

REFERENCES:

1. Akter, T, Simonovic SP and Salonga J (2004) Aggregation of Input from Stakeholders from Flood Management Decision -Making in the Red River Basin, *Canadian Water Resources Journal*, 29:4, 251-266, DOI: 10.4296/cwrj251.
2. Bakkensen, L. A., Fox-Lent, C., Read, L. K. and Linkov, I.: Validating resilience and vulnerability indices in the context of natural disasters, *Risk Anal.*, 37(5), 982–1004, doi:10.1111/risa.12677, 2017
3. Balica, S. F, Popescu, I., Beevers, L., and Wright, N. G.: Parametric and physically based modelling techniques for flood risk and vulnerability assessment: A comparison, *Environ. Modell. Softw.*, 41, 84–92, 2013.
4. Balica, SF, Douben, N & Wright, NG 2009, ‘Flood vulnerability indices at varying spatial scales’, *Water Science and Technology Journal*, vol. 60, No. 10, pp. 2571–80.
5. Barredo, JI, de Roo, A & Lavalle, C 2007, ‘Flood risk mapping at European scale’, *Water Science and Technology*, vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 11–17.
6. Bharwani, S., Magnuszewski, P., Sendzimir, J., Stein, C. and Downing, T. E.: Vulnerability , adaptation and resilience: Progress toward incorporating VAR concepts into adaptive water resource management., 2008.
7. Bilsel, R.U., Büyüközkan, G., Ruan, D., 2006. A fuzzy preference-ranking model for a quality evaluation of hospital web sites. *Int. J. Intell. Syst.* 21, 1181–1197.
8. Birkmann, J. and Wisner, B.: Measuring the un-measurable: the challenge of vulnerability., 2006.
9. Bora, A.K. (2003), Floods of the Brahmaputra in Assam: A management approach, In: Sabhapandit, P.C. (ed.), *Flood problem of Assam*, Om Sons Pub. New Delhi.]
10. Borah, K.K. (2015) : “A Study of Culture Change Among the Tiwas of Morigaon District of Assam”, Ph. D Thesis, Department of Anthropology, Gauhati University.

11. Bouma, JJ, François, D & Troch, P 2005, 'Risk assessment and water management', *Environmental Modelling & Software*, vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 141–151.
12. Brahma A. K, Dipak Kr. Mitra, Fuzzy AHP and Fuzzy VIKOR Approach modelling for flood control project selection, *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research* ISSN 0973-4562 Volume 14, Number 17 (2019) pp. 3579-3589
13. Brahma A. K., A Look on Some Applications of Fuzzy VIKOR and Fuzzy AHP Methods on Flood Risk, *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research* ISSN 0973-4562 Volume 13, Number 18 (2018) pp. 13689-13696
14. Brans, J.P., Vincke, P., Marescha, B., 1986. How to select and how to rank projects: the PROMETHEE method. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 24, 228–238
15. Brans, J.P., Vincke, P., 1985. A preference ranking organization method. *Manage. Sci.* 31, 647–656.
16. Buckley JJ (1985) Fuzzy hierarchical analysis. *Fuzzy Sets Syst* 17:233–247
17. Buyukozkan, G., & Ruan, D. (2008). Evaluation of software development projects using a Fuzzy multi-criteria decision approach. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 77, 464–475.
18. C. Ting-Yu, "A PROMETHEE-based outranking method for multiple criteria decision analysis with interval type-2 fuzzy sets." *Soft Computing*, 18(5), 2014, pp. 923-940.
19. Cardona, O. D., van Aalst, M. K., Birkmann, J., Fordham, M., McGregor, G., Perez, R., Pulwarty, R. S., Schipper, L. F. and Sinh, B. T.: Determinants of risk: exposure and vulnerability, in *Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation - a special report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)*, pp. 65–108., 2012.
20. Carlos A. Bane E Costa, Paula A D Silva and F N Correia., Multicriteria Evaluation of Flood Control Measures: The Case of Ribeira do Livramento. *Water Resources Management* **18**: 263–283, 2004. *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.*

