Table 1. Characteristics of home health care patients in Fukui Prefecture, Japan who responded to the survey and those who did not. (2020–2021)

	Respondents (%) (N=98)	Non-respondents (%) (N=101)	Total (%) (N=199)
Sex			
Male	38 (38.8)	48 (47.5)	86 (43.2)
Female	60 (61.2)	53 (52.5)	113 (56.8)
Age			
100-	4 (4.1)	1 (1.0)	5 (2.5)
90-99	16 (16.3)	15 (14.9)	31 (15.6)
80-89	29 (29.6)	31 (30.7)	60 (30.2)
70-79	19 (19.4)	11 (10.9)	30 (15.1)
60-69	11 (11.2)	6 (5.9)	17 (8.5)
50-59	2 (2.0)	3 (3.0)	5 (2.5)
40-49	0 (0.0)	3 (3.0)	3 (1.5)
30-39	7 (7.1)	5 (5.0)	12 (6.0)
20-29	0 (0.0)	3 (3.0)	3 (1.5)
10-19	3 (3.1)	3 (3.0)	6 (3.0)
0-9	7 (7.1)	20 (19.8)	27 (13.6)
Level of the need for care or support			
Not certified	35 (35.7)	52 (51.5)	87 (43.7)
Support level 1	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	2 (1.0)
Support level 2	2 (2.0)	3 (3.0)	5 (2.5)
Care level 1	8 (8.2)	12 (11.9)	20 (10.1)
Care level 2	14 (14.3)	6 (5.9)	20 (10.1)
Care level 3	10 (10.2)	8 (7.9)	18 (9.0)
Care level 4	18 (18.4)	11 (10.9)	29 (14.6)
Care level 5	10 (10.2)	8 (7.9)	18 (9.0)
Primary disease			
Diseases of the nervous system	26 (26.5)	34 (33.7)	60 (30.2)
Mental, behavioral or neurodevelopmental disorders	29 (29.6)	28 (27.7)	57 (28.6)
Developmental anomalies	3 (3.1)	11 (10.9)	14 (7.0)
Injury, poisoning or certain other consequences of external causes	3 (3.1)	10 (9.9)	13 (6.5)
Neoplasms	10 (10.2)	1 (1.0)	11 (5.5)
Diseases of the musculoskeletal system or connective tissue	7 (7.1)	4 (4.0)	11 (5.5)
Diseases of the circulatory system	6 (6.1)	4 (4.0)	10 (5.0)
Endocrine, nutritional or metabolic diseases	6 (6.1)	2 (2.0)	8 (4.0)
Others	8 (8.2)	7 (6.9)	15 (7.5)
Address			
Fukui city	86 (87.8)	79 (78.2)	165 (82.9)
Sakai city	4 (4.1)	7 (6.9)	11 (5.5)
Yoshida gun	4 (4.1)	6 (5.9)	10 (5.0)
Sabae city	3 (3.1)	3 (3.0)	6 (3.0)
Ohno city	0 (0.0)	3 (3.0)	3 (1.5)
Katsuyama city	0 (0.0)	2 (2.0)	2 (1.0)
Echizen city	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)
Awara city	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.5)
Disaster risk (flooding and/or landslides)			
Exists	87 (88.8)	82 (81.2)	169 (84.9)
Not exists	11 (11.2)	19 (18.8)	30 (15.1)
Depth of flooding (m)			
0	23 (23.5)	35 (34.7)	58 (29.1)
0~0.3	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
0.3~0.5	0 (0.0)	3 (3.0)	3 (1.5)
0.5~1.0	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.5)

