



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The development of comprehensive plans for flood management is a crucial task to be considered by governments and the citizenry, so this paper is focused on an important and interesting topic. The author clearly showed the relevance of flood disasters in Nigeria. Also the evolution of the institutional response was presented. The author aimed to highlight the value of the preparedness plan in the flood management context by using Lagos as a case of study. Nevertheless, in my opinion, there are certain analyses that should be done or reconsidered in order to achieve the aim expressed: • The Lagos State Flood Preparedness Plan was described in very general terms. This complicates the extrapolation of the plan to be applied in other states. It was stated that "the Lagos model contains innovative lessons", a detailed presentation of these lessons would be opportune. • The author argued that the preparedness plan is an effective tool to manage flood disasters. This opinion, although valuable, was not supported by objective information (such as the reduction in the number of people affected after the application of the plan, reduction in material loss, reduction in the cost of recovery actions, among others). An objective analysis, including this kind of data, should be done. • It was expressed in the paper that the Lagos Preparedness Plan "is a step in the right direction". This observation was based on the fact that the leading	These innovative lessons were listed from lines 345-347. We however expanded them in line with the recommendation. This correction is worthwhile and has been effected from line 77 This is a useful suggestion but it is beyond the scope of this work. A comparative analysis of the Lagos model with those of the cited countries



SDI Review Form 1.6

	countries in flood management apply this kind of plans. A comparative analysis of the preparedness plans implemented by those countries and by Lagos State would be useful to support such observation.	will form an important area of future studies. We believe however that the extensive revision done on this paper captures aspects of the reviewers suggestions
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 26. <i>Manuscript:</i> "...in this paper refers, to...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "... in this paper, refers to..." Line 59. <i>Manuscript:</i> "111,255 persons...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "111,255 people..." Line 73. <i>Manuscript:</i> "...activities. (Akintola and Ikwuyatum, 2012) The...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "... activities (Akintola and Ikwuyatum, 2012). The..." Line 75. <i>Manuscript:</i> "... recovery (reconstructions), Prior emergency...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "... recovery (reconstructions). Prior emergency..." Line 79. <i>Manuscript:</i> "which, characteristically tend to be...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "which, characteristically, tend to be..." Line 94. <i>Manuscript:</i> "This the highest number...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "This is the highest number..." Line 97. <i>Manuscript:</i> "transportations routes". <i>Suggestion:</i> "transportation routes" Line 167. <i>Manuscript:</i> "...episode occur in...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "... episode occurs in..." Line 170. <i>Manuscript:</i> "... evidence show...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "...evidence shows..." Line 223. <i>Manuscript:</i> "Infact". <i>Suggestion:</i> "In fact" Line 344. <i>Manuscript:</i> "The lagos model...". <i>Suggestion:</i> "The Lagos model..." Fig. 2. Consistency in the use of capital letters in labels and in the location of labels would be desirable	All these corrections are worthwhile and were duly effected in the main work. Further proof reading also revealed similar corrections which we have effected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It would be appropriate to check the grammar and reconsider the writing style, especially in the Introduction and Review sections. The text is somewhat repetitive. It might be shortened thus it would be easier to follow. There is relevant but not crucial information which was described in detail and repeated along the text. Besides the relevancy of the topic, it should be pointed out that: Bibliography is extensive, relevant and current.	This observation is very much in order and the repetitions has been expunged- line 80 ("flooding is the ..." and line 69 "the Lagos – Ibadan...")



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Great effort was done to summarise the large amount of related agencies and committees, and their interactions.	
--	---	--