21. Celik, E., Gul, M., Gumus, A.T., Guneri, A.F., 2012. A fuzzy TOPSIS approach based on trapezoidal numbers to material selection problem. *J. Inf. Technol. Appl. Manage.* 19 (3), 19–30.
22. Chambers, R 1989, Vulnerability: how the poor cope, *IDS Bulletin*, vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 1-7.
23. Chang, C.-L. (2010), A modified vikor method for multiple criteria analysis, *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* **168**, 339–344.
24. Chang, C.L. Evaluation of basin environmental vulnerability: the weighted method compared to the compromise method. *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.* (2013) 10: 1051-1056 DOI: 10.1007/s13762-013-0234-z.
25. Chang, C.L. Hsu, C H., Applying a Modified VIKOR Method to classify Land Subdivision According to Watershed Vulnerability, *Water Resour Manage* (2011) 25: 301-309 DOI: 10.1007/s11269-010-9700-2
26. Chang, C.L. Hsu, C H., Multi-criteria analysis via the VIKOR method for prioritizing land -use restraint strategies in the Tseng-Wen reservoir watershed. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90 (2009) 3226-3230.
27. Chang, D. Y. (1996). Applications of the extent analysis method on Fuzzy AHP. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 95, 649–655.
28. Chen, C. T. (2000). Extensions of the TOPSIS for group decision-making under fuzzy environment. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 114(1), 1–9.
29. Chen, S.J. and Hwang, C.L. (1992), *Fuzzy multiple attribute decision making: methods and applications*, 1st edition, Springer-Verlag, New York.
30. Chen, Shouyu, and Zhaocheng Hou, 2004. Multicriterion Decision Making for Flood Control Operations: Theory and Applications. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association (JAWRA)* 40(1):67-76.
31. Chen, Y.H., Wang, T.C., Wu, C.Y., 2011. Strategic decisions using the fuzzy PROMETHEE for IS outsourcing. *expert Syst. Appl.* 38, 13216–13222.
32. Cheng, C. H. (1997). Evaluating naval tactical missile systems by fuzzy AHP based on the grade value of membership function. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 96(2), pp. 343–350.

33. Chitsaz, N. and Banihabib, M. E.,(2015) Comparison of Different Multi Criteria Decision-Making Models in Prioritizing Flood Management Alternatives, *Water Resour Manage* DOI10.1007/s11269-0954-6
34. Chou, W.C., Lin, W.T., Lin, C.Y., 2007. Application of fuzzy theory and PROMETHEE technique to evaluate suitable ecotechnology method: a case study in Shihmen Reservoir Watershed. *Ecol. Eng.* 31, 269–280.
35. Choudhary, D., & Shankar, R. (2012). An STEEP-fuzzy AHP-TOPSIS framework for evaluation and selection of thermal power plant location: A case study from India. *Energy*, 42(1), 510–521.
36. Coburn, AW, Spencer, JS & Pomoni, A 1994, training manual: vulnerability and risk assessment, 2nd ed., Oast House: UNDP Disaster Management Training Programme.
37. Cred Crunch March 2018, Issue No.50
38. Cutter, S. L., Barnes, L., Berry, M., Burton, C., Evans, E., Tate, E. and Webb, J.: A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters, *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 18(4), 598–606, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.07.013>, 2008.
39. Cutter, SL 1996, *Vulnerability to environmental hazards*, Progress in Human Geography, London.
40. Das, P., Chutiya, D., and Hazarika, N., 2009, “*Adjusting to Floods on the Brahmaputra Plains, Assam, India*” ICIMOD, Aaranyak, Guwahati.
41. Davies, M. A. P. (1994). A multicriteria decision model application for managing group decisions. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 45(1), pp. 47-58.
42. De Brito, M.M Multi-criteria decision-making for flood risk management: a survey of the current state of the art, *Nat. hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 16, 1019-1033,2016, doi; 10.5194/nhess-16-1019-2016
43. Deng H. (1999) Multicriteria analysis with fuzzy pair-wise comparison. *Int J Approx Reason* 21:215–231
44. Dipak Kr. Mitra and Ashoke Kumar Brahma, Fuzzy VIKOR Approach to Identify the Flood Vulnerability Region in Kokrajhar, *Journal of Computer and Mathematical Sciences*, (An International Research Journal) *Vol.9(11),1768-1785 November 2018*, www.compmath-journal.org

