



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I thank the author for considering my suggestions. However, some of the more relevant ones, which are, in my opinion, needed to assure a qualified paper in accordance with the quality standards of this journal, have not been fulfilled. 1. Introduction (from line 26 to 110 in the revised manuscript) is virtually the same that in original manuscript and, consequently, is still too long and quite repetitive. 2. Although the comparison between the Lagos Preparedness Plan and the plans conducted by other countries (such as UK, USA, Australia, among others) is beyond the scope, it would be useful and appropriate to outline the most relevant points they have in common. 3. Great effort was done to describe in detail the past and present approach to flood disaster management in Nigeria (i.e. the way the money was allocated by the Federal Government in 2012, lines 188 to 205). Nevertheless, the Lagos Preparedness Plan is still not explained in such detail. For instance, the flood management responsibilities contained in the plan were listed in lines 316 to 325 and in lines 382 to 384, it would be worthwhile explaining (or, at least, outlining) <i>how</i> they were implemented. In brief, I think more emphasis should be placed on the Lagos Plan (its implementation and goals) than in previous experiences in Nigeria. This would help to extrapolate the model to other states or regions. 4. Finally, the most important point in my opinion, the included the sentence in lines 76-77 to support the opinion that the Lagos Plan is "in the right direction". I have no access to the paper authored by Ndukwu and Chiemelu (2010), however it seems to refer to preparedness plans in general. Thus, this does not provide objective information to support the idea that the Lagos Plan, in particular, is an effective tool to be <i>copied</i> by others. I think these points, especially the last one, are needed to develop the goals set out by the author and to provide the manuscript with enough substance as a <i>research</i> paper.	The comments and suggestions of the reviewer the constructive. We appreciate them. 1. We have revised and reduced the information contained between lines 26 and 110. Lines 26-38 were completely re-drafted. Lines 53-54 and 56-57 were deleted. 2. The goodness of the Lagos model has been discussed fully 3. The methodology for implementing the model has been added using new information collected from the Nigerian Hydrological Services Agency (NHSA), Abuja