

Supplementary material for the article:

Dabović T, Pjanović B, Tošković O, Djordjević D, Lukić B. Experts' Perception of the Key Drivers of Land-Use/Land-Cover Changes in Serbia from 1990 to 2012. *Sustainability*. 2021; 13(14):7771. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13147771>

Description of the process of selecting and communicating with experts who participated in the experts' survey

First of all, we considered experts involved in land-use planning, assuming that they were familiar with the complex and multifaceted causes of LULCCs in Serbia. In this regard, we also sought to obtain responses from academics with different background (geography and spatial planning), which was further developed through the research related to LULCCs (in rural and urban areas, infrastructure corridors, protected areas and other special purpose areas); and those with a specialised disciplinary background (such as economy, agriculture, forestry, geodesy), which was further developed in LULCCs research (in local and regional development, spatial sociology, landscape and spatial planning). We also decided to invite one professional with experience in land-use planning on various territorial and functional levels, one who had acquired experience in land-use planning in the private and NGO sectors and one working for the national spatial planning administration. We also wanted to involve more academics (8 in total) than professionals (3 in total) in order to ensure a better quality of the rating of temporally distant drivers of associated LULCCs.

As the majority of the authors were members of both academic and professional planning communities in Serbia, the list of professionals and the first group of academics identified as able to respond to the survey, in terms of their attentiveness to the task and knowledge, was relatively easy to make. On the other hand, the academics from the second group (except for one expert with a background in economics) were more difficult to find. We browsed the web pages of specific academic institutions to find information about their teaching and research. We had also made a rather informal inquiry with senior colleagues from our department involved in interdisciplinary teams exploring LULCCs in the past before defining the initial list of 17 experts to be contacted.

Knowing that such a survey would require from the respondents a long time and considerable concentration to complete, each expert was personally contacted and the research, the survey and its purpose were explained in order to increase the motivation for performance and attentiveness to the tasks. Through these conversations we were able to see whether the experts understood the concepts and terminology used in the survey and how they perceived their task and the rating; they also allowed us to provide additional explanation in case of misunderstanding. Experts were also encouraged to offer their assessment only on those targets they were the most familiar with (see Maestas, 2016). Once the oral consent was provided, the survey (see Figure A1) was sent via e-mail, with an additional written explanation of the context of the research, the purpose of the survey, the types of LULCCs and each group of drivers.

Since some experts were unavailable for the first round, we conducted two more rounds of invitations in order to ensure that the intended structure of experts be achieved.

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | Which drivers influenced the most <i>urban sprawl</i> at the national level in Serbia? | | | | *Additional comment: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | Drivers | Sub-periods | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | 1990-2000 | 2000-2006 | 2006-2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | Political-institutional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | Economic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | Natural-spatial | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | Cultural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | Technological | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

- I cannot say
0 - no influence
10 - the greatest impact

Urban sprawl Agricultural intensification Agricultural extensification Afforestation Deforestation Water bodies' construction & ma

Figure S1. Survey on key drivers of land-use/land-cover changes in Serbia from 1990 to 2012.