45. District Disaster Management plan, Kokrajhar 2011-12, District emergency operation centre 03661-270657
46. Doley, L.C. and Pegu, R., 2015, “*Causes and Problems of Population Displacement of the Mishings of Dhemaji due to Flood Vulnerability*” in International Journal of Scientific Research and Management, May 2015.
47. Duvivier, D., Meskens, N., Ahues, M., 2013. A fast multi-criteria decision-making tool for industrial scheduling problems. *Int. J. Prod. Econ.* 145, 753–760.
48. E. Afful-Dadzie, S. Nabareseh, A. Afful-Dadzie and Z. K. Oplatková, “A fuzzy TOPSIS framework for selecting fragile states for support facility,” *Quali-ty & Quantity*, 2014, pp. 1-21. doi: 10.1007/s11135-014-0062-3
49. Edwards, J., Gustafsson, M. and Näslund-Landenmark, B.: *Handbook for vulnerability mapping*, Stockholm., 2007.
50. Ertuğrul İ. & Karakaşoğlu N., Comparison of fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methods for facility location selection, *Int J Adv Manuf Technol* (2008) 39:783–795 DOI 10.1007/s00170-007-1249-8
51. Fanghua, H et al. A Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Group Decision-Making Model Based on Weighted Borda Scoring Method for Watershed Ecological Risk Management: a Case Study of Three Gorges Reservoir Area of China, *Water Resour Manage* (2010) 24:2139–2165 DOI 10.1007/s11269-009-9544-9
52. Fekete, A.: *Assessment of Social Vulnerability to River Floods in Germany*, UNU-EHS, Bonn., 2010
53. Fuchs, S.: Susceptibility versus resilience to mountain hazards in Austria - paradigms of vulnerability revisited, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 9, 337–352, 2009.
54. Gabor, T & Griffith, TK 1980, ‘The assessment of community vulnerability to acute hazardous material incidents’, *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, vol. 8, pp. 323-22.
55. Gall, M.: *From social vulnerability to resilience: measuring progress toward disaster risk reduction*, UNU, Bonn., 2013.

56. Geldermann, J., Rentz, O., 2001. Integrated technique assessment with imprecise information as a support for the identification of best available techniques. *OR Spektrum* 23, 137–157.
57. Geldermann, J., Spengler, T., Rentz, O., 2000. Fuzzy outranking for environmental assessment. Case study: iron and steel making industry. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 115, 45–65.
58. Generino P. Siddayao, Sony E. Valdez, and Proceso L. Fernandez, “Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) in Spatial Modeling for Floodplain Risk Assessment”, *International Journal of Machine Learning and Computing*, Vol. 4, No. 5, October 2014
59. George J.K.Hr, Bo Yuan, “Fuzzy sets and fuzzy logic theory and applications”, Prentice- Hall of India, 1997.
60. Gershon, M., Duckstein, L., 1983. Multi objective approaches to river basin planning. *J. Water Resources Planning Management* 109 (1), 13-28.
61. Godfrey, A., Ciurean, R. L., van Westen, C. J., Kingma, N. C. and Glade, T.: Assessing vulnerability of buildings to hydro-meteorological hazards using an expert based approach – An application in Nehoiu Valley, Romania, *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.*, 13, 229–241, doi:10.1016/j.ijdr.2015.06.001, 2015a.
62. Gul, M., Celik, E., Aydin, N., Gumus, A.T., Guneri, A.F., 2016. A state of the art literature review of VIKOR and its fuzzy extensions on applications. *Appl. SoftComput.* 46, 60–89.
63. H. Sonia and N. Halouani, "Hesitant-fuzzy-promethee method." In *Modeling, Simulation and Applied Optimization (ICMSAO)*, 2013 5th International Conference on, pp. 1-6. IEEE, 2013.
64. Hajkowicz, S. and Collins, K.: A review of multiple criteria analysis for water resource planning and management, *Water Resour. Manag.*, 21(9), 1553–1566, doi:10.1007/s11269-006-9112-5, 2007.
65. Hinkel, J.: “Indicators of vulnerability and adaptive capacity”: Towards a clarification of the science–policy interface, *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 21(1), 198–208, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.08.002, 2011.