1.0~3.0	31 (31.6)	30 (29.7)	61 (30.7)
3.0~5.0	42 (42.9)	29 (28.7)	71 (35.7)
5.0~10.0	2 (2.0)	3 (3.0)	5 (2.5)
10.0~20.0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
20.0~	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Landslide Disaster Information			
None	84 (85.7)	83 (82.2)	167 (83.9)
Steep Slope Failure	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.5)
Mudslide	4 (4.1)	4 (4.0)	8 (4.0)
Landslide	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Streams in danger of mudslides	3 (3.1)	2 (2.0)	5 (2.5)
Steep Slope Failure Hazard Area	5 (5.1)	11 (10.9)	16 (8.0)
Landslide danger zone	2 (2.0)	2 (2.0)	4 (2.0)
Avalanche	12 (12.2)	12 (11.9)	24 (12.1)
Special Alert Area			
None	90 (91.8)	89 (88.1)	179 (90.4)
Warning Area	6 (6.1)	9 (8.9)	15 (7.6)
Special Warning Area	0 (0.0)	2 (2.0)	2 (1.0)
Warning Area (Steep Slope Failure)	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	2 (1.0)
Warning Area (Mudslide)	2 (2.0)	1 (1.0)	3 (1.5)
Warning Area (Landslide)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.5)
Structure of the house			
Single house (One story)	12 (12.2)		
Single house (Two stories)	62 (63.3)		
Single house (Three or more stories)	7 (7.1)		
Apartment (two or three stories and wooden or lightweight steel frame)	5 (5.1)		
Apartment (three or more stories and steel or reinforced concrete frame)	8 (8.2)		
Others	4 (4.1)		
Frame of the house			
Wooden frame	71 (72.4)		
Heavy or lightweight steel frame	12 (12.2)		
Reinforced concrete frame	9 (9.2)		
Steel reinforced concrete frame	2 (2.0)		
Others	1 (1.0)		
Unknown	4 (4.1)		
Not available	12 (12.2)		
Use of medical devices			
Ventilator	11 (11.2)		
Dialysis	0 (0.0)		
Intravenous drip	6 (6.1)		
Nutritional support thorough gastric or intestinal bypass	18 (18.4)		
Not used.	57 (58.2)		
Not available	20 (20.4)		

Table 2. Results regarding the accuracy of survey respondents' risk assessment of flooding and landslides, divided by the presence or absence of flooding and landslides risk.

	Group at risk of flooding and/or landslides (%) (N=87)	Group at risk of flooding (%) (N=75)	Group at risk of landslide (%) (N=14)	Group at no risk of disaster (%) (N=11)	Total (%) (N=98)
Risk assessment of flooding and/or landslides					
Correct	40 (46.0)	34 (45.3)	6 (42.9)	6 (54.5)	46 (46.9)
Not correct	47 (54.0)	41 (54.7)	8 (57.1)	5 (45.5)	52 (53.1)

Table 3. Results of logistic analysis of factors that contributed to inadequate comprehension of risk of flooding and landslides.

	OR Univariate (95% confidence Interval)	p-value	OR Multivariate (95% confidence Interval)	p-value
Sex				
Male	1			
Female	1.58 (0.66~3.79)	0.309		
Age				
0~75	1			
75~	1.59 (0.67~3.77)	0.298		
Primary disease				
Nervous	1			
Mental	2.93 (0.91~9.44)	0.073		
Neoplasm	4.55 (0.77~26.84)	0.094		
Others	0.92 (0.30~2.78)	0.879		
Presence of flooding risk				
Yes	1			
No	0.89 (0.24~2.81)	0.764		
Flooding depth (m)				
0~3	1			
3~	0.87 (0.37~2.02)	0.740		
Presence of landslide risk				
Yes	1			
No	0.86 (0.27~2.73)	0.798		
Presence of special alert				
Yes	1			
No	1.19 (0.28~5.12)	0.81		
Building count				
2 or more	1		1	
1	4.72 (1.24~18.00)	0.023	8.89 (1.66~47.68)	0.011
Home structure				
Wood	1			

Others	2.02 (0.77~5.27)	0.152		
Presence of medical device use				
Yes	1		1	
No	3.12 (1.09~8.89)	0.034	3.58 (1.01~12.71)	0.049
Evacuation is important				
Yes	1		1	
No	11.92 (1.46~96.99)	0.021	11.87 (1.23~114.28)	0.032
Presence of difficulties in evacuating alone				
Yes	1			
No	0.41 (0.36~4.71)	0.475		
Bedroom floor				
2 or more	1			
1	1.56 (0.54~4.48)	0.410		
Presence of evacuation concern				
Yes	1			
No	0.48 (0.11~2.14)	0.333		
Respondents				
Patient	1			
Others	0.48 (0.18~1.29)	0.148		
Number of disaster risk				
1	1			
2	1 (empty)			