. *Jurnal Kejuruteraan*, 37(7), 3641–3654. [https://doi.org/10.17576/jkukm-2025-37\(7\)-40](https://doi.org/10.17576/jkukm-2025-37(7)-40)
- Taubenböck, H., Wurm, M., Netzband, M., Zwenzner, H., Roth, A., Rahman, A., & Dech, S. (2011). Flood risks in urbanized areas - multi-sensoral approaches using remotely sensed data for risk assessment. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 11(2), 431–444. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-11-431-2011>
- Tyagi, M., Singh, H., Thakur, D. A., & Prakash Mohanty, M. P. (2024). Compound risks of floods and droughts over multi-hazard catchments: Revealing association through hydrodynamic-cum-statistical modelling and novel bivariate risk classifier [Article]. *Science of the Total Environment*, 957, Article 177689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.177689>
- Ullah, I., Kovacs, G., & Lenner, T. (2025). Impact of climate change on flood risk with urban resilience perspective using fuzzy logic model [Review]. *Earth Science Informatics*, 18(2), 20, Article 346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12145-025-01848-3>
- Ullah, K., Wang, Y., Xi, C., Du, B., Li, P., Liu, T., Hong, S., & Hamed, M. (2025). Multi-Scenario Flood Susceptibility Projections in the Eastern Hindu Kush: Integrating Machine Learning, CMIP6, and Land Use Change [; Early Access]. *Earth Systems and Environment*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41748-025-00793-x>
- Vizireanu, I., Grigoras, G., & Raducanu, D. (2025). Integrating LiDAR, Sentinel-2 data and Bluespot modeling for flood risk mapping in Mihăești, Romania. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 84(16), 13, Article 470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-025-12491-y>
- Vojinovic, Z., Hammond, M., Golub, D., Hirunsalee, S., Weesakul, S., Meesuk, V., Medina, N., Sanchez, A., Kumara, S., & Abbott, M. (2016). Holistic approach to flood risk assessment in areas with cultural heritage: a practical application in Ayutthaya, Thailand. *Natural Hazards*, 81(1), 589–616. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-2098-7>
- Wang, M., Zhao, J., Xiong, Z., Zhang, M., Wang, L., & Tan, S. K. (2025). Strategic deployment of nature-based solutions for urban flood management in high-density urban landscapes [Article]. *Ecological Indicators*, 176, Article 113681. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2025.113681>
- Wang, P., Li, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2021). An urban system perspective on urban flood resilience using SEM: evidence from Nanjing city, China. *Natural Hazards*, 109(3), 2575–2599. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-021-04933-0>
- Wang, Y., Zhai, J., & Song, L. (2021). Waterlogging risk assessment of the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei urban agglomeration in the past 60 years [Article]. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 145(3-4), 1039–1051. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03670-5>
- Waseem, H., & Rana, I. (2025). Understanding urban flood risk perception and its determinants across diverse hazard sources [; Early Access]. *Urban Water Journal*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1573062x.2025.2574877>
- Waseem, M., Ahmad, S., Ahmad, I., Wahab, H., & Leta, M. (2023). Urban flood risk assessment using AHP and geospatial techniques in swat Pakistan. *SN Applied Sciences*, 5(8), 20, Article 215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-023-05445-1>
- Xu, J., Takahashi, M., & Li, W. (2024). Identifying vulnerable populations in urban society: a case study in a flood-prone district of Wuhan, China. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 24(1), 179–197. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-24-179-2024>
- Yadav, N., Wu, J., Banerjee, A., Pathak, S., Garg, R., & Yao, S. (2024). Climate uncertainty and vulnerability of urban flooding associated with regional risk using multi-criteria analysis in Mumbai, India. *Environmental Research*, 244, 13, Article 117962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2023.117962>
- Yan, B., Li, S., Wang, J., Ge, Z., & Zhang, L. (2016). Socio-economic vulnerability of the megacity of Shanghai (China) to sea-level rise and associated storm surges. *Regional Environmental Change*, 16(5), 1443–1456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-015-0878-y>
- Yin, J., Yu, D., & Liao, B. (2021). A city-scale assessment of emergency response accessibility to vulnerable populations and facilities under normal and pluvial flood conditions for Shanghai, China. *Environment and Planning B-Urban Analytics and City Science*, 48(8), 2239–2253, Article 2399808320971304. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808320971304>

- Yosri, A., Ghaith, M., & El-Dakhakhni, W. (2024). Deep learning rapid flood risk predictions for climate resilience planning. *Journal of Hydrology*, 631, 16, Article 130817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2024.130817>
- Zhang, M., Liu, Z., & van Dijk, M. (2019). Measuring urban vulnerability to climate change using an integrated approach, assessing climate risks in Beijing. *PeerJ*, 7, 19, Article e7018. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.7018>
- Zheng, J., & Huang, G. (2023). Towards flood risk reduction: Commonalities and differences between urban flood resilience and risk based on a case study in the Pearl River Delta. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 86, 15, Article 103568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2023.103568>
- Zhou, Q., Leng, G., & Feng, L. (2017). Predictability of state-level flood damage in the conterminous United States: the role of hazard, exposure and vulnerability. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 11, Article 5354. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-05773-4>
- Zhu, S., Li, D., Huang, G., Chhipi-Shrestha, G., Nahiduzzaman, K., Hewage, K., & Sadiq, R. (2021). Enhancing urban flood resilience: A holistic framework incorporating historic worst flood to Yangtze River Delta, China. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 61, 15, Article 102355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102355>