66. Hoggan, D. H., *Floodplain Hydrology and Hydraulics*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1997. Hydrologic Engineering Center, *HEC-1 Flood Hydrograph Package: User's Manual and Programmer's Manual* (updated 1985), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, CA. 1981.
67. Hsieh T. Y, Lu S.T. and Tzeng G. H. Fuzzy MCDM approach for planning and design tenders selection in public office buildings , *International Journal of Project Management* 22 (2004) 573–584, doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2004.01.002
68. Hwang, C.L., ve Yoon, K., 1981. *Multiple Attribute Decision Making- Methods and Applications: A State of the Art Survey*. Springer, New York.
69. IPCC 2007, 'Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change', Forth assessment report: Climate Change 2007.
70. IPCC 2014, 'Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change', Fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change.
71. J. P. Vincke and Ph Brans, "A preference ranking organization method. The PROMETHEE method for MCDM," *Management Science* 31(6), 1985, pp. 647-656
72. Jongman, B., Winsemius, H. C., Aerts, J. C. J. H., Coughlan de Perez, E., van Aalst, M. K., Kron, W. and Ward, P. J.: Declining vulnerability to river floods and the global benefits of adaptation, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 201414439, doi:10.1073/pnas.1414439112, 2015
73. Ju, Y and Wang A., Extension of VIKOR method for multi- criteria group decision making problem with linguistic information, *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 37(2013) 3112-3125
74. Kahraman, C., Cebeci, U., & Ruan, D. (2004). Multi-attribute comparison of catering service companies using Fuzzy AHP: The case of Turkey. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 87, 171–184.
75. Khan, M.H., 2012, "River Erosion and Its Sicio-Economic Impact in Barpeta District with Special Reference to Mandia Dev. Block of Assam", *The International Journal of Engineering and Science (IJES)*, Vol.I.

76. Kilincci, O., & Onal, S. (2011). Fuzzy AHP approach for supplier selection in a washing machine company. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38, 9656–9664.
77. Kim, Y and Um, M-J. Prioritizing alternatives in strategic environmental assessment (SEA) using VIKOR method with random sampling for data gaps, *Expert system with applications* (2015) doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2015.07.010
78. Kim, Y. and Chung, E. S.: Fuzzy VIKOR approach for assessing the vulnerability of the water supply to climate change and variability in South Korea, *App. Math. Model*, 37, 9419–9430, 2013a.
79. Kim, Y., and Chung, E-S. Robust prioritization of climate change adaptation strategies using the VIKOR method with objective weights, *Journal of the American water resources Association* Vol. 51, No. 5 (1167- 1182)
80. Klein, RJT & Nicholls, RJ 1999, ‘Assessment of coastal vulnerability to climate change’, *AMBIO*, vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 182-187.
81. Ko, S.K., Fontane, D.G., Margeta, J., 1994. Multiple reservoir system operational planning using multi-criterion decision analysis. *European J. Oper. Res.* 76, 428-439.
82. Koks, E. E., Jongman, B., Husby, T. G. and Botzen, W. J. W.: Combining hazard, exposure and social vulnerability to provide lessons for flood risk management, *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 47, 42–52, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2014.10.013, 2015
83. L. Wei-xiang and B. Li, "An extension of the Promethee II method based on generalized fuzzy numbers." *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(7), 2010, pp. 5314-5319.
84. Lee, A. H. (2009). A Fuzzy supplier selection model with the consideration of benefits, opportunities, costs, and risks. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36, 2879–2893.
85. Lee, G., Jun, K. S., and Chung, E. S.: Integrated multi-criteria flood vulnerability approach using fuzzy TOPSIS and Delphi technique, *Nat.*

- Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 13, 1293–1312, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-1293-2013, 2013
86. Lee, G., Jun, K. S., and Chung, E.-S., Group decision- making approach for flood vulnerability identification using the fuzzy VIKOR method, *Nat. hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 15, 863-874,2015, doi; 10.5194/nhess-15-863-2015
 87. Levy, J. K., Zhang and Hall, J. (2005). Advances in flood risk management under uncertainty. *Stoch Environ Res Risk Assess.* 19, 375 – 377.
 88. Lewis, J 1999, Development in disaster- prone places, intermediate technology London.
 89. Li, D. F. (2007). Compromise ratio method for fuzzy multi-attribute group decision making. *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, 7(3), 807–817
 90. Li, F., Li, Z.-K. and Yang, C.-B.: Risk assessment of levee engineering based on triangular fuzzy number and analytic network process and its application, in *Modeling Risk Management in Sustainable Construction*, edited by D. D. Wu, pp. 415–426, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin., 2011
 91. Liao, C-N. (2011). Fuzzy analytic hierarchy process and multi-segment goal programming applied to new product segmented under price strategy. *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, 61(3), pp. 831–841.
 92. Linkov, I., Varguese, A., Jamil, S., Seager, T. P., Kiker, G. and Bridges, T.: Multi-criteria decision analysis: a framework for structuring remedial decisions at contaminated sites, in *Comparative risk assessment and environmental decision making*, edited by I. Linkov and A. B. Ramadan, pp. 15–54, Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York., 2004.
 93. Lolli, F., Ishizaka, A., Gamberini, R., Rimini, B., Ferrari, A.M., Marinelli, S., Savazza, R.,2016. Waste treatment: an environmental, economic and social analysis with a new group fuzzy PROMETHEE approach. *Clean Technol. Environ. Policy* 18 (5), 1317–1332.
 94. Lui, H-C., et al. Assessment of health-care waste disposal methods using a VIKOR-based fuzzy multi criteria decision making method, *Water Management* (2013) doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2013.08.006

