



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_11844
Title of the Manuscript:	INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO FLOOD DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA: NEED FOR A PREPARDNESS PLAN
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Dear Author, It was my pleasure to review this very interesting manuscript. In the paper, the author presents an interesting review of governance process and the participation strategies in the field of flood risk in Nigeria. Nonetheless, I have some critical remarks related to this manuscript, which should be addressed before the article can be accepted for publication. It is appreciable the efforts to collect and describe flood events in Nigeria during the last decade and the evolution of governance practices, in the field of non-structural mitigation strategies, as consequence of the past calamitous events. The main aim of the paper is to review the improvement in government mitigation strategies of Nigeria until the development of flood intervention plan in Lagos in 2003, which the author considered a "practical demonstration of governments' commitment to fighting flood hazards" (line 358). The author has highlighted some innovative aspects of Lagos plan without analyzing in detail the structure of the plan and its effective impact on the area. I have not seen the demonstration in practice of the enhancement of the plan: It could be interesting, for example, to analyze how this plan has reduced the costs and the loss of life during the flood events happened, after the 2003, in the area. It could be important to validate the goodness of the plan, describes the methodology to delineate the plan or real	The effectiveness of the Lagos state preparedness plan can be deduced from table 1. Since 2003, the most disastrous flood hazards (involving the loss of several lives) recorded in Nigeria has occurred outside Lagos state. This is despite the fact that 78% of Lagos consists floodable, low-lying lands and wetlands (Odunuga et al, 2012). Detailed analysis of how the Lagos state preparedness plan has reduced the damage potentials of flood waters in the area currently is difficult due to data limitations. It is also beyond the scope of this work. However, we agree with the reviewer that evaluation of the effectiveness of the preparedness plan will be an interesting study- it will be taken up later.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	examples, i.e. the methodology and the results in public participation activities, and/or how the reduction of the national costs and the increment in regional ones is sustainable in case of a future flood events, and/or how is the most appropriate mechanisms for response and recovery in affected areas and why these mechanisms are the most appropriate for Nigeria, and so on. The author have to analyze how the plan has reach the proposed objects (lines 243-254 and lines 309-318) and what have been the limits to reach these objectives. The abstract need to be re-drafted. It needs to be evident in the abstract what are the failure of the past intervention strategies and what are the improvements that Nigeria could learn from Lagos plan and also why this plan is due for review (line 360), i.e. the actual limitations and how the authors deduce these limits. These issues should be described in detailed in the paper.	Sir, this sentence is not clear to us. Please inform us of what to do. We have checked the lines carefully. The failures of past intervention strategies and the improvements which Nigeria could learn form the Lagos model are contained in the main work lines 52-53, 74-81. The Lagos preparedness plan, in our view, is due for review because it has lasted for over a decade-since 2003. It is time to test its goodness. However, the sentence could be expunged (line 360) if the editor so wish.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The work for collect the data about past floods in Nigeria and their consequences is laudable; The author should create a map with all the past flood events to increment the understanding of the section "REVIEW OF REOCCURING FLOOD DISASTERS IN NIGERIA" to the reader that is not familiar with socio-political zone division in Nigeria . The table 1 is called "Spatial distribution of Disastrous Floods in Nigeria (2000-2012)", it is an indirect georeferencing. The author should highlight in the text all the events that have been happened in Lagos. The Lagos plan has been development with the participation of stakeholders. As I have seen in the Figure 2 also the citizen are involved in the delineation of the plan. The authors in line 302 have presented the abatement unit	We are highly pleased with the comments in this section. We thank the reviewer for commending us. Actually, stakeholder participation is emphasised in the Lagos model (see fig. 2). Those who "dread" the staffs of the Abatement unit is residents who erect structures illegally across natural water flow paths or dump waste into drains etc. (see Adeagu, 2011). Many residents contravene the urban planning laws due to rapid rate of urbanization. Illegal structures and slums are growing rapidly and encroaching on he various flood plains and wetlands within and around Lagos (Ibitoye, 2007) such residents are penalised; their illegal structures are almost always demolished. This is



SDI Review Form 1.6

	that the author described as most dreaded for citizen, in particular for resident in flood prone areas. So, in which way the Lagos plan has involved the public participation if the citizen doesn't agree with the abatement of own buildings. How the Lagos plan has reduced this gap?	why they "dread" The Abatement Unit. We have made this clarification in the text (see line 304). We have effected other corrections in this section as much as possible.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Specific comments: - reduce the lines 26-39, that are generic on flood risk, in maximum two sentences. -in lines 26 the sentence is suspended - for definitions of terms, such as flood, (line 29-30), pleas, refers to international papers like Flood site project, Language of risk, 2005; - Lines 48-50: the authors should cite the reference of this statement. - lines 135: the author should describe the characteristic of these areas; - Lines 190; there are two areas with category C. The author should described the aims of these division, i.e. why this categorization, in terms of? - Lines 243: see "Albano et al., 2014, Journal of Water Resource and Protection, 2014, 6, 351-362" for emergency plan support system. - It could be an excellent job if the authors realize a database or a table, in the paper, with all the accessible information of the flood like the AVI project developed in Italy some years ago (http://avi.gndci.cnr.it/welcome_en.htm). This comment is not compulsive for the publication but could be a good spark for the author. - The author has been a role in the delineations of Lagos plan?	We reduced lines 26-39 into 2 sentences as suggested. The sentences became too long and vague. What we did therefore was to reduce the paragraph by deleting lines 38-39. Very good observation; the reference has bee added (line 50) We have describe these lines as recommended in the text (lines 138-140) The error has been corrected (see line 185) We thank the reviewer for this valuable information. We appreciate this. It will help us in this and in future works.