95. M. Karamouz, F. Szidarovszky, B. Zahraie, WATER RESOURCES SYSTEMS ANALYSIS, LEWIS PUBLISHERS, A CRC Press Company, Boca Raton London New York Washington, D.C. 2003
96. Malekian A. et al. Application of Integrated Shannon's Entropy and VIKOR Technique in Prioritization of flood Risk in the Shemshak Watershed, Iran *Water Resour Manage* (2015) DOI10.1007/s11269-015-1169-6
97. Maragoudaki, R. and G. Tsakiris, 2005. Flood mitigation planning using PROMETHEE. *European Water*, 9(10): 51-58.
98. Marija KERKEZ, Vladimir GAJOVIĆ, Goran PUZIC, "Flood risk assessment model using the fuzzy analytic hierarchy process" *Progress in Economic Sciences* Nr 4 (2017) p-ISSN 2300-4088 e-ISSN 2391-5951 DOI: 10.14595/PES/04/019.
99. Mays, L. W., *Water Resources Handbook*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1996.
100. Merz, B, Thielen, AH & Gocht, M 2007, 'Flood risk mapping at the local scale: concepts and challenges', *Flood risk management in Europe*, vol. 25, pp. 231–251.
101. Merz, B., Kreibich, H., Schwarze, R. and Thielen, A.: Assessment of economic flood damage, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 10(8), 1697–1724, doi:10.5194/nhess-10-1697-2010, 2010
102. Mikhailov, L. (2004). A fuzzy approach to deriving priorities from interval pairwise comparison judgments. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 159(3), pp. 687–704.
103. Muhammet Gul ,Erkan Celik , Alev Taskin Gumus , Ali Fuat Guneri , A fuzzy logic based PROMETHEE method for material selection problems. *Beni-Suef University Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences* 7 (2018) 68–79
104. N. Zamri, L. Abdullah, M. S. Hitam, N. Maizura, M. Noor and A. Jusoh, A Type-2 Multi-Criteria Decision Making Approach For Flood Control Project Selection. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 7(10): 180-191, 2013

105. O'Brien, K. L. and Vogel, H. C.: Coping with climate variability: the use of seasonal climate forecasts in Southern Africa, Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot., 2003.
106. Opricovic, S. & Tzeng, G.-H. (2004), Compromise solution by mcdm methods: A comparative analysis of vikor and topsis, *European Journal of Operational Research* **156**(2), 445–455.
107. Opricovic, S. & Tzeng, G.-H. (2007), Extended vikor method in comparison with outranking methods, *European Journal of Operational Research* **178**(2), 514–529.
108. Opricovic, S. (1998), *Multi-criteria optimization of civil engineering systems*, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Belgrade.
109. Opricovic, S., 2011. Fuzzy VIKOR with an application to water resources planning. *Expert Syst. Appl.* 38 (10), 12983–12990.
110. Opricovic. S. A fuzzy compromise solution for multicriteria problems *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and knowledge- based system* Vol. 15 No. 3(2007) 363-380
111. Opricovic. S. A fuzzy compromise solution in Water Resources Planning *Water Resour Manage* (2009) 23: 1549-1561 , DOI10.1007/s11269-015-1169-6
112. Opricovic. S. and Tzeng G-H Compromise solution by MCDM methods: A comparative analysis of VIKOR and TOPSIS *European Journal of Operational Research* 156 (2004) 445-455
113. Opricovic. S. and Tzeng G-H., Multicriteria Scheduling in Water Resources Engineering Using Genetic Algorithm *Computing in Civil and Building Engineering* (2000) 1434-1441
114. Opricovic. S. Fuzzy VIKOR with an application to water resources planning *Expert system with applications* 38 (2011) 12983-12990
115. Papathoma-Köhle, M., Gems, B., Sturm, M. and Fuchs, S.: Matrices, curves and indicators: a review of approaches to assess physical vulnerability to debris flows, *Earth-Science Rev.*, 171(June), 272–288, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2017.06.007, 2017.

116. Park, J. H., Cho, H. J. & Kwun, Y. C. (2011), Extension of the vikor method for group decision making with interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy information, *Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making* **10**(3), 233–253.
117. Peng, Y., 2012. Regional earthquake vulnerability assessment using a combination of MCDM methods. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 1–16
118. Pillai, C.R.S., Srinivasa Raju, K., 1995. Ranking of alternatives in planning of water resources systems. In: *Advances in Model Use and Development in Water Resources, Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual Symposium*, AWRA, Houston.
119. Plate E J., Flood risk and flood Management *Journal of Hydrology* 267 (2002) 2-11
120. R.K. Shukla, D. Garg & A. Agarwal (2014) An integrated approach of Fuzzy AHP and Fuzzy TOPSIS in modeling supply chain coordination, *Production & Manufacturing Research*, 2:1, 415-437
121. Radmehr, A., & Araghinejad, S. (2015). Flood Vulnerability Analysis by Fuzzy Spatial Multi Criteria Decision Making, *Water Resour Manage* DOI: 10.1007/s11269-015-1068-x
122. Raju, K.S., and C.R.S., Pillai, 1999. Multi-criterion decision making in river basin planning and development. *European Journal of Operation Research*, 112: 249-257.
123. Rashed, T. and Weeks, J.: Assessing vulnerability to earthquake hazards through spatial multicriteria analysis of urban areas, *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Sci.*, 17(6), 547–576, doi:10.1080/1365881031000114071, 2003.
124. Reza G.M , Evaluation of flood mitigation alternatives using hydrological modeling, *J. Appl. Sci. Environ. Manage. December, 2007* Vol. 11(4) 113 - 117
125. Roy, D. C. and Blaschke, T.: Spatial vulnerability assessment of floods in the coastal regions of Bangladesh, *Geomatics, Nat. Hazards Risk*, 6(1), 21–44, doi:10.1080/19475705.2013.816785, 2015
126. Saaty T.L. (1980) *The analytic hierarchy process*. McGraw-Hill, New York

127. Sabzi H Z. Numerical Comparison of Multi- Criteria Decision-making Technique: A simulation of flood Management Multi-criteria System *World Environmental and Water Resources congress 2015, floods, Droughts and Ecosystems* ASCE 2015
128. Sajjad Ahmad and Slobodan P. Simonovic., System Dynamics Modeling of Reservoir Operations for Flood Management. *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering*, Vol. 14, No. 3, July, 2000.
129. Samantra C. et al Application of Fuzzy Based VIKOR Approach for Multi-Attribute Group Decision Making (MAGDM): A case study in supplier selection, *Decision Making in Manufacturing and Services* Vol. 6 2012 No.1 PP 25-39
130. Sampson, C. C., Smith, A. M., Bates, P. D., Neal, J. C., Alfieri, L. and Freer, J. E.: A high-resolution global flood hazard model, *Water Resour. Res.*, 51(9), 7358–7381, doi:10.1002/2015WR016954, 2015.
131. Sanayei, A., Farid Mousavi, S. & Yazdankhah, A. (2010), Group decision making process for supplier selection with vikor under fuzzy environment, *Expert Systems with Applications* 37(1), 24–30.
132. Santos, P P. d et al. Basin flood Risk Management: A territorial- Driven Approach to Support Decision Making *Water* 2015, 7, 480-502: doi: 10.3390/w7020480
133. Scheuer, S., Haase, D., and Meyer, V.: Exploring multi criteria 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, *Nat. Hazards*, 58, 731–751, 2011.
134. Schuwirth, N., Reichert, P. and Lienert, J.: Methodological aspects of multi-criteria decision analysis for policy support: A case study on pharmaceutical removal from hospital wastewater, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 220(2), 472–483, doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2012.01.055, 2012.
135. Selvaraj et al. Fuzzy TOPSIS approach to identify the flood vulnerability region in south Chennai, *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics* Vol. 118 No, 3 20018, 667-674

136. Shakhshi-Niaei, M., Torabi, S.A., Iranmanesh, S.H., 2011. A comprehensive framework for project selection problem under uncertainty and real-world constraints. *Comput. Ind. Eng.* 61, 226–237.
137. Sharma, A., 2004, *Folk Culture of the Misings of Assam: Traditional and Change*, Decent Books, Indiana University.
138. Shemshadi, A. et al. A fuzzy VIKOR method for supplier selection based on entropy measure for objective weighting *Expert Systems with Applications* 38 (2011) 12160–12167
139. Simonovic, S. P. (1999). Social Criteria for Evaluation of Flood Control Measures – Winnipeg Case Study. *Urban Water (special issue 'Non-Structural Measures in Urban Flood Control' ed. B. Braga)*, Vol.1, No.2, 167-175.
140. Statistical hand book of Bodoland Territorial Council, Assam 2014-15, 2015-16.
141. T. M. Amaral, and P. C C. Ana, "Improving decision-making and management of hospital resources: An application of the PROMETHEE II method in an Emergency Department," *Operations Research for Health Care* 3(1), 2014, pp. 1-6.
142. T. Xiaojuan, X. Liu and L. Wang, "An improved PROMETHEE II method based on Axiomatic Fuzzy Sets." *Neural Computing and Applications*, 25(7-8), 2014, pp. 1675-1683.
143. Takara, K.: Consideration of disaster risk and floods, *J. Flo*, 6, 289, doi:10.1111/jfr3.12078, 2013.
144. Taslima Akter, Slobodan P Simonovic & Jason Salonga (2004) Aggregation of Input from Stakeholders for Flood Management Decision-Making in Red River Basin, *Canada water Resources Journal*, 29:4 251-266, DOI: 10.4296/cwrj251
145. Thouret, J. C., Enjolras, G., Martelli, K., Santoni, O., Luque, J. A., Nagata, M., Arguedas, A. and Macedo, L.: Combining criteria for delineating lahar- and flash-flood-prone hazard and risk zones for the city of Arequipa, Peru,

- Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 13(2), 339–360, doi:10.5194/nhess-13-339-2013, 2013
146. Tingsanchali, T et al. Flood hazard and risk analysis in the southwest region of Bangladesh, *Hydrological Processes* Hydrol Process 19, 2055-2069 (2005)
 147. Tsubaki, R., David Bricker, J., Ichii, K. and Kawahara, Y.: Development of fragility curves for railway embankment and ballast scour due to overtopping flood flow, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 16(12), 2455–2472, doi:10.5194/nhess-16-2455-2016, 2016.
 148. Tuzkaya, G., Gulsun, B., Kahraman, C., Ozgen, D., 2010. An integrated fuzzy multicriteria decision making methodology for material handling equipment selection problem and an application. *Expert Syst. Appl.* 37, 2853–2863.
 149. Tzeng, G.H., Huang, J.J., 2011. *Multiple Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications*. CRC Press.
 150. UNDP: Disaster resilience measurements: Stocktaking of ongoing efforts in developing systems for measuring resilience., 2014.
 151. UNISDR: Terminology on disaster risk reduction, UNISDR, Geneva., 2009.
 152. Vaidya O.S., Kumar S (2006) Analytic hierarchy process: an overview of applications. *Eur J Oper Res* 169:1–29
 153. Van Duivendijk, J., 2005. Assessment of Flood Management Options. Contributing papers to the World Commission on Dams. Ward, R., 1978. *Floods*. The Macmillan Press Ltd.
 154. Van Laarhoven P.J.M., Pedrcyz W (1983) A fuzzy extension of Saaty's priority theory. *Fuzzy Sets Syst* 11:229–241
 155. Venkatesh V. G., Zhang Abraham, Deakins E., Luthra S. and S. Mangla (2018) A fuzzy AHP-TOPSIS approach to supply partner selection in continuous aid humanitarian supply chains, *Annals of Operations Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-018-2981-1>
 156. Viessman, J. R. and Hammer, M., *Water Supply and Pollution Control*, Harper & Row, New York, 1985.
 157. W. Jiang et al., Risk assessment and validation of flood disaster based on fuzzy mathematics, *Progress in Natural Science* 19 (2009) 1419–1425

158. Wang T.C., Chen Y.H. (2007) Applying consistent fuzzy preference relations to partnership selection. *Omega* 35:384–388
159. Wang, J. and Perera, B. J. C., 2005. Spatial Analysis of Flood Levels in a Decision Support System, Proceedings of The 29th *Hydrology and Water Resources Symposium* - Water Capital, Canberra, ACT, 20-23 February 2005.
160. Wang, T. C., Chen, L. Y., Chen, Y. H. (2008, October). Applying fuzzy PROMETHEE method for evaluating IS outsourcing suppliers. In *Fuzzy Systems and Knowledge Discovery, 2008. FSKD'08. Fifth International Conference on* (Vol. 3, pp. 361–365), IEEE.
161. Wang, T. Y., & Yang, Y. H. (2009). A Fuzzy model for supplier selection in quantity discount environments. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36, 12179–12187.
162. Wang, T.-C., & Chang, T.-H. (2007). Application of TOPSIS in evaluating initial training aircraft under a fuzzy environment. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 33(4), 870–880.
163. Wang, Z. et al. Flood hazard risk assessment model based on random forest, *Journal of Hydrology* 527 (2015) 1130-1141
164. Ward, P. J., Moel, H. de and Aerts, J. C. J. H.: How are flood risk estimates affected by the choice of return-periods?, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 11, 3181–3195, doi:10.5194/nhess-11-3181-2011, 2011.
165. Watts, MJ & Bohle, HG 1993, 'Hunger, famine and the space of vulnerability', *GeoJournal*, vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 117–125.
166. Weather, H. S. (2006). Flood hazard and management: a UK perspective. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A.*, 364, 2135-2145.
167. Welle, T. and Birkmann, J.: The World Risk Index – An Approach to Assess Risk and Vulnerability on a Global Scale, *J. Extrem. Events*, 2(1), 1550003, doi:10.1142/S2345737615500037, 2015.
168. Willett, K., and R. Sharda, 1991. Using the analytic hierarchy process in water resources planning: selection of flood control projects. *Socioeconomic Planning*, 25(2): 103-112.

169. Wu, M., Liu, Z. J. (2011), The supplier selection application based on two methods: VIKOR algorithm with entropy method and Fuzzy TOPSIS with vague sets method, *International Journal of Management Science and Engineering Management* 6(2), 936–946.
170. Xu, X. An Overview of Methods for Determining OWA Weights *International Journal of Intelligent Systems* Vol. 20, 843-865 (2005)
171. Yager, R.R On Ordered Weighted Averaging Aggregation Operation in Multicriteria Decision making, *IEEE Trasaction on Systems, Man, Cybernetics* 18, 183-190, 1988
172. Yang X.L., Ding J. H.and Hou H. Application of a triangular fuzzy AHP approach for flood risk evaluation and response measure analysis, *Nat Hazards* (2013) 68: 657-674, DOI 10.1007/s11069-013-0642-x
173. Yilmaz B. and Harmancioglu N. B. Multi-criteria decision making for water resource management: a case study of the Gediz River Basin, Turkey , <http://www.wrc.org.za> ,2010
174. Yilmaz, B., Dagdeviren, M., 2011. A combined approach for equipment selection: FPROMETHEE method and zero–one goal programming. *Expert Syst. Appl.* 38, 11641–11650.
175. Yu , P. L. A class of solution for group decision problem *Management science* Vol. 19 No. 8 April, 1973
176. Yu, C. S. (2002). A GP-AHP method for solving group decision-making fuzzy AHP problems. *Computers and Operations Research*, 29(14), pp. 1969–2001.
177. Yucenur, G. et al. Group decision making process for insurance company selection problem with extend VIKOR method under fuzzy environment, *Expert Systems with Applications* 39 (2012) 3702–3707
178. Zadeh L.A. (1975). The concept of a linguistic variable and its application to approximate reasoning. *Information Sciences*, Part I : 8, 199-249 ; Part II : 8, 301-357 ; Part III : 9, 43-80
179. Zadeh, L. A., 1965. “Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control*”, 8, 338–353

180. Zhou, Y., Vairavamoorthy, K., Grimshaw, F. (2009). Development of a Fuzzy based pipe condition assessment model using PROMETHEE. In The 29th World Environmental & Water Resources Congress, Kansas City, Missouri, USA (pp. 1–10).
181. Zimmermann, H. J. (1992). Fuzzy set theory and its applications. Boston, MA: Kluwer.